

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 11060

For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 15.5.2026

DRAFT MA TAU KOK OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K10/31

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K10/31 – R1 TO R5

**DRAFT MA TAU KOK OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K10/31
 CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K10/31-R1 TO R5**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Item)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/K10/31-)
<p><u>Amendment to the Plan (Plan H-1)</u></p> <p><u>Item A</u> Revision to the building height restriction (BHR) from 5 storeys to 114 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) for the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone currently occupied by the Evangel Hospital at 222 Argyle Street.</p>	<p>Total: 5</p> <p><u>Support Item A (Total: 4)</u> R1: Evangel Hospital R2: 寶血兒童村 Precious Blood Children’s Village R3: 郭予宏 Eric KWOK (Member of Kai Tak Area Committee (KTAC)) R4: Graceful Health & Rehabilitation Centre</p> <p><u>Oppose Item A (Total: 1)</u> R5: Individual</p>

Note: The names of the representers are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of the submissions is sent to Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K10_31.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department (PlanD) in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 24.12.2025, the draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/31 (the Plan) at **Annex I**, together with the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)^[1], was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments is at **Annex II** and the location of the amendment item is shown on **Plan H-1**.
- 1.2 During the two-month public exhibition period, five valid representations were received. On 20.3.2026, the Board agreed to consider all the representations collectively in one group.
- 1.3 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations. The list of representers is at **Annex III**. The representers have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

^[1] The Notes and ES are available at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K10_31.html.

2. Background

Amendment Item A – Revision to the BHR from 5 storeys to 114mPD for the “G/IC” zone currently occupied by the Evangel Hospital at 222 Argyle Street

- 2.1 To take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 4.7.2025 to agree to an application No. Y/K10/6^[2] under section 12A (s.12A) of the Ordinance, the BHR of the “G/IC” site occupied by the Evangel Hospital at 222 Argyle Street (Item A Site) (**Plan H-2**) has been amended from 5 storeys to 114mPD to facilitate the proposed hospital redevelopment (**Drawing H-1**). An extract of the minutes of the Committee’s meeting is at **Annex IV**.

Amendments to the Notes and ES of the Plan

“G/IC” zone

- 2.2 In relation to the above amendment item, the ES for “G/IC” zone of the OZP has been revised accordingly to incorporate the BHR of 114mPD of the Item A Site and the design measures proposed by the applicant, including a 6m-wide non-building area (NBA) abutting Argyle Street from the lot boundary; a 6m-wide tower setback above podium level (at 39mPD) from Fu Ning Street; and to mitigate visual impact on the development at 218-220 Argyle Street (i.e. adjacent Hoover Court to its southwest), a minimum building setback of 0.65m from the south-western site boundary to maintain an approximate 4.45m building gap between the two sites (**Drawing H-2 and Plan H-2**).

Technical Amendments

- 2.3 In accordance with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN), the following technical amendments are incorporated in the Notes of the OZP:
- (a) to revise ‘Public Utility Installation (not elsewhere specified)’ to ‘Public Utility Installation’ under Column 2 of Schedule I of the Notes for “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zone, and to incorporate a footnote on dangerous goods under Schedule II of the Notes for “R(E)” zone;
 - (b) to incorporate an editorial amendment to the planning intention of “G/IC” zone;
 - (c) to revise ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ to ‘Shop and Services’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sports and Recreation Club” zone; and
 - (d) to revise the Chinese translation of the user term ‘Research, Design and Development Centre’ from ‘研究所、設計及發展中心’ to ‘研究、設計及發展中心’ in the Notes for “Comprehensive Development Area”, “R(E)” and “G/IC” zones.

^[2] The MPC Paper No. Y/K10/6, including its attachments, is available at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/768_mpc_agenda.html.

The Plan

- 2.4 On 5.12.2025, the Committee of the Board agreed that the proposed amendments to the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/30 (the previous OZP) were suitable for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. The relevant MPC Paper No. 11/25 is available at the Board's website^[3] and an extract of the minutes of the said Committee's meeting is at **Annex V**. Subsequently, the draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/31 was gazetted on 24.12.2025.

3. Local Consultation

During the statutory exhibition period of the Plan, members of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) were notified that members of the public could submit representations on the amendments to the Secretary of the Board. No representation from members of the KCDC was received.

