

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 796th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 25.9.2026

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

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Professor Janet K.Y. Chan

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

Professor Herbert P.K. Chia

Dr Chris K.T. Lam

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Jenny Y.L. Tsang

Assistant Director/Regional 1,
Lands Department
Mr Jason C.S. Chan

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Secretary

In Attendance

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

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Melissa C.H. Kwan

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 795th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 795th MPC meeting held on 11.9.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there was one case selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the application. Details of the planning application, Members' declaration of interests for the case and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

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

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Messrs Daniel K.W. Chung and Derrick S.M. Yip joined the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Messrs Tony K.Y. Yip and Elton H.T. Chung, Senior Town Planners/Hong Kong (STPs/HK), and Ms Farica F.Y. Ng and Mr Henry H.C. Au, Town Planners/Hong Kong (TPs/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H6/97 Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction for Permitted Flat
Use in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, 4, 4A, 4B and 4C Tai Hang Road,
Hong Kong
(MPC Paper No. A/H6/97A)

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Tai Hang. Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had declared an interest on the item as she was living in Tai Hang. As Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong’s residence had no direct view of the Site, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, 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 had no objection to the application.

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

Current Scheme

7. In response to a Member’s enquiry about the planning and design merits and estimated population of the current scheme, as compared with the previously approved scheme under application No. A/H6/91, Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, TP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint

slides, said that as compared with the approved scheme, the current scheme incorporated design improvements, including a reduction in the podium height from 57 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 45.2mPD with a stepped podium design, a reduction in the overall building height (BH) from 145.6mPD to 142.2mPD, the addition of a covered landscape area on 6/F to enhance air ventilation, the provision of peripheral planters and vertical greening at the podium fronting Tai Hang Road, and an increase in the buffer distance between the podium and the “Green Belt” zone to the south. With the proposed increase in the number of flats from 61 to 176 and based on a person-per-flat ratio of 2.6, the estimated population for the proposed development would increase from 165 to 458.

[Professor Herbert P.K. Chia joined the meeting at this point.]

Traffic Impact

8. Some Members raised the following questions:
 - (a) elaboration on the conclusion of the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that no adverse traffic impacts were generated by the proposed development, noting that the estimated population of the proposed development would increase by almost 300 and traffic jams were often observed along Tai Hang Road towards Causeway Bay;
 - (b) why a smaller flat size would result in lower trip rates and trip generations in the current scheme despite the increase in the number of flats; and
 - (c) whether the TIA had taken into account the impact on the demand for public transport, as well as taxis and ride-hailing vehicles.
9. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, and Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, TP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:
 - (a) according to the submitted TIA, several critical junctions along Tai Hang Road towards Causeway Bay (including Junction No. J4 – Tung Lo Wan Road/Moreton Terrace and Junction No. J5 – Tai Hang Road/Pedestrian

Crossing near Ka Ning Path) had been assessed. Although there was an increase in the number of flats in the current scheme, the proposed smaller average flat size had resulted in a reduced requirement for provision of private car parking spaces. Consequently, the overall traffic generation remained similar to that of the approved scheme. Furthermore, there was no change in the Reserve Capacity (RC) for signalised junctions and Design Flow/Capacity (DFC) ratios for roundabouts between the reference case (i.e. the approved scheme) and the design case (i.e. the current scheme) during the peak hours in year 2033. Therefore, the proposed increase in the number of flats was not expected to generate a significant traffic impact on those critical junctions;

- (b) the provision of parking spaces for private cars was determined in accordance with the parking standard for private housing stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. The parking requirements were calculated based on three key factors, including flat size, proximity to a rail station, and domestic plot ratio (PR). Regarding flat size, the assessment assumed that residents of larger flats had a higher propensity to use private cars, whereas residents of smaller flats were more likely to rely on public transport. Thus, smaller units required fewer parking spaces; and
- (c) with reference to Table 7.4 of the TIA, the transport modal split derived from the 2021 Population Census and adjusted based on the context of the Site indicated that about 58% and 11% of the population would take buses and public light buses respectively. The remaining 16%, 9% and 6% were assumed to use private cars, taxis and other non-public transport respectively. The demand for ride-hailing vehicles should have been taken into account under the non-public transport category. Based on the public transport survey carried out by the applicant in 2026, it was anticipated that there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate the future public transport demand generated by the proposed development, together with the existing demand, during peak hours in year 2033 (as shown in Tables 7.1, 7.2 and 7.7 of the TIA).

10. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry regarding the performance of critical junctions in Causeway Bay, Mr B.K. Chow, Assistant Commissioner/Urban (AC/U), Transport Department (TD) explained that a higher RC percentage indicated the signalised junction could handle more extra traffic flow before reaching its capacity limit. With reference to Table 5.1 of the TIA, there was sufficient reserve capacity in Junction No. 1 – Causeway Road/Irving Street/Leighton Road/Tung Lo Wan Road, with RCs of 75% and 106% during AM and PM peak hours respectively, under both the approved scheme and the current scheme.

11. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the standard for evaluating the operational performance of critical junctions from traffic engineering perspective, Mr B.K. Chow, AC/U, TD explained that RC and DFC ratio were the performance indicators commonly used to measure the performance of signalised junctions and roundabouts respectively. In practice, the overall traffic impact would be assessed on a case-by-case basis by considering various factors, including actual road conditions, estimated trip generation from the proposed development, and changes in performance at critical junctions. If there was significant traffic impact at critical junctions, traffic improvement measures would be required. The same Member further enquired why the RCs/DFC ratios at critical junctions remained unchanged between the approved scheme and the current scheme during peak hours in year 2033, despite the increase in the number of flats and estimated population. Mr B.K. Chow clarified that the unchanged RCs/DFC ratios indicated that the additional traffic trips generated by the current scheme as compared with the approved scheme were relatively small when comparing to the overall traffic volume at the critical junctions.

12. In response to some Members' enquiries regarding the junction performance in the baseline case (i.e. the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)-compliant scheme) and the fundamental considerations of the TIA, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that there was no information at hand regarding the junction performance for the baseline case. While each application should be considered on its own merits, the applicant submitted a TIA for the current scheme to demonstrate that the proposed development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas. TD had no objection to the application and considered the findings of the TIA acceptable. The Chairperson supplemented that the Site was zoned "Residential (Group B)" ("R(B)"), where 'Flat' use was always permitted, subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 30 storeys. Traffic and infrastructural capacities in the area had been reserved for an OZP-compliant residential development. The Site was the subject of a

previously approved application involving minor relaxation of PR from 5 to 5.687, which was the same as the currently proposed PR. As the current application primarily proposed an increase in the number of flats while maintaining the same extent of minor PR relaxation, the fundamental consideration of the application, including the TIA, should be whether the impacts generated by the increased number of flats and the corresponding increase in population were acceptable.

13. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding whether there were any upgrades or improvements to the traffic signal systems at critical junctions as compared with the previously approved application, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that no relevant information was provided in the submitted TIA. Mr B.K. Chow, AC/U, TD supplemented that the assessment of the operational performance of critical junctions should have been conducted based on the latest traffic and road conditions. The same Member further enquired whether operational performance during non-peak hours had been assessed. In response, Mr B.K. Chow explained that AM and PM peak hours were considered to be the most critical scenarios under this development. Should the operational performance of critical junctions be found acceptable during peak periods, no significant operational issues would be anticipated during non-peak hours.

14. The Chairperson enquired whether the application of artificial intelligence (AI) to the traffic signal system could improve the overall traffic conditions. In response, Mr B.K. Chow, AC/U, TD said that the degree of improvement with AI applications would be contingent upon actual road conditions and prevailing traffic patterns.

Sewerage Impact

15. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the sewerage impact of the proposed development, Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, TP/HK, said that despite the increase in the estimated population, the submitted Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) indicated that the additional sewage generated by the proposed development was insignificant. Both the Environmental Protection Department and the Drainage Services Department had no adverse comment on the submitted SIA and the application.

Public Concerns

16. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the major grounds of objection and concerns from the 178 public comments received on the application, Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, TP/HK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the comments were mainly submitted by the Incorporated Owners of Illumination Terrace and Winway Court, as well as local residents. The major grounds of objection and/or concerns included: (i) there was no planning merit in the redevelopment proposal and the proposed PR was considered excessive and incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood; (ii) the additional traffic generated by the redevelopment would overload the local traffic network and place undue strain on public transport; (iii) the proposed redevelopment would generate adverse visual impact and affect the natural lighting of the neighbourhood; (iv) the proposed redevelopment would create additional stress on the existing slope and pose a potential risk to slope safety; (v) the proposed redevelopment would affect air ventilation in the surrounding area and generate adverse environmental impacts; and (vi) the applicant was alleged to be abusing the planning system by repeatedly submitting planning applications, and the prolonged redevelopment process would cause serious disturbance to the neighbourhood. In response to the public concerns, the applicant had submitted a TIA with public transport survey conducted in March 2026, an Environmental Assessment, a SIA and a Geotechnical Statement to demonstrate that the proposed redevelopment would not generate adverse traffic, environmental, sewerage and geotechnical impacts on the surrounding area. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application.

Deliberation Session

17. The Chairperson remarked that the Site fell within the "R(B)" zone, where 'Flat' use was always permitted, subject to a maximum PR of 5 and a maximum BH of 30 storeys. The Site was the subject of a previous application for minor relaxation of PR restriction to the same proposed PR of 5.687 for the same permitted residential use, which was approved in 2022 mainly on the grounds that the lease provisions permitted private residential development over the entire lot which partly falling within the adjoining "GB" zone, and the proposed development, which was confined within the "R(B)" portion of the lot, would result in a higher PR over a reduced site area with no adverse impacts. As compared with the approved scheme, the current scheme mainly involved an increase in the number of flats from 61 to 176, with no changes to the gross floor area, PR or number of storeys. The proposed BH of the residential

tower complied with the BH restriction under the OZP. Various technical assessments had been conducted, which demonstrated that the proposed development would not generate adverse impacts on the surrounding area in terms of traffic, sewerage, environment and other aspects.

