

**FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATION NO. A/H19/87**  
**UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of  
Plot Ratio, Building Height and Site Coverage Restrictions in  
“Other Specified Uses” annotated  
“Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved” Zone,  
44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley**

**1. Background**

- 1.1 On 13.9.2024, the applicant, New Season Global Limited represented by KTA Planning Limited, submitted the current application seeking planning permission for a preservation-cum-residential development with minor relaxation of plot ratio (PR) from 0.75 to 0.9 (i.e. +0.15 or +20%), building height (BH) from 64mPD to 67.7mPD (i.e. 3.7m or +5.8%), and site coverage (SC) from 30% to 36% (i.e. +6% or +20%) restrictions at the application site (the Site), which is zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved”<sup>1</sup> (“OU(RDHBP)”) on the approved Stanley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H19/16 (**Plan FA-1**). The Site is currently occupied by a Grade 1 historic building, namely the Maryknoll House (**Plans FA-2 to FA-6**).
- 1.2 On 28.3.2025, the application was considered by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (the Board)<sup>2</sup>. Members in general had grave concerns regarding the removal of the cross at the rooftop which was considered as one of the character-defining elements of the Maryknoll House. Some Members were also concerned about the proposed increase in PR and SC<sup>3</sup> without design merits and sufficient justifications, and invited the applicant to

---

<sup>1</sup> According to the Notes for the “OU(RDHBP)” zone of the OZP, ‘Flat’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Any new development, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to (except those minor alteration and/or modification works which are ancillary and directly related to the always permitted uses) or redevelopment of the existing historic building requires permission from the Board. Minor relaxation of the PR, BH and SC restrictions may be considered by the Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

<sup>2</sup> The current application proposes a preservation-cum-residential development comprising (i) adaptive reuse of the Grade 1 Maryknoll House, which consists of the three-storey Main Building (proposed for flat use), the two-storey Chapel Wing (proposed for Heritage Gallery use), and the two-storey Library Wing (proposed for recreational club house and E&M uses); (ii) alterations to the western, eastern and southern façades, including the addition of a one-storey extension to the west, a three-storey extension above one level basement carpark to the east, and two new loggias at G/F to the south of the Maryknoll House; (iii) a four-storey new residential block above one level carpark on the southern platform formed from the existing garden and slope; and (iv) a one-storey guard house at the entrance of the Site (**Drawings A-1 to A-9 of Appendix F-I**).

<sup>3</sup> The Site is the subject of a section 16 application (No. A/H19/82) submitted by the same applicant for a preservation-cum-residential development with minor relaxation of the BH restriction, which was approved by the Committee on 24.12.2021 (the ‘approved 2021 scheme’). The proposed BH of 67.7mPD under the current application is the same as that in the approved 2021 scheme.

provide supplementary information, such as justifications for removing the cross at the rooftop and the extent of the proposed increase in PR and SC. The Planning Department (PlanD) was also requested to provide more details of Members' previous concerns about heritage conservation elements during the consideration of previous section 12A and section 16 applications, as well as the OZP amendment process to facilitate further consideration of the application<sup>4</sup>.

1.3 After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application for two months, pending the applicant's further information (FI), including (i) consideration of retaining the cross at the rooftop, and if removal was deemed necessary, strong justifications should be provided; and (ii) review of the extent and justifications for the proposed increase in PR and SC, for further consideration of the Committee.

1.4 For Members' reference, the following documents are attached:

- (a) MPC Paper No. A/H19/87A (Appendix F-I)
- (b) Extract of minutes of the 762<sup>nd</sup> MPC meeting held on 28.3.2025 (Appendix F-II)
- (c) Secretary of the Board's letter dated 11.4.2025 informing the applicant of the Committee's decision to defer a decision on the application (Appendix F-III)
- (d) FI received on 27.5.2025 (Appendix F-IV)  
*(accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirements)*

## **2. FI Submitted by the Applicant**

On 27.5.2025, the applicant submitted FI (Appendix F-IV) in response to the Committee's concerns, which are summarised as follows:

### **Preservation of the Cross**

- (a) The cross at the rooftop of the Maryknoll House will be retained in the current scheme after review, in response to the strong views expressed by the Members.