4. The Representation Site and Its Surrounding Areas

Item A Site (Plans H-1 to H-4)

- 4.1. The Item A Site (about 1,463m²) is located at a corner abutting Argyle Street and Fu Ning Street (**Plan H-1**). It is within a cluster of residential developments bounded by Prince Edward Road West and Ma Tau Chung Road, with building heights (BHs) mainly in the range of about 24mPD to 80mPD, except for two tall residential buildings of about 103mPD and 129mPD (i.e. the Montebello and Forfar respectively) to the immediate northwest of the Site across Argyle Street. Its neighbourhood is dominated by both residential and Government, institution or community (GIC) uses, including a private residential building, Hoover Court, in the immediate southwest of the Site, two public housing estates with redevelopment plan being studied and clusters of schools and hospitals. It is currently occupied by the Evangel Hospital, a 5-storey non-profit making private hospital built in 1960s with an existing height of 26.058mPD.

- 4.2. Under the application No. Y/K10/6, the applicant proposed to amend the BHR from 5 storeys to 114mPD to facilitate the in-situ redevelopment of the Evangel Hospital. According to the indicative scheme for the application (**Drawings H-1 and H-2**), the proposed redevelopment involves a 22-storey building over two levels of basement with a BH of 114mPD, along with the proposed design measures as mentioned at paragraph 2.2. 104 in-patient beds, four High Dependency Units, 30 day beds/recliners and six day chemo places will be provided upon redevelopment.

4.3. Planning Intention

The "G/IC" zone is intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also

^[3]The MPC Paper No. 11/25 and its attachments are available at the Board's website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/778_mpc_agenda.html.

intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

5. The Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

5.1.1 During the two-month exhibition period, five valid representations were received. One representation (**R1**) was submitted by the applicant of the application No. Y/K10/6 (i.e. the Evangel Hospital) with attachments of supportive letters from various universities, organisations and individuals, the other four representations were submitted by Precious Blood Children’s Village (**R2**), a member of KTAC (**R3**), Graceful Health & Rehabilitation Centre (**R4**) and an individual (**R5**).

5.1.2 **R1 to R4**^[4] support Item A while **R5** opposes Item A. The major grounds of the representations and PlanD’s responses, in consultation with relevant bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are summarised in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.3 below.

5.2 Supportive Representations

Item A

Major Views	Representation No.
(1) The Site is small and bounded by three streets. Essential supporting facilities are already housed off-site due to the spatial limitations, which is not ideal for hospital operations. While two basement levels are proposed, further excavation is unsustainable. Vertical expansion is the only viable strategy for increasing capacity.	R1
(2) Item A is in line with the Government policy to sustain medical service provision and efficiency in the private sector, which allows hospital expansion given its site constraints.	R1
(3) The hospital shall continue serving community needs in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone with a proposed BH compatible with BHR of the surrounding area. Mitigation measures have also been proposed to address the potential visual impact due to increased BH (Drawing H-2).	R1
(4) The proposed redevelopment of a non-profit making hospital meets the increasing healthcare demand of	R1 to R2 and R4

^[4] **R3** expressed support without specific grounds.

ageing population and population growth from future developments in Kowloon City with an increased number of beds and expanded services.	
(5) The proposed redevelopment is considered necessary for the existing hospital of over sixty years to improve its operational conditions. The increased BH is required to accommodate modernized hospital infrastructure that is up to prevailing standards and equipped with advanced technology, allow potential adoption of Modular Integration Construction (MiC) and enhance site efficiency.	R1 to R2 and R4
(6) The proposed redevelopment would help relieve the demand for paramedical facilities and public medical services.	R1 and R4
(7) The redeveloped hospital creates opportunities for community education and professional medical training to retain professionals.	R1 to R2
(8) No adverse technical impacts will be induced by Item A, and government departments consulted have no adverse comments or no in-principle objection.	R1
(9) The Evangel Hospital has consulted relevant stakeholders including the Owners' Corporations of Hoover Court, Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) ^[5] and KCDC which expressed general support and understanding regarding the proposed redevelopment. Responsive design measures have been proposed to address potential interface impact on Hoover Court.	R1
Responses	
(a) The supportive views are noted.	

5.3 Opposing Representation

Item A

5.3.1 Planning Intention

Major Views	Representation No.
(1) For sites zoned "G/IC", a major portion of the proposed development should be dedicated to GIC and other public uses including public open spaces.	R5

^[5] A HKHS's estate, Chun Seen Mei Chuen, is located to the east of the Site across Fu Ning Street.