18. A Member generally supported the application and remarked that the Committee had thoroughly considered the public concerns regarding the traffic impacts of the proposed development. Another Member also expressed a supportive view on the application and noted that the relatively low expected occupancy rate of green minibuses during peak hours in 2033 was anticipated to provide sufficient capacity for the additional demand for public transport arising from the increased population. The Committee noted that TD would continue to monitor the future demand for public transport in the area, and the frequency of the services would be reviewed if necessary.

19. A Member, while having no objection to the application, enquired whether the applicant of the section 16 (s.16) application should be invited to the meeting to explain the application. The Chairperson said that the Town Planning Ordinance had only provided for the attendance of the Town Planning Board's meeting by the applicant of s.12A application, but not for applicant of s.16 application. As established practice, the applicant of s.16 application would not be invited to attend the meeting to ensure meeting efficiency. The subject applicant had submitted relevant technical assessments to support the application and relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application. PlanD's representative(s) would present the application to the Committee and answer possible questions from Members. In the event that the s.16 application was rejected by the Committee, the applicant would have the opportunity to present their case to the Town Planning Board and respond to Members' questions during the s.17 review stage.

20. The same Member opined that future TIAs could, where appropriate, provide greater precision in the figures used to compare junction capacity across different scenarios to facilitate the Committee's understanding of the findings. The Chairperson remarked that a clear illustration on the number of trips generated and attracted by the proposed development could provide Members with a clearer understanding of the traffic implications.

21. A Member suggested that the Government and the industry should adopt new AI

technologies to capture real-time traffic data, allowing for the analysis and presentation of dynamic traffic flows, rather than relying solely on static peak-hour analyses. The Committee noted that the use of AI would enhance the efficiency and accuracy of traffic data collection, and TD had been exploring the application of AI in conducting traffic surveys. Nevertheless, the Committee also noted that peak-hour conditions represented the “most critical scenario” for assessment, and the current methodology remained prudent and sufficient for planning purposes.

22. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 25.9.2030, 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 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/H21/160	Proposed Minor Relaxation of Non-domestic Gross Floor Area and Building Height Restrictions for Permitted Commercial Development in “Commercial (7)” Zone, Various Lots in “Commercial (7)” Zone Bounded by King’s Road and Taikoo Shing Road, Quarry Bay (MPC Paper No. A/H21/160B)
-----------	---

23. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Quarry Bay and the application was submitted by Actuate 5 Limited to Actuate 27 Limited, which were partly owned by Gaw Capital. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Bond C.P. Chow	-	for co-owning with spouse a property in Quarry Bay; and
-------------------	---	---

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung - for having current business dealings with Gaw Capital.

24. As the property of Mr Bond C.P. Chow had direct view of the Site and the interest declared by Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung was considered direct, the Committee agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Mr Bond C.P. Chow left the meeting temporarily and Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Development History

26. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that several sets of general building plans (GBPs) for the proposed extension of the existing office building at 1111 King's Road (the Development Site) were approved in 1999, 2008 and 2025, with non-domestic gross floor areas (GFAs) (ranging from 163,530m² to 202,926m² for the application site (the Site)) significantly larger than the GFA restriction of 123,129m² under the prevailing Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), whether the applicants had an entitled development right to materialise the approved GBPs; and
- (b) the rationale for imposing a building height (BH) restriction of 135 metres

above Principal Datum (mPD) for the Development Site in 2008 and a total non-domestic GFA restriction of 123,129m² under the Taikoo Shing Master Development Plans (MDP) approved in 2008, rather than reflecting the higher total non-domestic GFA figures under the GBPs approved in 1999 and 2008.

27. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) prior to the imposition of GFA restriction on the “Commercial (7)” (“C(7)”) zone in 2009, a set of GBPs for a proposed 19-storey office extension to the existing office building at the Development Site, with a total BH of 186.45mPD for the Development Site and a total non-domestic GFA of 202,926m² for the Site (i.e. the area covered by the current “C(7)” zone), was approved by the Building Authority in 1999. The Taikoo Shing MDP was approved under the lease in 2008 with a total non-domestic GFA restriction of 123,129m² for the Site, which was subsequently incorporated into the OZP when the Site was rezoned from “C” to “C(7)” in 2009. As the non-domestic GFA proposed in both the previously approved GBPs and the current application would exceed the limits stipulated in the MDP and the OZP, the applicants were required to obtain prior written consent from the Lands Department (LandsD) for amendment to the MDP and planning permission from the Town Planning Board respectively. Thus, the previously approved GBPs could not be materialised without amendment to the MDP and obtaining the planning permission;
- (b) the BH restriction of 135mPD was imposed on the then “C” zone covering the Development Site in 2008 to achieve a stepped BH profile and to respect the planning intention for a medium-density character within the Taikoo Shing area. The EAST Hong Kong Hotel on the western part of the Site, which received GBP approval in 2005 with a BH of about 141mPD, was under construction in 2008 and was then taken into account in setting the BH restriction. The GFA restriction of 123,129m² was imposed on the “C(7)” zone in 2009 to reflect the non-domestic GFA as stipulated under the

