TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 798th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 23.10.2026

Present

Director of Planning Mr C.K. Yip	Chairperson
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	Vice-chairperson
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	
Professor Herbert P.K. Chia	
Dr Chris K.T. Lam	
Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department Mr B.K. Chow	

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung

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

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

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

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

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

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Nicol W.K. Yu

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 797th MPC Meeting

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 797th MPC meeting held on 9.10.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Case

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there was one case requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the application. Details of the request for deferral, Members' declaration of interests for the case and the Committee's view on the declared interests were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Paper.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

Hong Kong District

[Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), and Ms Farica F.Y. Ng, Town Planner/Hong Kong (TP/HK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

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)

5. The Secretary reported that the application site (the Site) was located in Causeway Bay, and Arup Hong Kong Limited (Arup), Otherland Limited (Otherland) and Ronald Lu & Partners (Hong Kong) Limited (RLP) were the consultants of the applicants. Some of the consultants of the applicants might also be eligible voters/nominators of candidates in the Architectural, Surveying, Planning and Landscape Subsector of the 2026 Electoral Committee Subsector Ordinary Elections (the Election). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	-	living in Causeway Bay;
Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung	-	having been nominated as a candidate in the Election;
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	-	having past business dealings with Arup and Otherland; and
Mr Derrick S.M. Yip	-	being a personal friend of the Chairman and Vice-chairman of RLP.

6. The Committee noted that Mr Vincent K.C. Cheung had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the residence of Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong had no direct view of the Site, and Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. 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 (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

[Professor Herbert P.K. Chia joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

Traffic Impact

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

(a) how the proposed development could improve the road traffic conditions of the area according to the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), noting that a commenter opined that the proposal could not improve the existing at-grade traffic conditions in Causeway Bay;

(b) whether the traffic improvement measures pertaining to the Lee Garden Eight development, including road widening works and junction improvements, had been taken into account in the TIA; and

(c) whether the proposed development was justified in view of the enhanced traffic performance as assessed under the TIA.

9. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) according to the TIA, the operational performance of seven affected road junctions in the vicinity had been assessed for the design year of 2036 when the three proposed underground vehicular tunnels (i.e. Tunnel T1 connecting Lee Garden One and Lee Garden Three as approved under application No. A/H6/93, Tunnel T2 connecting Lee Garden One and Lee Garden Two as approved under application No. A/H6/94, and Tunnel T3 connecting Lee Garden Three and Lee Garden Eight under the current application) were expected to be in full operation. The reserve capacities (RCs) for signalised junctions and the design flow to capacity (DFC) ratios for priority junctions were mostly improved between the reference scenario (i.e. with Tunnels T1 and T2 only) and the design scenario (i.e. with Tunnels T1, T2 and T3) during peak hours in 2036. Consequently, the overall at-grade traffic flow was reduced, except at Junction J1 (Caroline Hill Road (West)/Link Road) where more vehicles were expected to access and leave the car parks at Lee Garden Eight through Tunnel T3. Notwithstanding that, the TIA demonstrated that the road capacity around Junction J1 was sufficient to accommodate the anticipated vehicle queue lengths leading to Lee Garden Eight during peak hours in both the reference and design scenarios upon completion of the road improvement works;

(b) the TIA had taken into account the traffic improvement measures proposed under the Lee Garden Eight development; and

(c) according to the TIA, the traffic performance was mostly improved, as reflected by higher values of RCs at signalised junctions and lower values of DFC ratios at priority junctions in the design year of 2036.

10. 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, Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport Department (TD) explained that RC and DFC ratio were the performance indicators commonly used to measure the performance of signalised junctions and roundabouts/priority junctions respectively. The overall traffic impact should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account various relevant

factors including actual road conditions, estimated trip generation from the proposed development and changes in performance at critical junctions. Regarding the traffic performance in the area, the Chairperson observed that the RCs and DFC ratios assessed in the TIA were well above the general acceptance level.

11. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry on whether there would be any measures to control traffic within the connected underground car parks, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, said that the applicants had proposed an overall traffic management strategy to guide drivers within the car parks, including the provision of directional signage with real-time vacancy information at the car park entrances and key circulation areas to direct traffic, as well as a mobile application providing real-time vacancy information.