<p>Otherwise, it (private hospital) should only be proceeded via a change of zoning to commercial or business, as in the case of the profit-making Hong Kong Sanatorium & Hospital (HKSH) development in Shau Kei Wan.</p> <p>(2) While most private hospitals claim to be non-profit, there is a lack of transparency regarding the public services they actually provide for the community. Their designation as non-profit entities, often associated with churches, is accepted without skepticism about their underlying motives. Rather than serving as genuine healthcare providers, these facilities may simply operate as profit-generating medical centers that exploit tax exemptions, straying from the planning intention of “G/IC” zonings. It is essential that their income and expenditures be transparent to the community and taxpayers.</p> <p>(3) The increase in the number of beds (only double) shows the intention for operating the site as a commercial healthcare centre, which suggests a lack of commitment to non-profit making intention, potentially leading to the exploitation of favorable land grants intended for services that should genuinely benefit the community.</p>	
---	--

Responses

In response to (1) to (3):

- (a) Item A is to amend the BHR for the “G/IC” zone covering the Evangel Hospital. The “G/IC” zone under the OZP is intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. ‘Hospital’ use is always permitted in the “G/IC” zone. Item A, which allows higher BH for the subject “G/IC” zone, is to facilitate the in-situ redevelopment of the Evangel Hospital for the provision of more and up-to-standard medical facilities as well as equipment requiring higher headroom, the expansion of clinical services, and potential adoption of MiC. As the Evangel Hospital has indicated in-principle acceptance of the minimum requirements (e.g. service scope, service standards etc.) contributing to providing the public with more choice and affordable high-quality private hospital services under the dual-track healthcare system in Hong Kong, the Health Bureau (HHB) has provided in-principle policy support for the Evangel Hospital’s proposed hospital redevelopment. The proposed development is in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone.
- (b) For the case of the HKSH Eastern Medical Centre in Shau Kei Wan, the application was to rezone a site amid an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) to “G/IC” zone for the development of a

specialised hospital in 2014. The Board considered it more appropriate to rezone the site to “OU(B)1” to provide land use flexibility for hospital development and compatible business uses while upkeeping the planning intention of the locality. On the other hand, Item A site is for the redevelopment of a hospital within an existing “G/IC” zone.

5.3.2 Development Intensity and BH

Major Views	Representation No.
<p>(1) GIC development should serve as breathing space among high-rise and high-density environments. There are plenty of on-going development projects in the area and such relief provided by GIC facilities become essential especially for a junction site. The proposed BHR is the same as other zones along Argyle Street, which creates wall effect, adversely affects light penetration and causes visual and ventilation impacts.</p> <p>(2) The proposal involves increases not only in BHR, but also PR and site coverage (SC). The increases in BHR and PR do not result in proportional increase in the number of beds and day beds should not be counted.</p>	<p>R5</p>
Responses	
<p>In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>(a) The proposed amendment is to take forward the approved s.12A application No. Y/K10/6 by amending the BHR of the “G/IC” zone covering the hospital site so as to allow better utilisation of this relatively small site and provide opportunities to augment the provision and quality of medical services to meet service demand. According to the proposal submitted under application No. Y/K10/6, upon redevelopment, the hospital can provide 144 beds, including 104 in-patient beds, four High Dependency Units, 30 day beds/ recliners and six day chemo places. As mentioned in the response at paragraph 5.3.1, HHB has provided in-principle policy support for the Evangel Hospital’s proposed hospital redevelopment.</p> <p>(b) The applicant has also conducted various assessments to support the application No. Y/K10/6. According to the submitted Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) (Appendix Ia of MPC Paper No. Y/K10/6) which included photomontages reproduced at Drawings H-3 to H-5, the proposed redevelopment will unlikely induce any significant adverse effects on the visual character of the surrounding townscape. Taking into account the design measures including NBA and setbacks proposed by the applicant (Drawing H-2) as detailed at paragraph 2.2 which have been incorporated in the ES to alleviate the potential visual and interface impacts, Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) had no adverse comments on the proposed amendment from urban design and visual</p>	

perspectives. Regarding the ‘wall effect’, given that the Site is relatively small, does not fall within any identified breezeway/air path and will adopt setbacks at the three sides of the Site as specified under the ES, no significant air ventilation impact is anticipated. Furthermore, building separation and aspects related to sustainability of the development will be subject to the Building (Planning) Regulations and Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.