approved MDP, which essentially reflected the GFA of the then existing and committed developments on the Site. With the completion of the EAST Hong Kong Hotel, the permitted GFA for the Site under the approved MDP had been fully utilised; and

- (c) the current application sought minor relaxation of the non-domestic GFA restriction from 123,129m² to 142,254m² (i.e. +19,125m² or +15.5%) and the BH restriction from 135mPD to 149.8mPD (i.e. +14.8m or +11%) to facilitate a proposed 10-storey office extension atop the existing 29-storey commercial building at the Development Site. A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) submitted by the applicants concluded that the overall visual impacts at all viewpoints ranged from negligible to slight when compared with the OZP-compliant scheme with a BH of 135mPD. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD had no adverse comment on the application from visual perspective. Taking into account the planning gains and community benefits proposed by the applicants, PlanD had no objection to the application.

28. The Chairperson remarked that development control operated under three distinct regimes, namely the planning, building and land administration regimes. Although several sets of GBPs with higher GFA and BH were approved at the time when the OZP had no BH and GFA restrictions and the MDP contained no GFA restriction, the proposal had not been implemented and now did not comply with the restrictions subsequently imposed under the OZP and lease. Therefore, the approved GBPs did not contain a right of acceptance under the planning and land administration controls. A Member agreed that the approval of GBPs did not confer a development right; rather, the approved GBPs should be viewed as part of the historical development context of the Site. The Chairperson added that the Committee's primary considerations for the current application should focus on whether the proposed minor relaxation of the non-domestic GFA and BH restrictions would result in adverse impacts and whether the proposed planning and design merits were sufficient to justify such relaxation. Whether sympathetic consideration should be given to the historical development context of the Site was a matter for Members' judgement.

Planning Intention of "C(7)" Zone

29. Noting that there was a public comment concerning the intention of the specific development restrictions within the “C(7)” zone to control development intensity, a Member enquired whether the proposed office extension was in line with the planning intention of the “C(7)” zone. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the BH restriction of 135mPD at the Development Site was imposed to maintain a stepped BH profile in the Quarry Bay area with BH bands ranging from 45mPD to 220mPD, generally increasing progressively from the waterfront towards the uphill area. The Site comprised three portions, including Cityplaza (about 43mPD) in the central portion, the EAST Hong Kong Hotel (about 141mPD) in the western portion, and the commercial building (currently with a BH of 106.35mPD) on the Development Site in the eastern portion, which was proposed to be increased to 149.8mPD. The proposed BH of 149.8mPD was broadly comparable to that of the neighbouring EAST Hong Kong Hotel, creating a twin tower configuration with similar BHs within the same “C(7)” zone. The proposed office extension on the Development Site was considered not incompatible with the surrounding built environment, and the established stepped BH profile of the Taikoo Shing area was generally maintained and respected.

Planning and Design Merits

30. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the enhancement works to the common area on 5/F and the pedestrian connectivity improvement works on 6/F were proposed under the current scheme;
- (b) whether the proposed refuge floor-cum-sky garden on 28/F would be open to the public free of charge; and
- (c) the rationale for the opening hours of the sky garden, which were proposed to be daily from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m., and whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the sky garden would be accessible to the public on a daily basis.

31. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the internal layouts on 5/F and 6/F were proposed to be revamped to enhance the common area and pedestrian connectivity. Those works were proposed under the current scheme as planning gains and benefits to the community;
- (b) according to the applicants' proposal, the proposed refuge floor-cum-sky garden would be open to the public free of charge daily from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. The sky garden would feature a jogging lane, as well as active and passive recreational zones. A dedicated lift would be reserved to provide direct public access to the sky garden; and
- (c) while the applicants did not provide a specific rationale for the proposed opening hours, the details regarding the implementation and management of the sky garden could be explored for incorporation into the lease condition as appropriate.