---

<sup>4</sup> The subject "OU(RDHBP)" zone is based on a section 12A application (No. Y/H19/1), which was partially agreed by the Committee on 4.1.2019, submitted by the same applicant to rezone the Site from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "OU(RDHBP)" to facilitate a proposed preservation-cum-residential development project. On 15.5.2020, the Committee agreed to proposed amendments to the OZP to take forward its decision. The draft OZP No. S/H19/13, incorporating the above amendments, was gazetted on 5.6.2020. After giving consideration to the representations and comments on 15.1.2021, the Board decided not to uphold the representations and determined that no amendments should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations. The draft OZP was approved by the Chief Executive in Council on 4.5.2021. Subsequently, a section 16 application (No. A/H19/82), which was approved by the Committee with conditions on 24.12.2021, was submitted by the same applicant for a preservation-cum-residential development with minor relaxation of the BH restriction.

### Major Public Gains

- (b) ***Preservation of the Maryknoll House*** – The main building and its architectural merits (details of the architectural merits are in paragraph 3.1 and **Appendix F-V**) identified by the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) will be preserved in this preservation-cum-residential development. To encourage private owners to preserve historic buildings, the Government takes a proactive approach to discuss with private owners to formulate options for preservation with possible economic incentives that are commensurate with the heritage value of the graded buildings. This preservation-cum-residential development is a collaborative effort among the Commissioner of Heritage Office (CHO), AMO, and the applicant. It has struck a balance between the preservation of a historic building and respect for private property rights.
- (c) ***Make the Maryknoll House Available for Public Appreciation*** – The applicant has made efforts to strike a balance between public appreciation and the privacy and security of future residents. The Maryknoll House was not opened to the public when it served as the headquarters for the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers. In the current scheme, the entire Chapel Wing will be dedicated to the Heritage Gallery and opened for public appreciation.
- (d) ***Improve the Interpretation of the Maryknoll House*** – Compared to the approved 2021 scheme, the area for public appreciation has been substantially increased from 44m<sup>2</sup> to 298m<sup>2</sup>, which will bring significant improvements to the public appreciation of the Site. Visitors of the guided tour will be able to enjoy an immersive experience in a serene environment, without disturbing or being disturbed by the users of the residential clubhouse<sup>5</sup>. Additionally, the Heritage Gallery will provide a more spacious area for various modes of interpretation, including the display of salvaged items, Augmented Reality (AR)/ Virtual Reality (VR), physical model(s), display panels, interactive digital screens, and projection screens, which cannot be accommodated in the interpretation areas of the approved 2021 scheme (**Drawing FA-1**).
- (e) The applicant is also committed to provide the following additional planning gains after review:
  - (i) Further increase the frequency of the guided tour from 12 times per year to 18 times per year;
  - (ii) the applicant will be responsible for setting up and operating the Heritage Gallery in accordance with the Deed of Mutual Covenant (DMC); and
  - (iii) the applicant will set aside a sinking fund for the future operation of the Heritage Gallery and guided tour.

### Challenges of Implementation of the Preservation-cum-Residential Development

- (f) Implementation of this preservation-cum-residential development project is challenging and costly. The lengthy applications and procedural requirements,

---

<sup>5</sup> In the approved 2021 scheme, the exhibition areas were separately located within the recreational facilities of the Chapel Wing and Library Wing, which is GFA non-accountable. Under the current scheme, these exhibition areas will be consolidated into a larger space within the Chapel Wing, creating a designated Heritage Gallery of about 298m<sup>2</sup>, which is GFA accountable.

including section 12 and section 16 applications, have caused financial strain on the applicant. Moreover, significant and costly site formation works are necessary to maintain the visibility of the Maryknoll House southern façade while accommodating new buildings at the lower deck. The structures of the Maryknoll House should also be upgraded to modern standards. The cost of preserving the main building, including the much-needed strengthening works, as well as the lowered building platform to avoid obstruction to showcase the main building is enormous. The provision of a Heritage Gallery with a substantial increase in size and content for public appreciation also has cost implications on the project.