5.3.3 Other Technical Aspects

Major Views	Representation No.
<p>(1) The proposed development with additional facilities shall attract an increase in traffic flow and on-street loading/unloading (L/UL) which may increase the impacts on pedestrian flow while the number of parking spaces proposed under the approved application No. Y/K10/6 has not been increased in comparison with the previous one (No. Y/K10/5).</p> <p>(2) Podium garden on 3/F provides no benefit to the public.</p> <p>(3) There is insufficient setback from Hoover Court, posing fire risks to this adjacent residential block.</p>	<p>R5</p>
Responses	
<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>(a) According to the proposal submitted under application No. Y/K10/6, 46 parking spaces^[6] and four L/UL spaces will be provided. The existing vehicular access to the hospital at Fu Ning Street will be relocated to Fuk Cheung Street upon redevelopment to improve the traffic flow, with potential alarm system at the run-in/out to enhance pedestrian safety. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (Appendix Ia of the MPC Paper No. Y/K10/6) confirmed that the proposed development would not induce adverse impact on the surrounding road traffic and pedestrian flow and the proposed internal parking provision could meet the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. Commissioner for Transport (C for T) has no adverse comments on the TIA and the proposed internal transport facilities.</p> <p>In response to (2):</p> <p>(b) According to the proposal submitted under application No. Y/K10/6, podium garden with seatings and landscape treatments is proposed on 8/F for staff</p>	

^[6] 46 parking spaces include 39 for private cars, five for motorcycle, one for ambulance (share-used as L/UL) and one for hearse; four L/UL spaces include one each for heavy goods vehicle, ambulance, taxi/private car and refuse vehicle.

and patients, and this contributes to the urban landscape by softening the building edges and promoting visual interest for the neighbourhood.

In response to (3):

- (c) As advised by the Director of Fire Services (D of FS), the design and construction of buildings are regulated under the Buildings Ordinance. Detailed fire services requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans.

6. Departmental Circulation

6.1 The following B/Ds have been consulted and their responses, if any, have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) Secretary for Health;
- (b) District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, LandsD;
- (c) C for T;
- (d) Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon, BD;
- (e) D of FS;
- (f) Chief Architect/3, Architectural Services Department;
- (g) Commissioner of Police;
- (h) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, Highways Department;
- (i) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (j) Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department;
- (k) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (l) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (m) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD);
- (n) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, CEDD;
- (o) CTP/UD&L, PlanD; and
- (p) District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department.

7. Planning Department's Views

7.1. The supportive views on Item A of **R1 to R4** are noted.

7.2. Based on the assessments in paragraph 5.3 above, PlanD does not support R5 and considers that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

Item A

- (a) Item A is to take forward the decision of the Board on the agreed s.12A application to facilitate redevelopment of the existing Evangel Hospital. The proposed redevelopment is in line with the planning intention of "G/IC" zone. The amended BHR allows better utilisation of the relatively small "G/IC" site

and provides opportunities to augment the provision and quality of medical services so as to meet the existing and future service demand; and

- (b) various technical assessments have been conducted to ascertain that no adverse impacts will be induced by the proposed redevelopment, along with the proposed mitigation and design measures of the redevelopment scheme. Also, relevant government departments have no adverse comments on the zoning amendment on visual, traffic, landscape and fire safety aspects. The relevant amendment to the BHR is considered appropriate.

8. Decision Sought

- 8.1. The Board is invited to consider the representations taking into account the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 8.2. Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the Plan, together with its Notes and ES, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

9. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/31 (reduced size)
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/30
Annex III	Index of Representations
Annex IV	Extract of Minutes of the Committee's Meeting held on 4.7.2025 for the s.12A Application No. Y/K10/6
Annex V	Extract of Minutes of the Committee's Meeting held on 5.12.2025
Drawing H-1	Section Plan of s.12A Application No. Y/K10/6
Drawing H-2	Indicative Design Features of s.12A Application No. Y/K10/6
Drawings H-3 to H-5	Photomontages of s.12A Application No. Y/K10/6
Plan H-1	Location Plan
Plan H-2	Site Plan
Plan H-3	Aerial Photo
Plan H-4	Site Photos