Structural Capacity and Railway Safety

32. Noting that there was a public comment regarding the structural safety of the existing foundation of the Development Site, as well as the impact on neighbouring buildings and infrastructure, a Member enquired whether the structural capacity of the existing building would require strengthening, whether the Development Site fell within the railway protection area, and whether MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) had been consulted on the development proposal. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the Development Site was located within the railway protection boundary of the existing MTR Island Line. The Railway Development Office of the Highways Department had no adverse comment on the application and advised the applicants to seek comments from MTRCL regarding railway operations. The applicants committed to liaising with the relevant government departments and stakeholders, including MTRCL, during the detailed design and implementation stages. Furthermore, according to the applicants' submission, the basement and foundation of the Development Site were originally designed with sufficient structural capacity and spatial allowance to accommodate additional office floors above at the time of the site's initial planning and construction in the 1990s.

Public Comments

33. Noting that an opinion poll was conducted by an Eastern District Council (EDC) member, which indicated that 99% of the 417 respondents opposed the proposed development, a Member enquired about the methodology of the poll and whether information regarding the planning merits of the development proposal had been provided in the questionnaire. In response, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the opinion poll was conducted by an EDC member through a three-round survey involving both online platforms and street booths. According to the submission of the said public comment, the questionnaire only requested basic information regarding the respondent's place of residence and whether the respondent supported or opposed the proposed office extension on the Development Site, with the provision of detailed reasons being optional.

Noise and Dust Control

34. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the mitigation measures for minimising the noise and dust arising from the proposed construction works, Mr Elton H.T. Chung, STP/HK, said that according to the application, the applicants would strictly observe and comply with the requirements under the Noise Control Ordinance and the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation, and other relevant environmental regulations and requirements stipulated by the Environmental Protection Department. Appropriate dust reduction measures and good practices for noise mitigation would be adopted to minimise environmental impacts and nuisance to the surrounding area.

Deliberation Session

35. The Chairperson briefly recapitulated the development history of the Site. The Site was not subject to any development restriction under the OZP when the first GBP for a proposed office extension with a maximum BH of 186.45mPD and a total non-domestic GFA of 202,926m² was approved in 1999. Subsequently, the Taikoo Shing MDP was approved under the lease in 2008 with a maximum non-domestic GFA of 123,129m² for the Site. A BH restriction of 135mPD and a GFA restriction of 123,129m² were imposed on the OZP in 2008 and 2009 respectively. The current application sought minor relaxation of the non-domestic GFA restriction from 123,129m² to 142,254m² (i.e. +19,125m² or +15.5%) and the

BH restriction from 135mPD to 149.8mPD (i.e. +14.8m or +11%) to facilitate a proposed 10-storey office extension atop the existing 29-storey commercial building at the Development Site. The applicants proposed several planning and community gains, including a publicly accessible sky garden on 28/F, enhancement road and pavement works to the entrance area on 5/F and improvement works to the internal layout on 6/F for better pedestrian connectivity. The applicants had submitted various technical assessments to demonstrate that the proposed office extension would not result in adverse impacts. Relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the application. In view of the above, PlanD had no objection to the application. Members were invited to consider whether the applicants had provided strong justifications and sufficient planning and design merits for the proposed minor relaxation of GFA and BH restrictions.

36. Noting that should the application be approved, amendments to the MDP under the lease would also be required to materialise the proposed office extension at the Development Site, a Member generally supported the application and expressed appreciation for the applicants' forward-looking approach to planning for office supply, rather than focusing solely on short-term economic conditions.

37. Another Member supported the application and enquired whether hotel use, including service apartments and student hostels, would be permitted within the commercial building. The Committee noted that 'Hotel' was a Column 1 use which was always permitted within the "C" zone. Hotel-like service apartments and student hostels supported by Government's policy, which were regarded as 'Hotel' use, would be permitted.

38. Members generally supported the application and appreciated the applicants' effort to provide a sky garden for public use free of charge. Notwithstanding that, they suggested an extension of the opening hours to before 8 a.m. and after 8 p.m., particularly on weekends, to accommodate more community users. A Member opined that the applicants could explore the opportunity to hold private events in the sky garden outside the public opening hours to facilitate the upkeep of the space. Nevertheless, the Committee noted that should GFA exemption be sought for the refuge floor-cum-sky garden, commercial use within that space would not be allowed under the Joint Practice Note No. 2 promulgated by the Buildings Department, LandsD and PlanD.

39. A Member remarked that the eight proposed new trees should include more native species to support the ecosystem. Noting that the Development Site was in proximity to the existing residential cluster and that there was public concern regarding construction-related noise and dust, the Member suggested the adoption of advanced construction solutions, such as the use of a foundation pit air-supported membrane. The Chairperson remarked that the applicants were required to comply with all relevant ordinances and regulations regarding noise and dust control during construction.

40. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally considered that the application could be approved. The Committee agreed that the proposed minor relaxation of the non-domestic GFA and BH restrictions was justifiable and acceptable, having regard to no adverse impacts and the planning and design merits proposed. In response to Members' views, the Chairperson suggested and the Committee agreed to include an additional approval condition requiring the provision of the sky garden to the satisfaction of PlanD and an additional advisory clause requesting the applicants to consider extending the opening hours of the sky garden to meet the community needs. Regarding Members' view that the applicants should be reminded to liaise closely with the local stakeholders given the significant number of opposing public comments from nearby residents, the Chairperson suggested and the Committee agreed to incorporate an additional advisory clause requesting the applicants to establish better communication with the local community to address the public concerns.