*Relaxation Being Sought is Minor and Reasonable*

- (g) The proposed minor relaxation of the PR restriction involves an additional gross floor area (GFA) of 1,146.8m<sup>2</sup> only. The increase in GFA for this heritage proposal will bring significant improvements to the public appreciation of the Site. There will be an exclusive and dedicated area within the Chapel Wing for interpretation purposes. About one-fourth of the additional GFA (i.e. about 298m<sup>2</sup>) is for the proposed Heritage Gallery. Under the approved 2021 scheme, the proposed areas for public appreciation (i.e. 22m<sup>2</sup> each, 44m<sup>2</sup> in total) fall within the residential clubhouse, which is GFA non-accountable. In contrast, the proposed Heritage Gallery in the current scheme is an exclusive and dedicated area for appreciation purpose and is GFA accountable.

**3. Background Information and Members' Previous Concerns on the Heritage Conservation Elements of the Maryknoll House**

*Historic Building Appraisal by AMO*

- 3.1 The Maryknoll House was built in 1935 and served as the headquarters for the Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers in their Chinese missionary work. The Antiquities Advisory Board confirmed its Grade 1 status for architectural merit and authenticity in 2016. According to the historic building appraisal prepared by AMO, the Maryknoll House has a handsome red-brick facade showcasing the strong character of Chinese architecture combined with western elements and details in a style known as Chinese Eclectic. The Chinese architectural features include green glazed tiled roofs, green glazed Chinese grilles, octagonal and hexagonal shaped windows, and various decorations and motifs on the façade. The building is symmetrical in plan, and the façades also exhibit regular fenestration with only minor deviations. Although there have been renovations, alterations and additions internally over the years to meet changing requirements, externally the building remains fairly authentic and rare piece of built heritage of architectural interest and value (**Appendix F-V**).

*Section 12A Application No. Y/H19/1*

- 3.2 A section 12A planning application (No. Y/H19/1) for rezoning the Site from “G/IC” to “OU(RDHBP)” for the proposed preservation-cum-residential development was submitted in July 2018. According to the conceptual development scheme of the application, a ‘triple volume entrance’ involving the removal of a section of the Maryknoll House to make way for its new main entrance to provide barrier-free

access, and a new extension on the eastern side of the Maryknoll House were proposed. Meanwhile, architectural features including the distinctive green glazed tiled roofs, most of the exterior walls and façade, and the wooden staircases would be preserved. The cross at the rooftop of the Maryknoll House was also retained under the scheme. The application was considered by the Committee on 4.1.2019. Members generally agreed with the proposed rezoning. A Member raised concerns regarding the heritage conservation elements, which mainly focused on the triple volume entrance lobby, as it might affect the architectural integrity of the historic building, the symmetry of the building, and its setting. Some members also considered that the public access arrangement should be enhanced, and the applicant should make more available area for public access and increase the number of guided tours (half-yearly under the scheme) <sup>6</sup>.

### Amendment to the OZP

- 3.3 An amendment to the OZP was made in 2020 to facilitate the proposed preservation-cum-residential development. During the hearing of the representations on 15.1.2021, a member enquired about the possible impact on the Maryknoll House arising from the western extension of the proposed development put forward by the applicant in the representation from a heritage conservation perspective. The Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO) advised that the southern façade of the Maryknoll House was the most important façade, and the public view of this façade should be preserved. After considering all the representations and comments received, the Board decided not to uphold the representations and determined that no amendments should be made to the draft OZP to meet the representations<sup>7</sup>. The draft OZP was approved by the Chief Executive in Council on 4.5.2021.

### Section 16 Application No. A/19/82

- 3.4 Taking into account the Members' comments given on the section 12A application, the applicant proposed extensions to the west and east of the Maryknoll House to respect its symmetrical design and deleted the triple volume entrance in the scheme. According to the applicant's submissions, architectural features including the pitched roof, green glazed tiles, all chimneys, and the cross at the rooftop of the Maryknoll House would be preserved in-situ. The application was considered by the Committee on 24.12.2021. While a member commented that the proposed new extension on the west would cover a portion of the building façade and hence affect the building design and obstruct public views to the main building, the majority of the Members indicated support for the application and generally considered that the proposal was an improvement to the indicative scheme under section 12A, and the proposed extension was not major in scale. Some Members considered that the applicant should explore the possibility to further enhance the public access arrangement, such as increasing the frequency (8 times a year under the scheme)

---

<sup>6</sup> The minutes of the Committee meeting on 4.1.2019 for the section 12A application No. S/H19/1 is available at the Board's website at: [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m619mpc\\_e.pdf](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m619mpc_e.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> The minutes of the Board meeting on 15.1.2021 for consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft Stanley OZP No. S/H19/13 is available at the Board's website at: [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Minutes/m1237tpb\\_e.pdf](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/TPB/Minutes/m1237tpb_e.pdf)

and the number of visitors for the guided tours. The application was approved with conditions<sup>8</sup>.