Tree Preservation and Protection

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

(a) whether the proposed development could enhance the preservation and protection of the Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) within the Lee Garden Eight development on Leighton Road;

(b) whether alternative alignments of the proposed vehicular tunnel had been considered so as not to affect the aforesaid OVT; and

(c) whether the proposed development would have any impact on the group of OVTs in Lee Garden Three on Hysan Avenue.

13. In response, Mr Tony K.Y. Yip, STP/HK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

(a) the OVT was found to be suffering from brown root rot disease. According to the latest site inspection, supporting iron ropes had been installed to stabilise the tree to prevent it from falling and endangering pedestrian safety. The preservation of the OVT was currently monitored under the special conditions in the land lease of the Lee Garden Eight

development, as well as the approval conditions attached to the previously approved application No. A/H7/188 in October 2025 for amendments to the approved layout plan and proposed minor relaxation of gross floor area restriction, which required a series of preservation measures, including the engagement of a tree expert and the implementation of a protection-cum-rehabilitation scheme to care for the tree. Under the current application, approval conditions relating to preservation works for the OVT in connection with the construction of Tunnel T3 were recommended. The applicants were required to submit a tree protection proposal, prepared by a tree expert, for the OVT before commencement of construction works and to implement the proposal to the satisfaction of the Lands Department (LandsD) to ensure the healthy growth of the tree;

(b) the applicants had explored three tunnel design options with different alignments. As the option along Hoi Ping Road would affect existing buildings and the option along Sunning Road with a change of tunnel direction would require excavation at ground level, thereby affecting the at-grade road traffic, the current option with a straight alignment along Sunning Road was adopted as the preferred option; and

(c) there was a buffer distance of at least 5m below the group of OVTs on Hysan Avenue for the construction of Tunnel T1, which was sufficient to protect the trees.

Deliberation Session

14. The Chairperson recapitulated that the proposed underground vehicular tunnel was expected to improve the at-grade traffic conditions of the area and the TIA was accepted by TD. Management measures were proposed for the efficient operation of the connected underground car parks. The Head of Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section (GLTMS) (H(GLTMS)) of the Development Bureau (DEVB) had no objection to the application, and approval conditions for the submission and implementation of the tree protection proposal for the OVT were recommended.

15. Members generally supported the application. A Member considered that the proposed tunnel could provide drivers with alternative routes to access and leave the connected underground car parks, thereby providing greater convenience, and the at-grade traffic conditions would be improved significantly. Another Member opined that connecting the underground car parks by the three proposed vehicular tunnels could bring about road traffic improvements in the area beyond those anticipated in the TIA.

16. Given the various commitments made by the developer of the Lee Garden developments to improve the vehicular and pedestrian traffic conditions of the area in the current and previous planning applications, the Vice-chairperson reminded that the Government should monitor the implementation and effectiveness of all such traffic improvement measures.

17. A Member said that the applicants should be reminded to proactively preserve the OVT as a tourist attraction and protect it from the risk of falling. Another Member concurred that the applicants should take the utmost care to protect the OVT to avoid recurrence of the previous incident involving the death of the OVT in the 1881 development in Tsim Sha Tsui.

18. In response to a Member's concern as to whether H(GLTMS) of DEVB should also be named as an approving authority in respect of the recommended approval conditions (e) and (f) on the submission and implementation of the tree protection proposal for the OVT, in addition to the Director of Lands (D of Lands), the Committee noted that the tree protection proposal would be reviewed by the Landscape Advisory Team of LandsD and circulated to GLTMS of DEVB for comment. The comments of H(GLTMS) of DEVB on the application were also incorporated in a recommended advisory clause for the applicants' attention.

19. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry regarding approval conditions (e) and (f) on the OVT, Ms Catherine W.S. Pang, Assistant Director/Regional 1, LandsD confirmed that the two approval conditions were recommended by LandsD, and its Landscape Advisory Team would vet compliance with the two approval conditions. A Member said that GLTMS of DEVB primarily played a supervisory role in the formulation of overall tree

management policy in Hong Kong and had limited resources, and might not be responsible for vetting submissions for individual projects, such as those relating to compliance with planning approval conditions, which should rest with relevant government departments. After discussion, the Committee agreed that it was appropriate to name D of Lands as the approving authority for approval conditions (e) and (f).

20. 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 23.10.2030, 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 applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 5

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

21. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:55 a.m.