41. 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 25.9.2030, 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 and the following additional approval condition:

“the provision of a sky garden open to the public, as proposed by the applicants, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.”

42. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper and the following additional advisory clauses:

- “- the applicants should maintain close communication with the local community throughout the development process with a view to addressing public concerns; and
- the applicants should consider extending the opening hours of the sky garden to meet the community needs.”

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

Kowloon District

[Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K), and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Bond C.P. Chow rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/50	Proposed Flat with Permitted Eating Place, Shop and Services and Social Welfare Facilities, and Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio Restriction in “Commercial (2)” Zone, 8 Lam Chak Street, Kowloon (MPC Paper No. A/K22/50A)
----------	--

43. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Health Link Investment Limited, which was partly owned by Asia Standard International Group Limited (Asia Standard). Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with Asia Standard. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

44. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen K.W. Ip, 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.

Development Background

45. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the existing commercial/office building was the subject of a previous planning application on the application site (the Site) and whether any planning merits were required to be achieved under that application; and
- (b) noting that the Site formed part of the extension of the Kowloon Bay Business Area (KBBA), whether there had been any changes in the planning circumstances of the area.

46. In response, Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was originally zoned “Industrial” and the first set of general building plans for an industrial building (IB) was approved by the Building Authority in 1998 at a plot ratio (PR) of 11.996 and a building height (BH) up to 172.75 metres above Principal Datum (mPD). The Site was subsequently rezoned to “Commercial (2)” (“C(2)”) in 2006, with the intention of serving as an extension of the existing/planned business developments in the Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong Business Areas. In 2008, a section 16 application (No. A/K22/6) for minor relaxation of the BH, PR and site coverage (SC) restrictions for a permitted commercial/office development was approved by the Committee, mainly on the considerations that the commercial building was in line with the planning intention of the “C(2)” zone and was considered more compatible with the surrounding area than the approved IB at 172.75mPD. While the commercial building had echoed the Government’s

policy of transforming the area from industrial to commercial use, no other specific planning merits were proposed under the previous application; and

- (b) although the Site formed part of the extension of KBBA, unlike the sites in the core business area where only commercial/business-related developments were permitted, the Notes of the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan for the “C(2)” zone allowed for residential development with a PR of 5 subject to planning permission and provided that all the environmental and technical concerns were properly addressed. There were similar applications for ‘Flat’ use approved in the adjacent “C(2)” zone at Kai Hing Road to the southeast. The area to the immediate southwest of the Site was also zoned “Residential (Group B) 2” (“R(B)2”) for residential development.

Proposed Development

47. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the proposed increase in PR from 5 to 7 (i.e. + PR 2 or +40%) was rather significant, what was the rationale behind the PlanD’s recommendation of no objection to the application, given that residential development within the “C(2)” zone should not exceed a maximum PR of 5 due to environmental concerns, including the air and noise impacts from Kwun Tong Bypass, and similar applications for ‘Flat’ use in the same zone to the southeast were approved with a domestic PR not exceeding 5 and a BH not exceeding 100mPD; and
- (b) noting that the Energising Kowloon East Office (EKEO) of the Development Bureau had raised concern regarding the loss of commercial floor space in Kowloon East, whether the integrity of KBBA would be compromised.

48. In response, Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, STP/K, and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/K, with the aid of the visualiser and some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) according to Chapter 2 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines

(HKPSG) on residential densities, the Kai Tak area fell within Residential Zone 1 of the Main Urban Areas, where the maximum domestic PR was generally 6.5. While residential development at the Site was subject to a maximum PR of 5 under the Outline Zoning Plan, the Town Planning Board (the Board) might consider minor relaxation of the PR, SC and BH restrictions based on the individual merits of a development proposal. The applicant of the current application had submitted technical assessments on traffic, environment, visual, drainage, sewerage and risk aspects to demonstrate that the proposed development would not create adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. Therefore, the proposed total PR of 7 (comprising a domestic PR of 6.5 and a non-domestic PR of 0.5) and a BH of 136.45mPD same as that of the existing building were considered not unacceptable; and

- (b) regarding the concern over the loss of commercial floor space, there was a total non-domestic gross floor area (GFA) of about 1,800,000m² within the Kai Tak Development (KTD). The existing commercial building at the Site had a GFA of about 63,000m², accounting for about 3.5% of the total non-domestic GFA in KTD. It was considered that the proposed development would not undermine the integrity of KBBA.