#### **4. Previous and Similar Applications**

There is no change to the previous and similar applications in the OZP area since the last consideration of the Committee.

#### **5. Comments from Relevant Government Departments**

- 5.1 Comments on the current application made previously by the relevant Government bureaux/departments are stated in paragraph 9 of **Appendix F-I**.
- 5.2 For the current submission of FI (**Appendix F-IV**), the following government departments have been consulted and their comments are summarised as follows:

##### **Heritage Conservation**

5.2.1. Comments from the CHO and Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), AMO, Development Bureau (DEVB):

- (a) No objection in principle to the overall preservation-cum-residential development proposal from the heritage conservation perspective.
- (b) The applicant's updated proposal to retain the rooftop cross of the MaryKnoll House in-situ having regard to the comments and advice provided by Members during the Committee meeting on 28.3.2025 is appreciated.
- (c) The applicant's initiative to increase the frequency of guided tours from 12 times to 18 times per year is welcomed. However, the applicant is reminded that the details of the guided tours (including the duration of each tour and whether the group size will remain at 25 persons per tour) should be further clarified and confirmed with CHO and AMO.
- (d) The operation strategy and financial management of the Heritage Gallery and guided tours are for the applicant to decide.
- (e) Similar to the approved application No. A/19/82, the following approval condition is suggested for the protection of the Maryknoll House should the application be approved:

---

<sup>8</sup> The minutes of the Committee meeting on 24.12.2021 for the section 16 application No. A/H19/82 is available at the Board's website at: [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m686mpc\\_e.pdf](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Minutes/m686mpc_e.pdf)

the submission of a revised Conservation Management Plan (CMP) with detailed arrangements for free guided tours prior to the commencement of any works, and the implementation of works, including the provision of free guided tours, in accordance with the CMP to the satisfaction of AMO of DEVB or of the Board.

5.3 The following government departments have no objection to/no further comment on the FI, and their previous comments on the application, as set out in paragraph 9 of **Appendix F-I**, remain valid:

- (a) Chief Architect/Advisory & Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, ArchSD);
- (b) Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage, Buildings Department;
- (c) District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department;
- (d) Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD);
- (e) Commissioner for Transport; and
- (f) Director of Fire Services.

5.4 The following government departments maintain their previous views of having no objection to/ no comment on the FI and the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (b) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department;
- (c) Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department;
- (d) Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department;
- (e) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (f) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (g) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services; and
- (h) District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department.

## **6. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

6.1 The current application is for a preservation-cum-residential development involving the in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House (a Grade 1 historic building), the addition of new extensions to the east and west and two new loggias to the south of the Maryknoll House, as well as the erection of a new residential block on the southern lower platform and a new guard house at the entrance of the Site. As the PR, BH of the proposed western extension, and SC (i.e. 0.9, 67.7mPD and 36% respectively) exceed the PR, BH and SC restrictions (i.e. 0.75, 64mPD, and 30% respectively) stipulated on the OZP, minor relaxation of these restrictions is required. Compared to the approved 2021 scheme, the original current scheme involves several new proposals, including (i) relocation of the existing cross from the roof to the Heritage Gallery to align with the adaptive reuse of the Site as a residential development with no religious association; (ii) redesign of the eastern extension by covering the flat roof to create additional habitable space for future residents; (iii) provision of a new free-standing canopy at the Entrance Porch to provide better weather protection for future residents; and (iv) installation of a new

glazing system at the verandas on the 1/F and 2/F of the main building to provide a more comfortable living environment.

- 6.2 PlanD raised no objection to the current application previously because (i) the proposal is in line with the planning intention of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone; (ii) relevant bureaux/departments, including CHO, AMO and CA/ASC of ArchSD, have no adverse comments on proposed alterations/additions to the Maryknoll House from heritage conservation and architectural perspectives and on the preservation-cum-residential development from other technical perspectives; (iii) the area for public appreciation will be enhanced by setting up the Heritage Gallery with a significantly increased area from 44m<sup>2</sup> to 298m<sup>2</sup>; (iv) the number of public guided tour will be increased from 8 times per year to 12 times per year; and (v) the proposed PR, BH and SC would not result in an out-of-context development, given that the Site is surrounded by several “R(C)” sites (with a PR of 0.75, SC of 25% and a BH of 3 storeys) and a “R(A)3” site (with a PR of 1.65 and a BH of 84mPD).
- 6.3 At the Committee’s meeting on 28.3.2025, Members raised grave concerns regarding the removal of the cross at the rooftop, which was considered as one of the character-defining elements of the Maryknoll House, and considered that design merits and sufficient justifications should be provided for the proposed increase in PR and SC. The applicant submitted FI on 27.5.2025 (**Appendix F-IV**) in response to the Member’s concerns.

#### *In-situ Preservation of the Cross at the Rooftop*

- 6.4 Having regard to the Members’ comments on the cross at the rooftop, the applicant indicates that the cross will be preserved in-situ under the current scheme after review. This decision reflects the historical and architectural significance of the cross as one of the character-defining elements of the Maryknoll House, ensuring its preservation as part of the heritage conservation efforts. CHO and AMO appreciate the applicant’s updated proposal. An approval condition requiring the submission and implementation of a revised CMP for the preservation of the Maryknoll House, as suggested by CHO and AMO, is proposed in paragraph 7.2 below.

#### *Justifications for Minor Relaxation*

- 6.5 The Maryknoll House and its key architectural features, including the cross at the rooftop, the pitched roof with green glazed tiles, red brick elevations, verandahs, timber windows, two existing staircases, the interior of Chapel and Library Wings, as well as the octagonal windows, would be retained, properly restored, or enhanced by the applicant to achieve the adaptive reuse of the historic building. To enhance public appreciation of the Maryknoll House, the exhibition areas have been consolidated from the previously separated locations in the recreational facilities in the Chapel and Library Wings to a designated Heritage Gallery on the G/F and 1/F of the Chapel Wing, with a significantly increased area from 44m<sup>2</sup> to 298m<sup>2</sup> under the current scheme. The proposed Heritage Gallery will feature the restored key elements of the Maryknoll House, including the stained glass panels, the patterned mosaic floor tiles, and the floor tiles with religious emblem, and the columns and vaulted ceiling currently within the Chapel Wing. In addition, advanced visualisation techniques such as VR, AR and mobile applications will be utilised to



improve heritage interpretation. The applicant believes that the expanded Heritage Gallery will offer more flexibility for arranging and organising heritage interpretation programmes. This preservation-cum-residential development is a collaborative effort among the CHO, AMO, and the applicant. It has struck a balance between the preservation of a historic building and respect for private property rights.

- 6.6 In response to concerns raised by the Committee regarding the extent and justification for the minor relaxation of PR and SC restrictions, the applicant explained that the implementation of the preservation-cum-residential development is challenging and costly. This includes lengthy applications and procedural requirements, which have caused financial strain on the applicant. Significant and costly site formation works are required to lower the southern platform to avoid obstruction and maintain the visibility of the Maryknoll House's southern façade while accommodating new buildings on the southern platform. Additionally, the structures of the Maryknoll House need to be upgraded to modern standards, and the provision of the Heritage Gallery with a substantial increase in size and content for public appreciation has cost implications for the project. The additional GFA could provide an incentive for the applicant to carry out the preservation-cum-residential development and support the Heritage Gallery with an enlarged area and enhanced content for public appreciation.
- 6.7 According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of the PR restriction involves an additional GFA of 1,146.8m<sup>2</sup> (approximately a 20% increase compared to the approved 2021 scheme). About one-fourth of the additional GFA (i.e. about 298m<sup>2</sup>) is allocated to the proposed Heritage Gallery. Under the approved 2021 scheme, the proposed areas for public appreciation (i.e. 22m<sup>2</sup> each, 44m<sup>2</sup> in total) fall within the residential clubhouse, which is GFA non-accountable. In contrast, the proposed Heritage Gallery under the current scheme is an exclusive and dedicated area for appreciation purpose and is GFA accountable.
- 6.8 Regarding the SC, a larger SC is required for this preservation-cum-residential development as compared with the surrounding low-density residential developments, so as to achieve the permissible PR through in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House and accommodating new buildings in the development. According to the applicant, in order to accommodate the additional GFA while maintaining the BH to ensure visibility from the south to the façade of the Maryknoll House, the SC must be increased accordingly under the current application. As previously stated by the applicant, most of the additional GFA and SC are allocated to the eastern extension and the new building on the southern platform, both of which are relatively unobtrusive and have a negligible visual impact on the heritage structure (**Drawing A-31 in Appendix F-I**).
- 6.9 Having considered that the Site is surrounded by several "R(C)" sites with a PR of 0.75 and a BH of 3 storeys for domestic purposes to the immediate north, east and south, as well as a "R(A)3" site with a PR of 1.65 and a BH of 84mPD to the west across Carmel Road, the proposed minor relaxation of PR from 0.75 to 0.9, BH from 64mPD to 67.7mPD, and SC from 30% to 36% would not result in an out-of-context development (**Plan FA-7**). CTP/UD&L of PlanD maintains her previous views that the overall scale of the proposal, in terms of building mass and BH, respects the heritage feature and is not incompatible with the surrounding

developments in visual terms. CA/ASC of ArchSD also has no adverse comments on the proposal from a visual perspective.

#### Additional Planning Gains

- 6.10 The applicant has committed to providing additional planning gains for the proposal, including (i) further increasing the frequency of guided tour from 12 times per year to 18 times per year; (ii) setting up and operating the Heritage Gallery in accordance with the DMC; and (iii) establishing a sinking fund for the future operation of the Heritage Gallery and guided tours. CHO and AMO welcome the applicant's proposal to increase the frequency of guided tours and remind the applicant that the details of the guided tours should be further confirmed with CHO and AMO. The requirement for providing free guided tours with detailed arrangements is included in the proposed approval condition set out in paragraph 7.2.
- 6.11 Having considered the applicant's FI in response to the Committee's concerns and the assessments in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.10 above, the planning considerations and assessments as stated in paragraph 11 of MPC Paper No. A/H19/87A at **Appendix F-I** remain valid.

### **7. PlanD's View**

- 7.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 6 above, PlanD maintains its previous view of having no objection to the application.
- 7.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 18.7.2029, and after the said date, the permission shall cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted is commenced or the permission is renewed. The following condition of approval and advisory clauses are also suggested for Members' reference:

#### Approval Condition

the submission of a revised CMP with detailed arrangements for free guided tours prior to the commencement of any works, and the implementation of the works, including provision of free guided tours, in accordance with the CMP to the satisfaction of AMO of DEVB or of the Board.

#### Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix V of Appendix F-I**.

- 7.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, the following reasons for rejection are suggested for Members' reference:
- (a) the applicant fails to demonstrate that there are adequate planning and design merits to justify the proposed minor relaxation of plot ratio, building height and site coverage restrictions; and

- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the overall design and layout of the proposed development will be compatible with the Maryknoll House.

## **8. Decision Sought**

- 8.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 8.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, Members are invited to consider the approval condition(s) and advisory clause(s), if any, to be attached to the permission, and the date when the validity of the permission should expire.
- 8.3 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant.

## **9. Attachments**

<b>Appendix F-I</b>	MPC Paper No. A/H19/87A
<b>Appendix F-II</b>	Extract of minutes of the 762 <sup>nd</sup> MPC meeting held on 28.3.2025
<b>Appendix F-III</b>	Secretary of the Board's letter dated 11.4.2025 informing the applicant of the Committee's decision to defer a decision on the application
<b>Appendix F-IV</b>	FI submitted by the Applicant on 27.5.2025
<b>Appendix F-V</b>	Historic building appraisal for the Maryknoll House by AMO
<b>Drawing FA-1</b>	Indicative Layout for the Heritage Gallery
<b>Plan FA-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan FA-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan FA-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans FA-4 to 6</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan FA-7</b>	Plot Ratio and Building Height of Nearby Existing/Planned Residential Developments

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
JULY 2025**