Planning Merits

49. Noting that only about 490m² GFA was dedicated to government, institution and community (GIC) use in the proposed scheme (accounting for about 1% of the total GFA), a Member enquired whether there were any guidelines or benchmarks on the proportion of GIC facilities to be provided within private development projects. In response, Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/K, said that with reference to a similar application (No. A/K22/43) for minor relaxation of PR and BH restrictions for a residential development with eating place, shop and services and social welfare facility (SWF) uses within the “R(B)2” zone to the southwest of the Site, the proposed SWFs accounted for about 1.1% of the total GFA of that development.

Air Ventilation

50. In response to a Member’s enquiry on whether the proposed development with

stepped BHs would have any impact on air ventilation, noting a public comment that the proposed development would create a wall effect on the surrounding area, particularly in the vicinity of the nearby hospital cluster, Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, STP/K, with the aid of the visualiser, said that based on a site photo taken from Cheung Yip Street, which was approximately 35m wide, the existing commercial building on the Site with a BH of 136.45mPD, did not have adverse visual impact on the area, including the Kai Tak Hospital currently under construction. With a reduced building bulk, the proposed residential development would unlikely create wall effect on the surrounding area. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD had no adverse comment on the proposed building bulk.

Environmental Impacts and Concerns

51. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the existing commercial/office building on the Site, namely Harbourside HQ, completed in 2010, was relatively new and in good building condition, whether the applicant had addressed the issue of construction waste generation or conducted a waste management assessment regarding the environmental impact of demolishing the building, and whether the applicant had explored the possibility of converting the existing building to alternative uses;
- (b) whether any mitigation measures would be implemented to minimise the noise and dust impacts arising from the demolition of the existing building; and
- (c) noting that the potential risks posed by the Liquefied Petroleum Gas Filling Station at Cheung Yip Street and Kerry D.G. Warehouse at Kai Hing Road to the proposed residential development had been assessed, whether the potential risks, including those related to helicopter operations at Kai Tak Hospital, during the demolition and construction stages had also been assessed.

52. In response, Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, STP/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) Harbourside HQ was completed in 2010. The applicant did not provide a specific rationale for redeveloping the Site, but a general waste management proposal regarding the demolition of the existing commercial building was included. The proposed change in use from commercial to residential was likely to be a commercial decision in response to changing market conditions and reduced demand for commercial floor space. According to the applicant, the vacancy rate of the existing commercial building was about 25%. The proposed redevelopment was claimed to be in line with the Government's policy to increase housing supply and the intention to rezone some commercial sites for residential use;
- (b) an Environmental Assessment (EA) had been conducted, which concluded that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, no adverse impacts related to noise and dust pollution were expected during the construction period; and
- (c) the risk associated with the planned helicopter operations at Kai Tak Hospital had been assessed in the submitted Quantitative Risk Assessment. No insurmountable environmental impacts associated with the proposed development were anticipated, and the Environmental Protection Department had no adverse comment on the application.

Trees

53. Noting that 56 new standard trees were proposed to be planted within the Site under the redevelopment proposal, a Member enquired about the species of the proposed trees. In response, Ms Paulina L.S. Pun, STP/K, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the applicant had provided a proposed planting schedule, which included a selection of native species. A relevant approval condition requiring the applicant to submit and implement a landscape proposal was recommended. The applicant could be required to plant more native species during the subsequent landscape proposal submission stage.

Deliberation Session

54. The Chairperson remarked that in view of the significant demand for housing land and current market conditions for commercial developments, the Government had adopted a flexible and case-by-case approach in converting commercial land to residential use. Government-led land use conversions and planning applications for 'Flat' use within "C" zone were not uncommon in recent years. Given the environmental considerations in the area, including the air and noise impacts from Kwun Tong Bypass, the Site was zoned "C(2)" and was subject to a maximum PR not exceeding 5 for residential development upon planning approval for 'Flat' use. From a macro perspective, the current application for proposed 'Flat' use at the Site was not unacceptable. Considering that similar applications for 'Flat' use in the adjacent "C(2)" zone had been approved and a proposed residential development in the "R(B)2" zone was located to the immediate southwest, the proposed residential development at the Site was not incompatible with the surrounding area from a micro perspective.

55. The current application also sought minor relaxation of the PR restriction from 5 to 7 (comprising a domestic PR of 6.5 and a non-domestic PR of 0.5), which was generally consistent with the maximum domestic PR of 6.5 recommended for KTD under HKPSG. Relevant technical assessments, including an EA, had been conducted and demonstrated that the proposed development was technically feasible. In support of the proposed minor relaxation of the PR restriction, the applicant had proposed various planning and design merits, including provision of active retail frontages and a splayed corner at Kai Hing Road and Lam Chak Street with low-level setbacks of about 2.5m wide from site boundaries, a 4m-wide public passage along the northeastern boundary within the 15m-wide setback area for 24-hour public access between Kai Tak Hospital and Kai Hing Road, and a dedicated GFA of about 490m² for SWFs required by the Social Welfare Department. Members were invited to consider whether the applicant had provided adequate justifications and sufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed 'Flat' use and minor relaxation of PR restriction.

56. Members generally considered that while the proposed 'Flat' use at the Site might not be incompatible with the surrounding uses, the application could not be supported as there were no strong planning justifications and sufficient planning and design merits for the proposed relaxation in PR.

57. Members expressed the following views and concerns:

- (a) the proposed planning and design merits were considered insufficient to justify an increase in PR of up to 40%. In particular, the provision of 490m² GFA for SWFs, accounting for about 1% of the total GFA, was deemed minimal when compared with the requirement in new public housing developments, where 5% of the domestic GFA was typically allocated for GIC use. Besides, the proposed 4m-wide 24-hour public passage was ineffective in connecting the major activity nodes surrounding the Site;
- (b) although a similar application for minor relaxation of PR restriction (up to 7) had been approved in the adjacent “R(B)2” zone, that application had obtained policy support for financing the development of the Smart and Green Mass Transit System, whereas the current application lacked similar policy support and should not be considered comparable;
- (c) approval of this application might set an undesirable precedent for another approved residential development (under Application No. A/K22/31, with a total PR of 5) to the immediate southeast in the “C(2)” zone to follow suit by proposing PR relaxation of a similar scale;
- (d) the concern raised by EKEO regarding the loss of commercial floor space in Kowloon East was concurred with. It was not certain whether such a loss would undermine the integrity of the business area in Kowloon East and its status as the “Core Business District 2”. In any event, it would contradict long-term policy objectives and potentially lead to cumulative effects resulting in a further loss of commercial land in the area; and
- (e) noting that the existing commercial development maintained an occupancy rate of 75%, it was evident that there was a tangible demand for commercial floor space in the area. There would likely be a long-term demand for such space to sustain Hong Kong’s status as a metropolis. Permitted uses, such as ‘Religious Institution’ and ‘School’, were often accommodated within

commercial buildings to provide essential community services. In recent years, the Government had also implemented measures to assist commercial property owners, such as allowing student hostel use in commercial buildings under the Hostels in the City Scheme. The existing commercial building should be viewed as a societal resource contributing to the supply of commercial floor space to meet market needs.

58. Some Members expressed grave concerns regarding the environmental impact of demolishing the existing commercial building, given its relatively young age of less than 20 years. Demolition of the building would be a waste of built resources. The absence of a detailed waste management assessment to drive material recycling and reuse during demolition was considered undesirable from environmental perspective. The substantial volume of construction waste generated would contradict global and national commitments regarding embodied carbon emissions and carbon neutrality goals. The applicant should explore opportunities to convert the building in-situ for alternative uses, such as student hostel or other compatible uses, rather than proceeding with complete demolition and reconstruction. The Chairperson clarified that as the current planning approval framework did not explicitly specify assessment requirements regarding building age or embodied carbon, such factors should not be regarded as main reasons for rejecting the current application.

59. A Member reiterated concerns that the proposed building bulk would create a wall effect on the surrounding area. Another Member pointed out that the minor overlapping of a tower of the proposed residential development with an existing high-rise building in the background did not justify the encroachment onto the “20% Building Free Zone” of the Kowloon Ridgeline, and stressed that such an encroachment should be avoided.

60. The Committee generally shared the view that the Board’s role should focus primarily on the needs and benefits of society rather than the financial interests of individual developers. The financial viability and commercial decisions of a development proposal could be determined by various factors, which should not be material planning considerations in the decision-making process.

61. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally had no strong view on the proposed ‘Flat’ use but did not support or had reservation on the application, having considered

that there were no strong planning justifications in the submission and that the proposed planning and design merits were insufficient to justify the proposed 40% relaxation of PR restriction, which was considered excessive. Members' views on the proposed 'Flat' use and the proposed PR would be duly recorded in the meeting minutes for the applicant's reference.

62. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reason was:

“there are no strong planning justifications, nor sufficient planning and design merits for the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio restriction.”

[Messrs Derrick S.M. Yip and Bond C.P. Chow, Professor Simon K.L. Wong, Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Dr Chris K.T. Lam and Professor Herbert P.K. Chia left the meeting during deliberation.]

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

Agenda Item 7

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

63. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:35 p.m.

**Minutes of 796th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee
(held on 25.9.2026)**

Case for Streamlining Arrangement

Application approved on a permanent basis

Item No.	Application No.	Planning Application
3	A/K5/880	Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (2)” Zone, Workshop C1 (Portion), G/F, Block C, Hong Kong Industrial Centre, 489-491 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan

Declaration of Interests

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

Item No.	Members’ Declared Interests	
3	The application premises for shop and services use were located in Cheung Sha Wan.	- Professor Herbert P.K. Chia for his spouse owning a property near the application premises - Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity

The Committee noted that Professor Herbert P.K. Chia had not yet joined the meeting. As the interest of Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan was considered direct, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion.