

APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION
UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

APPLICATION NO. A/H9/86

<u>Applicant</u>	: Land Glory Holdings Limited represented by LCH Planning & Development Consultants Limited
<u>Application Site</u>	: 9-19 (odd nos.) Kam Wa Street, Shau Kei Wan
<u>Site Area</u>	: 518.41m ² (about)
<u>Lease</u>	: Section D, Section F, Section G and the Remaining Portion of Shaukiwan Inland Lot (SIL) No. 433 - virtually unrestricted subject to “non-offensive trades” and “rate and range” clauses
<u>Plan</u>	: Approved Shau Kei Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H9/22
<u>Zoning</u>	: “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) (about 476.41m ² or 92%) <i>[Restricted to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 8 for Class A site, 9 for Class B site and 10 for Class C site, or a maximum non-domestic PR of 15; and a maximum building height (BH) of 100 metres above Principal Datum (mPD), or the PR and the height of the existing building, whichever is the greater]</i> Area shown as ‘Road’ (about 42m ² or 8%) ¹
<u>Application</u>	: Proposed Hotel and Permitted Shop and Services with Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction

1. The Proposal

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a proposed 31-storey hotel (with an absolute building height of 109.25m at the main roof) with a permitted shop on the G/F at the application site (the Site) which falls within an area zoned “R(A)” on the approved Shau Kei Wan OZP No. S/H9/22 (**Plan A-1**) and a minor relaxation of the BH restriction from 100mPD to 113.56mPD (i.e. +13.56m or +13.56% in terms of mPD) (the Proposed Scheme). According to the Notes of the OZP, ‘Shop and Services’ is a Column 1 use on the lowest three floors of a building (including basements), while ‘Hotel’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board). Based on the

¹ A minor portion of the Site (i.e. about 42m² or 8%) falls within an area shown as ‘Road’ which is treated as minor boundary adjustment of “R(A)” zone according to the covering Notes of the OZP and will not be included in the planning assessment.

individual merits of a development proposal, minor relaxation of the BH restriction may be considered by the Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

- 1.2 The Site is located on Kam Wa Street and currently fenced off and under construction² (**Plans A-2 and A-4a**).
- 1.3 The applicant proposes to develop the Site into a 31-storey hotel with a PR of 15 and a gross floor area (GFA) of about 7,776m² (excluding a GFA of 694m² (or a PR of 1.339) resulting from the adoption of Modular Integrated Construction (MiC) which is assumed to be disregarded from the GFA calculation by the applicant), comprising a retail shop on the G/F, car parking spaces on the G/F and 2/F, various hotel ancillary facilities and back-of-house on the G/F to 6/F, and about 336 hotel guestrooms on the upper floors (**Drawing A-11**). According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of the BH restriction from 100mPD to 113.56mPD (i.e. +13.56m or +13.56% in term of mPD) aligns with the Government's policy to facilitate aboveground car park design in private developments³ and the adoption of MiC. The proposed aboveground car park will feature floor-to-floor heights (FTFHs) of 5.25m (G/F) and 5.6m (including transfer plate) (2/F) respectively, resulting in an increase of 10.85m to the overall BH. Additionally, the adoption of MiC for the hotel guestroom floors (from 7/F to 30/F, spanning 24 storeys) involves thickened/double slabs between MiC modules. Under the Joint Practice Note (JPN) No. 8: Enhanced Facilitation Measures for Buildings Adopting Modular Integrated Construction⁴, an increase of 3.12m in BH will be favourably considered. The applicant proposes that, although the combined height increment from these measures totals 13.97m, only 13.56m is being sought in the current application.
- 1.4 The applicant proposes to incorporate various design merits: (i) a canopy with dimensions of about 1.5m in width and 15m in length, with a height clearance of about 4.95m above the existing northern footpath of Kam Wa Street⁵ (**Drawings A-2, A-11 and A-18**); (ii) an active frontage for the G/F retail space featuring transparent facades or open-front configurations (**Drawing A-18**); (iii) local art

² The latest set of general building plans (GBPs) for proposed residential development, with a domestic PR of 7.59, a non-domestic PR of 0.77, a domestic site coverage (SC) of 33.32%, a non-domestic SC of 93.71% and a BH of 97.63mPD (at main roof), for the Site was approved by the Building Authority (BA) on 24.4.2026. No internal transport facilities would be provided at the proposed residential development. According to the Notes of the OZP, 'Flat' use is always permitted within the "R(A)" zone.

³ The Chief Executive's 2025 Policy Address (2025 PA) proposes to relax the GFA exemption arrangement for car parks in private developments by removing the mandatory requirement of constructing underground car parks as a condition of exemption, and granting full GFA exemption if developers construct no more than two storeys of aboveground car parks. According to the applicant, the proposed two aboveground car parking floors are required because of the constrained footprint of the Site; the need to reserve 1/F for essential E&M plant; and the inability to accommodate LGV spaces on G/F alongside the required taxi lay-bys and vehicle maneuvering space.

⁴ Under JPN No. 8, favourable consideration may be given to an increase of BH up to 4% of the total storey height of MiC floors to facilitate the adoption of MiC. According to the applicant, this translates to a maximum allowable BH increase of 24 floors x 3.25m (FTFH) x 4% = 3.12m under the Proposed Scheme.

⁵ According to the applicant, the detailed design shall be determined and agreed with the Buildings Department (BD) in the GBP submission stage. Nevertheless, the Site is subject to a virtually unrestricted lease and there may not be an effective control mechanism to guarantee the provision of the canopy.

painting on the building façade⁶ to mitigate building bulkiness (**Drawing A-17**); (iv) voluntary greenery site coverage of 20% (about 104m²)⁷ (**Drawing A-18**); (v) multi-level landscaping, including balcony planting and over-hanging vegetation on the 1/F to 3/F, together with a sky garden on the 3/F for both hotel guests and the local community at designated opening hours⁸ (**Drawings A-2 to A-4, A-11 and A-18**); and (vi) a semi-open structure at 2/F with louvre design to facilitate natural ventilation (**Drawing A-18**). The floor plans, section plan and artistic impressions submitted by the applicant are at **Drawings A-1 to A-11, A-17 and A-18**, and the major development parameters of the Proposed Scheme are summarised below:

Major Development Parameters	Proposed Scheme
Site Area	About 518.41m ² (a)
Non-domestic PR	Not more than 15 (b) (c)
Non-domestic GFA	About 7,776m ² (a) (b) (c)
- <i>Proposed Hotel</i>	7,726m ²
- <i>Proposed Shop and Services</i>	50m ²
Maximum BH (at main roof level)	Not exceeding 113.56mPD
Maximum BH (absolute)	109.25m
No. of Storeys	31 (including two storeys of above ground car park)
Site Coverage (SC)	
- <i>above 15m</i>	Not more than 60% (b)
- <i>below 15m</i>	Not more than 100%
Number of Block	1
Number of Hotel Guestrooms	About 336
Size of Hotel Guestrooms	15.8m ² to 16.7m ²
Number of Parking Spaces	
- <i>Private Car</i>	4 (incl. one disabled parking space)
Loading/Unloading (L/UL) Spaces	
- <i>Taxi/Private Car Layby</i>	3
- <i>Light Goods Vehicle (LGV)</i>	2
- <i>Shared-use for Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) and Coach</i>	1
- <i>Shared-use for LGV and Mini Coach</i>	1
Site Coverage of Greenery	About 104m ² (about 20% of site area)
Anticipated Completion Year	2031

Remarks:

(a) Subject to detailed site survey.

(b) Under JPN No. 8, in recognition of the additional floor area needed in MiC, GFA and/ or SC concessions may be granted (i.e. 10% of the MiC floor area of a new building may be

⁶ According to Drawing A-17, the local art painting is proposed to be at the G/F of the rear façade of the proposed hotel development facing the back alley.

⁷ According to the applicant, with a site area of less than 1,000m², the Proposed Scheme is not required to fulfil the minimum site coverage of greenery as stated in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) under PNAP APP-152.

⁸ According to the applicant, the proposed sky garden will be open to the public subject to detailed design and operational arrangements. Nevertheless, the Site is subject to a virtually unrestricted lease and there may not be an effective control mechanism to guarantee the opening of the proposed sky garden to the public.

disregarded from calculation of GFA of the development and 10% of the MiC floor area at each floor level need not be counted for SC) to facilitate its adoption. According to the applicant, while the PR and SC for the portion of the development above 15m under this planning application will not exceed 15 and 60% respectively, an additional 694m² of GFA (equivalent to about PR of 1.339) and 5.598% in SC attributable to the adoption of MiC technology will be applied to the Buildings Department for exemption under s.42 of the Building Ordinance. Taking into account the GFA and SC exemption, the actual building bulk (without concession) would be about PR of 16.339 and SC of 65.598%.

- (c) The applicant has not specified whether the proposed GFA for Back-of-House (BOH) Facilities, which may be exempted under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)Rs), have been included in the PR calculation.

- 1.5 The main uses of each floor of the proposed development (**Drawings A-1 to A-10**) and the proposed FTFHs (**Drawing A-11**) under the Proposed Scheme are summarised as follows:

Floor	Main Use	FTFH
G/F	Carpark, Shop and Services and Entrance Lobby	5.25m
1/F	E&M Facilities	3.85m
2/F	Carpark (with 1.5m high transfer plate)	5.6m ⁹
3/F	Refuge Floor cum Sky Garden	5m
4/F	Lobby / Back-of-House (BOH) Facilities	3.25m
5/F	E&M and BOH Facilities	
6/F	BOH Facilities	
7/F - 30/F	Hotel Guestrooms	
R/F	E&M Facilities	-

- 1.6 The Site abuts Kam Wa Street along its southern boundary where pedestrian and vehicular access points for the proposed development will be located (**Plan A-2**). A run-in/out of about 6.5m wide will be located at the eastern end of the Site, occupying certain portion of the existing Public Light Bus (PLB) Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by¹⁰ along Kam Wa Street in front of the Site. According to the applicant, it is designed to reduce the impact on the PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by as much as possible (**Drawings A-1, A-19** and **Plan A-2**). The proposed run-in/out will also impact two of the five licensed fixed-pitch hawkers currently operating on the pavement along the eastern section of Kam Wa Street immediately south of the Site (**Plan A-2**). The applicant commits to assisting the affected hawkers in liaising with the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) to facilitate their relocation, and to coordinating the construction programme, as far as practicable, to align with the relocation arrangement (please refer to FEHD's comments in paragraph 8.1.11 and Transport Department (TD)'s comments in paragraph 8.1.4).

- 1.7 Technical assessments, including the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Air Quality Impact Assessment (AQIA), Noise Impact Assessment (NIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA), and Visual Appraisal (VA), have been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the Proposed Scheme will not generate adverse traffic, air quality, noise, sewerage and visual impacts on the surrounding areas.

⁹ According to the applicant, the proposed FTFH of 5.6m at 2/F is necessary to accommodate the transfer plate for MiC above, an E&M zone, and the minimum headroom required for LGV parking.

¹⁰ Operational as a PLB stand from 7am to 9am and 5pm to 9pm on Mondays to Fridays, and allowing parking of PLBs at other times.

- 1.8 The Shau Kei Wan Tram Terminus (**Plan A-2**) is located about 10m to the southeast of the Site and as mentioned in paragraph 1.6 above, the run-in/out of the proposed hotel will occupy certain portion of the existing PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by (**Drawing A-19 and Plan A-2**). According to the applicant's submission, consultations with tramway and PLB operators were conducted in March 2026. Most operators had replied "no objection" to the subject application¹¹. Temporary traffic diversions during tram maintenance will be coordinated with the tramway operator, and construction-phase mitigation measures will be introduced to prevent damage or dust nuisance to tram operations.
- 1.9 According to the revised AQIA and NIA (**Appendix Ie**), a centralised ventilation system will be provided for the lobby, BOH areas, and hotel guestrooms; and the proposed hotel will not rely on openable windows for natural ventilation. All fixed plant equipment will be designed and installed to comply with the relevant noise criteria stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Noise mitigation measures such as enclosure, silencers and acoustic louvres will be adopted to minimise the fixed noise impact. In case the proposed mitigation measures cannot provide sufficient noise reduction level to comply with the relevant standards, the planned fixed noise sources would be restricted to the southern façade at 20/F or above to provide considerable distance to the nearby noise sensitive receivers (NSRs). Potential odour impact may arise from Kam Wa Street Wet Market and the nearby Refuse Collection Point (RCP) (**Plan A-2**). Mitigation measures are recommended, including locating fresh air intakes away from these sources and installing air purifiers in the fresh air system.
- 1.10 According to the revised SIA (**Appendix Id**), a new public manhole is proposed and an existing sewer is proposed to be improved to cope with the expected peak sewage flow from the Site.
- 1.11 According to the revised VA (**Appendix Ie**), the overall visual impact of the Proposed Scheme would be negligible to moderately adverse (**Drawings A-12 to A-16**). Design features (**Drawing A-18**) including building disposition to maximise visual permeability and integrated landscape design will be incorporated to enhance visual amenity of the area.
- 1.12 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- (a) Application Form received on 21.4.2026 (**Appendix I**)
 - (b) Supporting Planning Statement (SPS) received on 21.4.2026 (**Appendix Ia**)
 - (c) Supplementary Information (SI) received on 23.4.2026 (**Appendix Ib**)
 - (d) SI received on 24.4.2026 (**Appendix Ic**)

¹¹ Motor Transport Workers General Union (Public Light Bus Branch) [汽車交通運輸業總工會(公共小巴分會)] has yet to replied "no objection" according to the Responses to Comments submitted by the applicant (**Appendix Id**).

(e) Further Information (FI) received on 28.5.2026 enclosing a revised SIA[#] (**Appendix Id**)

(f) FI received on 18.6.2026 enclosing a Supplementary Planning Analysis and a revised SPS, TIA, AQIA, NIA and VA[#] (**Appendix Ie**)

[#] *accepted but not exempted from the publication and recounting requirements*

2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

The justifications put forth by the applicant in support of the application are detailed in the SPS, SIs and FIs at **Appendices Ia to Ie**, which are summarised as follows:

Echo with the Latest Government Policy to Revitalise Tourism Industry

- (a) in view of the ongoing vision to develop Hong Kong into a premier tourism destination and promote the ‘District Tourism’ and ‘Night Vibes Hong Kong in All 18 Districts’ initiatives to cultivate distinctive attractions across all areas, the proposed development aligns with the vision of ‘Tourism is Everywhere’ as outlined in the 2025 PA, as well as with ‘Hong Kong 2030+’ and the ‘Development Blueprint for Hong Kong’s Tourism Industry 2.0’ to support ‘Culture + Tourism’ and ‘Ecology + Tourism’ in the Eastern District;
- (b) Shau Kei Wan, with its unique cultural and geographical identity, offers rich potential for heritage and culinary tourism. The site’s proximity to Kam Wa Street Wet Market and Shau Kei Wan Main Street East, popular with food tourists seeking authentic local experiences, enhances its strategic value. However, there is a lack of new hotel room supply in the Eastern and Southern Districts of Hong Kong. The proposed development will provide a stable supply of 336 hotel guestrooms to accommodate the increasing demand from recovering visitor arrivals, and will improve visitor arrival arrangements by leveraging the Site’s locational advantage to facilitate tourism development in the Eastern District;
- (c) the proposed development will create synergy with the existing tourism assets in Shau Kei Wan, positioning the area as a representative destination for heritage, cultural and eco-tourism;

Compatible Land Use Pattern and Effective Use of Land Resources

- (d) the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding context, which comprises mixed-use developments with commercial and residential uses, and aligns with the planning intention of the “R(A)” zone;
- (e) the Site is located within a cluster rich in tourism resources relating to local culture, heritage and food culture. It benefits from good accessibility and is well served by public transport facilities, including bus, minibuses and tram routes in close proximity and MTR Shau Kei Wan station within a 5-minute walking distance. The proposed development would make effective use of this prime land resource by providing additional hotel options to support the needs of overnight travellers;

- (f) having regard to the BHs of surrounding residential developments ranging from 100mPD to 120mPD, the proposed BH of 113.56mPD remains within the recommended BH band of 100mPD to 115mPD for the surrounding inland built-up area as set out in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP. It also maintains the stepped BH profile concept adopted in the Shau Kei Wan area, where BHs increase progressively from the waterfront towards inland areas, while maintaining important visual corridors and key view lines to and from Lei Yue Mun Park and waterfront viewpoints;

Minor and Acceptable Relaxation of BH Restriction

- (g) in line with JPN No. 8 and 2025 PA, the proposed scheme will adopt MiC technology, which requires thickened floor slabs that raise storey heights on MiC floors, and two aboveground parking levels respectively. The proposed minor relaxation of the BH restriction (+13.56m) is less than the BH increment (+13.97m) resulting from the adoption of MiC technology and the inclusion of aboveground car parking floors;

The “Established Practice” for Approval of Hotel Developments within “R(A)” Zones on Hong Kong Island

- (h) similar hotel applications A/H1/77 and A/H1/78¹² at Davis Street, Kennedy Town were approved in 2005 and 2006 respectively with a PR of 15. In 2007, the “Established Practice” for approving hotel developments within the “R(A)” zones on Hong Kong Island with a maximum PR of 12 emerged. Such practice has not resulted in any amendment to the maximum non-domestic PR permitted under the “R(A)” zone on the OZP, nor has it resulted in the exclusion of new non-domestic development reaching the maximum non-domestic PR allowable under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)Rs) (Cap. 123F). Urban overcrowding and the heat island effect were the major public concerns, and building height restriction with respect to the district wind profile was then introduced in the statutory planning system to address such concerns. Currently, the focus has shifted to making efficient use of scarce land resources. The “Established Practice” should be critically reviewed, and the proposed PR of 15 under the current application should be assessed against the current statutory planning framework;
- (i) similar planning applications for proposed non-domestic developments with PRs over 15 on Hong Kong Island (No. A/H5/412 and A/H5/421 in Wan Chai,

¹² Applications No. A/H1/77 and A/H1/78 (amendments to the approved scheme under Application No. A/H1/77) for a proposed hotel with a proposed PR of 15, SC of 60% and BHs of 117m and 119m (for Application No. A/H1/78), were approved with conditions by the Committee on 28.10.2005 and 15.12.2006 respectively, mainly on the grounds that the proposed use and BH were not incompatible with the surrounding land uses and developments, with no adverse comments from an urban design perspective; and the proposed development would unlikely generate adverse environmental, traffic, sewerage and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas.

A/H7/183 in Causeway Bay ¹³ and A/H3/420 in Sai Ying Pun ¹⁴) have been approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) in recent years, which are consistent with the Government's broader policy direction of optimising the use of scarce urban land resources and supporting the recovery and growth of the tourism sector;

The Proposed PR of 15 is in line with OZP

- (j) the maximum non-domestic PR of 15 is permissible within the "R(A)" zone on the Shau Kei Wan OZP. Against this background, the proposed development represents a logical extension of the established mixed commercial and residential character of Kam Wa Street and Shau Kei Wan Main Street East. The overall development intensity and building bulk are therefore not incompatible with the surrounding neighbourhood;
- (k) the recent rezoning of the Former Shau Kei Wan Market site from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "R(A)7" for private residential development has demonstrated that a non-domestic PR of 15 and a BH restriction of 120mPD are considered not incompatible within the "R(A)" zone of the Shau Kei Wan OZP;

Planning Gains and Design Merits of the Proposed Scheme

- (l) the proposed run-in/out is positioned at the eastern end of the existing PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by in front of the Site, rather than in the middle, so as to preserve a continuous parking area;
- (m) the proposed scheme will minimise disturbance to the existing hawker stalls situated along the street frontage and provide retail floorspace at the G/F of the proposed development to maintain street-level vibrancy and support the continuity of local culture in Shau Kei Wan;
- (n) the proposed canopy would provide shading and enhance pedestrian walking comfort, while the stepped building height profile and on-site greenery provision

¹³ These three commercial developments with PRs of 15 or above (mainly for proposed eating places, shops and services, and offices), all situated in neighbourhoods where high-rise commercial buildings with a PR of 15 are found across the street, were approved by the Committee from 2019 to 2023. Application No. A/H5/412 in Wan Chai (with a PR of 16.883 including a bonus PR of 1.883 for dedication of G/F area for public passage and a BH of 90 mPD) was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2019 as a previous scheme for similar uses was approved, the public passage would enhance the pedestrian environment, and there were no adverse departmental comments. Application No. A/H5/421 in Wan Chai (with a PR of 15 and a BH of 110 mPD) was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2023 as the development was compatible with the surrounding mixed residential and commercial uses despite a minor PR increase from 14.7 (existing commercial development) to 15, complied with the OZP BH restriction, and received no adverse departmental comments. Application No. A/H7/183 in Causeway Bay (with a PR of 15 and a BH of 118.95 mPD) for redevelopment of the site from an existing 29-storey hotel into a 28-storey commercial development was approved with conditions in 2022 mainly on the grounds that the PR and GFA were the same as those in the previously approved scheme, the site had obtained approved building plans for commercial development, and no adverse comments were received from government departments.

¹⁴ Application No. A/H3/420 in Sai Ying Pun for proposed hotel, with a PR of 15.187 (including a bonus PR of 0.187) and a BH of 99.95mPD, was approved with conditions by the Committee in 2014 mainly on the grounds that the application site had all along been for hotel use; and there was already a set of building plans for hotel development with PR of about 15.191 approved before the application site was rezoned from Commercial/Residential to "R(A)6" zone.

of the proposed development would help maintain natural breezeways, improve the local microclimate, ensure adequate ventilation for the site and surrounding areas, enhance visual interest, and mitigate building bulkiness;

- (o) by featuring artworks inspired by the local culture and heritage on the building façade, the design transforms the proposed development into a visually engaging, context-responsive new landmark that would enhance the streetscape, enrich the pedestrian experience, foster a strong sense of place, and position it as a cultural contributor rather than merely an ordinary commercial development. Local visual permeability would also be improved; and

No Adverse Impacts

- (p) no adverse traffic, air quality, noise, sewerage or visual impacts from the proposed development are anticipated, as demonstrated in the relevant technical assessments. For air quality aspect, with the implementation of the mitigation measures, no adverse odour impact is anticipated. The VA (**Appendix Ie**) concludes that the overall visual impact of the Proposed Scheme would be negligible to moderately adverse (**Drawings A-12 to A-16**). Design features will be incorporated to enhance visual amenity. Hence, the Proposed Scheme is still considered compatible with the surrounding residential neighbourhood.

3. Compliance with the “Owner’s Consent/Notification” Requirements

The applicant is the sole “current land owner” of the Site. Detailed information would be deposited at the meeting for Members’ inspection.

4. Previous Application

There is no previous application in respect of the Site.

5. Similar Applications

- 5.1 There were five similar applications (No. A/H9/63, 68, 70, 71 and 73) covering two application sites for hotel developments within the “R(A)” zone in the Shau Kei Wan Planning Scheme Area.
- 5.2 Application No. A/H9/63 at 68 Hing Man Street (**Plan A-1**) within the “R(A)” zone¹⁵ for converting an existing 23-storey building (including two basement levels), formerly a commercial/ office building, for hotel use, with a PR of 14.455, SCs of 100% (below 15m) and 62.5% (above 15m) and a BH of 66.92mPD, was approved with conditions by the Committee on 23.5.2008. The approval was granted mainly on the grounds that the proposed development, without increasing the PR, SC and BH of the building, was considered not incompatible with surrounding developments that are predominantly residential with commercial uses on lower floors; the proposed development was considered acceptable from environmental, traffic and infrastructural aspects, and was not expected to cause

¹⁵ At the time of consideration of the application. The subject site is now zoned “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”).

any adverse impact on surrounding areas.

- 5.3 The remaining four applications (No. A/H9/68, 70, 71 and 73) involved the same site zoned “R(A)2” at 225-227 Shau Kei Wan Road (**Plan A-1**). Applications No. A/H9/68 and A/H9/73 (with proposed BHs of 81.368mPD and 77.38mPD at the main roof respectively) were approved with conditions by the Committee on 20.1.2012 and 2.1.2015 respectively, mainly on the grounds that the proposed hotel was considered not incompatible with surrounding uses with no adverse impacts on the surrounding areas; the proposed PR of 12 was considered acceptable in terms of development intensity; and the relevant government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the applications. The hotel development was completed, with the Occupation Permit (OP) issued in December 2022.
- 5.4 Applications No. A/H9/70 and 71 (with proposed BHs of 99.243mPD and 81.418mPD at main roof respectively) (**Plan A-1**) were rejected by the Committee on 1.6.2012 and 25.1.2013 respectively. The rejections were primarily on the grounds that the proposed developments, with PRs of 15 and 13 respectively, were considered excessive with respect to the surrounding residential developments with permitted PRs of 8 to 10. Approval of these applications would set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments, with cumulative effects adversely affecting the general amenity of the area. For Application No. A/H9/71, there was also insufficient planning merit justifying a departure from the Board’s established practice since mid-2007 of allowing up to a PR of 12¹⁶ for hotel applications within the “R(A)” zones on Hong Kong Island.
- 5.5 Details of the similar applications are summarised at **Appendix II**.

6. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 and A-2, Aerial Photo on Plan A-3 and Site Photos on Plans A-4a and A-4b)

6.1 The Site:

- (a) is currently fenced off and under construction;
- (b) abuts Kam Wa Street along its southern boundary, where five licensed fixed-pitch hawkers operate on the pavement, alongside a PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by; and
- (c) is conveniently located about 10m to the northwest of the Shau Kei Wan Tram Terminus, 70m to the south of the MTR Shau Kei Wan Station, 150m to the east of Shau Kei Wan Bus Terminus, and within a 150m radius of several bus/ minibus stops.

¹⁶ In 2007, in considering applications for hotel developments within the “R(A)” zones on Hong Kong Island, the Board has taken the view that a PR of about 12 is generally acceptable for such developments, as the development intensity is more compatible with the surrounding residential developments which have a permitted PRs of 8 to 10. Since then, a hotel development with a PR exceeding 12 within an “R(A)” zone is generally considered excessive and incompatible in terms of development intensity and building bulk.

6.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics (**Plans A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4a and A-4b**):

- (a) the subject locality is predominantly residential intermixed with various Government, Institutional and Community (GIC) facilities and open spaces while the lower levels of the residential developments along Shau Kei Wan Main Street East, Kam Wa Street and Mong Lung Street are occupied by commercial uses such as shops and eating places;
- (b) its immediate surroundings comprise a mix of old and new residential developments within “R(A)”, “R(A)2” and “R(A)7” zones, subject to BH restrictions ranging from 100mPD to 120mPD¹⁷, increasing progressively from the waterfront in the north to the inland areas in the south;
- (c) to the west across Mong Lung Street is a wet market along Kam Wa Street;
- (d) to the east lie Shing Wong Temple, Kam Wah Street Rest Garden, Kam Wa Street Refuse Collection Point and Public Toilet; and
- (e) to its further east lies the Hong Kong Housing Society’s Ming Wah Dai Ha public rental housing estate, which is currently undergoing phased redevelopment and is zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) with maximum BHs of 100mPD for the northern part and 120mPD for the southern part.

7. **Planning Intention**

- 7.1 The “R(A)” zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building.
- 7.2 On land designated “R(A)”, no new development of or redevelopment to a domestic or non-domestic building shall result in a total development and/or redevelopment in excess of a maximum domestic PR of 8 for Class A site, 9 for Class B site and 10 for Class C site, or a maximum non-domestic PR of 15, as the case may be. The definition of Class A, Class B and Class C sites shall be in accordance with the B(P)Rs.
- 7.3 As stated in the ES of the OZP, a minor relaxation clause in respect of BH restrictions is incorporated into the Notes of the OZP in order to provide incentive for developments/redevelopments with design merits/planning gains. Each application for minor relaxation of BH restriction under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) will be considered on its own merits and the relevant criteria for consideration of such application are as follows:
 - (a) amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements;

¹⁷ “R(A)” zone is subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD. “R(A)2” zone is subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD, and 120mPD for sites with an area of 400m² or more. “R(A)7” zone is subject to a maximum BH of 120mPD.

- (b) accommodating the bonus plot ratio granted under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) in relation to surrender/ dedication of land/ area for use as a public passage/ street widening;
- (c) providing better streetscape/ good quality street level public urban space;
- (d) providing separation between buildings to enhance air and visual permeability;
- (e) accommodating building design to address specific site constraints in achieving the permissible plot ratio under the OZP; and
- (f) other factors such as need for tree preservation, innovative building design and planning merits that would bring about improvements to the townscape and amenity of the locality and would not cause adverse landscape and visual impacts.

8. Comments from Relevant Government Bureau/ Departments (B/Ds)

- 8.1 The following B/Ds have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

Tourism Aspect

8.1.1 Comments of the Commissioner for Tourism:

the Tourism Commission welcomes initiatives that are conducive to the long term and sustainable development of the tourism industry in Hong Kong. For reference, Hong Kong received almost 50 million visitors, of which over 23 million were overnight visitors, for the whole of 2025. Hotel occupancy rate was over 86.9% for the whole of 2025. To support and sustain the growing momentum of the tourism industry and maintain the city's attractiveness to visitors, a stable and sufficient supply of hotel rooms is very important. Therefore, the application is supported which will provide new and more hotel rooms and facilities to offer additional accommodation options to our visitors and enhance the tourism offering of Hong Kong.

8.1.2 Comments of the Chief Officer (Licensing Authority), Office of the Licensing Authority, Home Affairs Department (HAD):

- (a) no objection to the application;
- (b) detailed licensing requirements will be formulated upon receipt of application under the Hotel and Guesthouse Accommodation Ordinance (Cap. 349), if applicable; and
- (c) other comments are at **Appendix V**.

Land Administration

8.1.3 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong East, Lands Department (DLO/HKE, LandsD):

- (a) the Site comprises Section D, Section F, Section G and the Remaining Portion of SIL No. 433 (“the lots”). The Government Lease of SIL No. 433 (“the Lease”) is virtually unrestricted except with the standard “non-offensive trades” and “rate and range” clauses. The term of the Lease is 999 years commencing from 3.1.1860; and
- (b) regarding the concerned lease restrictions above, the lot owner needs to apply to LandsD should the Board approve the planning application. However, there is no guarantee that the application, if submitted, will be approved. Such application, if received, will be dealt by LandsD acting in a capacity as the landlord at its absolute discretion, and if it is approved, it will be subject to such terms and conditions including, among others, payment of appropriate fees, as may be imposed by LandsD.

Traffic Aspect

8.1.4 Comments of the Commissioner for Transport (C for T):

- (a) she has reservation on the application;
- (b) it is noted that the applicant commits to assist the two licensed fixed-pitch hawkers outside the Site in liaising with FEHD to facilitate their relocation to avoid conflict with the proposed run-in/out. Nevertheless, the proposed run-in/out would occupy a certain portion of the existing PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by along Kam Wa Street (**Drawing A-19**). It is noted from the applicant’s submission that consultations with PLB and tramway operators were conducted in March 2026 and most operators had replied “no objection” to the subject application. However, the clarification from the applicant regarding whether the Motor Transport Workers General Union (Public Light Bus Branch) [汽車交通運輸業總工會 (公共小巴分會)] has replied “no objection” instead of “*no objection so far*”, is still pending;
- (c) furthermore, her comments regarding (i) potential conflict between vehicles waiting for the car lift and taxi pick-up/drop-off activities within the Site; (ii) the impact of passengers drop-off and goods delivery activities on adjacent public footpath along Kam Wa Street due to a lack of internal access between the L/UL bays and the lift lobby; (iii) the improvement measures to address item (ii) above, such as to widen the footpath along Kam Wa Street; and (iv) the adopted trip rates for retail and hotel, have not been responded to and the

associated traffic impact and operational concerns have not been addressed;

- (d) the width of the proposed building canopy (**Drawing A-2**) is less than the minimum width of 2m required under the Transport Planning and Design Manual (TPDM) and the HKPSG. The applicant could also consider extending the canopy across its proposed vehicular access by providing suitable vertical clearance;
- (e) should the application be approved by the Board, the following approval condition is required to be stipulated:

“the submission of a revised TIA to the satisfaction of the C for T or of the Board.”; and

- (f) detailed comments are at **Appendix III**.

8.1.5 Comments of the Commissioner of Police (C of P):

no specific traffic comment on the application at this stage. The proposed development should not cause adverse traffic impact to the local community. Each Temporary Traffic Arrangement involving works on footpath and/or carriageway should be submitted to the Road Management Office of Hong Kong Police Force and TD for comment before implementation.

8.1.6 Comments of the Chief Highway Engineer/Hong Kong, Highways Department (CHE/HK, HyD):

- (a) no objection to the application; and
- (b) the applicant is required to follow Highways Standards for the construction of run-in/out, and to seek comments from the Buildings Department (BD) regarding the compliance of the proposed canopy under the BO.

Environmental, Sewerage and Drainage Aspects

8.1.7 Comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP):

- (a) he has no comment on the revised AQIA (**Appendix Ie**) and SIA (**Appendix Ie**);
- (b) he has no objection in-principle to the application from the noise perspective. The revised NIA (**Appendix Ie**) demonstrated that no insurmountable noise impact would be anticipated from the proposed development and could comply with the noise standard stipulated in the HKPSG and Noise Control Ordinance, provided that proper mitigation measures for fixed noise sources are provided;
- (c) based on the information provided, the proposed hotel will not rely on openable windows for natural ventilation. No adverse road traffic

noise impacts upon the proposed development are anticipated. For the fixed plant noise impact upon nearby Noise Sensitive Receivers (NSRs), the planned fixed noise sources would be restricted to the southern façade at 20/F or above, the maximum permissible sound power levels (SWLs) of planned fixed plants in the proposed development have been determined and no adverse fixed plant noise impact is anticipated; and

(d) other comments are at **Appendix V**.

8.1.8 Comments of the Chief Engineer/Hong Kong & Islands, Drainage Services Department (CE/HK&I, DSD):

(a) from the drainage system point of view, no insurmountable drainage impact is envisaged from the proposed development. As such, he has no objection in-principle to the application;

(b) he has no comment on the revised SIA (**Appendix Id**);

(c) should the application be approved by the Board, the following approval condition is required to be stipulated:

“the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/ sewerage connection works identified in the revised SIA to the satisfaction of the Director of the Drainage Services or of the Board”; and

(d) other comments are at **Appendix V**.

Urban Design and Visual Perspectives

8.1.9 Comments of the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), Planning Department (PlanD):

(a) she has reservation on the application;

(b) the Site is located on Kam Wa Street and adjacent to Shau Kei Wan Tram Terminus (**Plan A-2**). The surrounding areas are characterised by high-rise residential developments with permitted PRs of 8 to 10. The proposed development intensity of PR of not more than 15 is much higher than the prevailing PR of the neighbouring developments;

(c) according to the submitted VA (**Appendix Ie**), the overall visual impacts of the proposed development (not exceeding 113.56mPD) from the five identified public viewing points range from “negligible” to “moderate” when compared to the existing condition. Yet, judging from the photomontage of Vantage Point (VP)1 (**Drawing A-12**), the proposed development is visually bulky; and

(d) as noted from the revised SPS (**Appendix Ie**), the proposed development would adopt various design measures such as multi-level sky garden and botanical terraces on lower floors, provision of

balcony greenery and overhanging plants at the aboveground carpark, and provision of canopy of about 15m long. However, the photomontages (**Drawings A-12 to A-16**)/ artist impression (**Drawings A-17 and A-18**) showing a blank façade treatment could not clearly demonstrate how the proposed design measures could soften the building bulk.

Building Matters

8.1.10 Comments of the Chief Building Surveyor/Hong Kong East and Heritage (CBS/HKE&H), BD:

- (a) no objection to the application, provided that the proposed development complies with the provisions of the BO;
- (b) regarding the revised SPS about enhancing natural ventilation through building design (**Appendix Ie**), as no detailed design is provided, detailed comments under the BO will be provided at the building plan submission stage; and
- (c) other comments are at **Appendix V**.

Hawker Management

8.1.11 Comments of the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene:

- (a) provided that TD has completed its review of all submissions from the applicant and maintains that “the proposed run-in/out would pose danger to the two affected licensed fixed-pitch hawkers”¹⁸, the FEHD has no objection in principle to make appropriate arrangements for the two licensed fixed pitch hawkers, which may include, but are not limited to, permanent relocation; and
- (b) other comments are at **Appendix V**.

Fire Safety

8.1.12 Comments of the Director of Fire Services (D of FS):

- (a) no specific comment on the Proposed Scheme subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to his satisfaction; and
- (b) detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans. Furthermore, the provision of Emergency Vehicular Access in the Proposed Scheme shall comply with the requirements as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011.

¹⁸ TD has confirmed that the proposed run-in/out of the Proposed Scheme is in conflict with the existing two licensed fixed-pitch hawkers outside the Site and would pose danger to the hawkers if the two hawkers are kept in place.

District Officer's Comments

8.1.13 Comments of the District Officer (Eastern) (DO(E)), HAD:

some residents and members of the public have approached Eastern District Council (DC) members and Area Committee (AC) members to express their views on the application. The relevant DC and AC members had been advised to submit comments to the Board in accordance with the statutory procedure.

- 8.2 The following Government departments have no objection to/ no adverse comments on the application:
- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
 - (b) Chief Engineer/South and Sustainable Lantau, Civil Engineering and Development Department; and
 - (c) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services.

9. Public Comments Received During the Statutory Publication Periods

- 9.1 During the statutory publication periods, eight public comments (**Appendix IV**) were received, including one supporting, two expressing views and five objecting to/ expressing adverse comments on the application.
- 9.2 The supporting comment was submitted by an Eastern DC member, indicating in-principle support for the proposed hotel development but with concerns on the traffic capacity of Kam Wa Street arising from the increased traffic flows generated by the proposed hotel. Mitigation measures such as designated drop-off areas, arrangements for surrounding parking areas, and traffic management plans should be proposed by the applicant to avoid undesirable impacts on the surrounding residents.
- 9.3 The two comments expressing views are both submitted by the Chairman of the Aldrich AC, consolidating and conveying comments from 361 survey responses of nearby residents. About 71% of the respondents supported the Site to be used for 'Hotel' and 'Shop and Services' purposes whilst 21% of the respondents objected and 8% had no comments. The main views/ concerns raised are summarised below:

Supporting Views

- (a) the proposed development can promote the regional economy of the Shau Kei Wan Area by enhancing the local tourism and creating job opportunities;
- (b) new developments in the area can promote urban renewal and revitalise the aging urban area of Shau Kei Wan;

Objecting Views

- (c) the proposed development is considered incompatible with surrounding traditional commercial activities;
- (d) the proposed development will lead to undesirable traffic impacts on the surrounding areas of Kam Wa Street, with an overwhelming increase in traffic on the existing pedestrian and road networks; and
- (e) the proposed hotel will duplicate with the nearby hotel and commercial developments in Taikoo Shing and create unnecessary competition.

9.4 The remaining five comments are from individuals raising objections to/ expressing adverse comments on the application, mainly on the grounds that:

- (a) compared with the approved GBP for residential development at the Site, the excessive increase in the GFA and bulk for the Proposed Scheme would lead to negative impacts on the health and well-being of the community;
- (b) the applicant has not provided sufficient justification to depart from the Board's "Established Practice" of approving hotel developments within "R(A)" zones on Hong Kong Island with a PR of 12;
- (c) similar approved applications are not comparable to the current application;
- (d) the proposed minor relaxation of BH would affect the natural ventilation, sunshine and privacy of nearby residents, as well as block off the local low-rise node that provided visual relief;
- (e) the proposed justification for hotel demand in the Shau Kei Wan area is inadequate. Shau Kei Wan lacks attractiveness with more vacant shops and fewer tourists;
- (f) the proposed development disrespects local hawker culture and will lead to a loss of the existing parking area at the frontage of the Site;
- (g) the proposed development would place additional burdens on vehicular and pedestrian flows in the area;
- (h) the construction works would affect the foundations and utility supplies of adjoining buildings, and disrupt the daily commuting of residents; and
- (i) the Site is suggested to be developed in conjunction with the adjoining buildings at 1-13 Kam Wa Street and other commercial buildings could be refitted for hotel developments to address the downfall in hotel rooms.

10. Planning Considerations and Assessments

10.1 The application is for a proposed hotel development with a minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 113.56mPD (i.e. +13.56m or + 13.56% in terms of mPD) at the Site zoned "R(A)". The proposed 31-storey hotel development

with a GFA of about 7,776m² or a PR of 15 (excluding a GFA of 694m² (or a PR of 1.339) resulting from the adoption of MiC, which is assumed to be disregarded from GFA calculation by the applicant) comprises a retail shop on the G/F, two aboveground car park levels on the G/F and 2/F, various hotel ancillary facilities and BOH on the G/F to 6/F, and about 336 hotel guestrooms on the upper floors (**Drawing A-11**).

Planning Intention and Land Use Compatibility

- 10.2 The Site is located in the town centre area of Shau Kei Wan, a predominantly residential neighbourhood with a mix of old and new residential developments, GIC facilities and open spaces, while the lower levels of residential developments are occupied by commercial uses such as shops and eating places that support the daily needs of the neighbourhood (**Plan A-2**). The site is well-served by public transportation, including MTR, buses, mini-buses and tram. There are several cultural heritage and tourism attractions in Shau Kei Wan such as Shing Wong Temple, Tin Hau Temple, Tam Kung Temple and Hong Kong Museum of the War of Resistance and Coastal Defence in the vicinity as well as commercial activities along Shau Kei Wan Main Street East.
- 10.3 The Proposed Scheme will provide about 336 hotel guestrooms. The C for Tourism supports the application as a stable and sufficient supply of hotel rooms is very important to support and sustain the growing momentum of the tourism industry and maintain the city's attractiveness to visitors, and the Proposed Scheme will provide new and more hotel rooms and facilities to offer additional accommodation options to visitors and enhance the tourism offering of Hong Kong.
- 10.4 Although the proposed hotel development is not in line with the planning intention of the "R(A)" zone, which is primarily for high-density residential developments, considering the above local context and that the Proposed Scheme is conducive to the long-term and sustainable development of Hong Kong's tourism industry, the development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding uses and developments.

Minor Relaxation of BH Restriction

- 10.5 According to the applicant, the proposed minor relaxation of BH restriction from 100mPD to 113.56mPD (i.e. +13.56m or + 13.56% in terms of mPD) is to facilitate the adoption of MiC and two levels of aboveground car park (10.85m in height) for the proposed development. Additionally, the adoption of MiC for the hotel guestroom floors involves thickened/double slabs between MiC modules, resulting in an increase of 3.12m in height. Although the combined height increase from these measures totals 13.97m, the applicant only seeks 13.56m increase in the current application. The reasons for proposed minor relaxation of the BH restriction generally align with the Government's policy to facilitate aboveground car park design in private developments to fast-track construction, reduce costs and expedite developments and to promote wider adoption of MiC to enable better quality control, shorten the construction period, and reduce disturbance and nuisance to the neighbourhood.

- 10.6 The Site is surrounded mainly by residential zones (i.e. “R(A)”, “R(A)2” and “R(A)7” zones) and a “CDA” zone further to the east, with BH restrictions from 100mPD to 120mPD increasing progressively from the waterfront in the north to the inland areas in the south (**Plan A-5**). The proposed development with proposed BH of 113.56mPD is not incompatible with the stepped BH profile of the town centre area of Shau Kei Wan.

Development Intensity and Design Merits

- 10.7 The proposed PR of 15 is much higher than the prevailing PRs of the neighbouring developments, which are characterised by high-rise residential developments with permitted domestic PRs of 8 to 10. Although a maximum non-domestic PR of 15 is permissible under the “R(A)” zone, the planning intention of this zone is primarily for high-density residential developments with commercial uses permitted on the lowest three floors of a building. If the subject site were developed as a pure residential development, the maximum domestic PR would be 8 for this Class A site¹⁹. For a new building that is partly domestic and partly non-domestic, assuming a 3-storey non-domestic podium, the overall PR would be only about 9.4 according to the composite formula under the B(P)Rs. For the Shau Kei Wan Planning Scheme Area, while there is no commercial zoning, commercial developments within areas zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” are subject to a maximum PR of 12. In view of the above, the proposed development with a PR of 15 (the actual building bulk would have a PR of about 16.339 and a SC of about 65.598% if the GFA and SC exemptions arising from adoption of MiC are taken into account) is considered excessive and incompatible with the surrounding areas in terms of development intensity. The CTP/UD&L of PlanD points out that, according to the submitted VA (**Appendix 1e**), the overall visual impacts of the proposed development (not exceeding 113.56mPD) from the five identified public viewing points range from “negligible” to “moderate” when compared to the existing condition, but the proposed development is visually bulky as shown in the photomontage of VP1 (**Drawing A-12**). She has reservation on the application from urban design and visual perspectives. Approval of the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar hotel developments that are excessive and incompatible with the development density and building bulk within the “R(A)” zone.
- 10.8 As mentioned in Paragraph 1.4 above, although the applicant proposes various design features such as multi-level landscaping with a sky garden on the lower floors (**Drawings A-2 to A-4, A-11 and A-18**), provision of balcony greenery and overhanging plants at the aboveground carpark (**Drawing A-18**), and provision of 1.5m-wide canopy of about 15m long (**Drawings A-2, A-11 and A-18**), CTP/UD&L of PlanD advises that the photomontages (**Drawings A-12 to A-16**)/ artist impressions (**Drawings A-17 and A-18**) showing a blank façade treatment could not clearly demonstrate how the proposed design measures could soften the building bulk. Regarding the proposed active frontage for the G/F retail space (**Drawing A-18**), there is only one shop on G/F (**Drawing A-1**) and its effectiveness in maintaining the street-level vibrancy and supporting the continuity of local culture in Shau Kei Wan is doubtful. For the proposed canopy (**Drawing A-2**), C for T advises that the width is less than the minimum width of 2m required under the TPDM and the HKPSG and the extension of the canopy across its

¹⁹ The definition of Class A, Class B and Class C sites shall be in accordance with the B(P)Rs.

proposed vehicular access by providing suitable vertical clearance could be considered. Regarding the proposed semi-open structure at 2/F with louvre design to facilitate natural ventilation, CBS/HKE&H, BD advises that no detailed design is provided in the applicant's submission. Regarding the proposed local art painting on the building façade (**Drawing A-17**), it covers only the G/F of the rear façade of the proposed hotel development facing the back alley and its effectiveness to mitigate building bulkiness is in doubt.

Technical Assessments

- 10.9 The applicant has submitted technical assessments to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed hotel development. The CE/MN of DSD has advised that no insurmountable drainage impact is envisaged from the proposed development and has no comment on the revised SIA (**Appendix Id**). DEP also has no comment on the revised SIA and AQIA (**Appendix Ie**), and advises that the revised NQIA (**Appendix Ie**) demonstrates that no insurmountable noise impact would be anticipated from the proposed development. However, C for T has reservation on the application as the applicant has not responded to her comments regarding (i) the potential impact on the existing PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by and the respective consultation with the PLB operators; (ii) the potential conflict between the vehicles waiting for the car lift and taxi pick-up/drop-off activities within the Site; (iii) the impact of passenger drop-off and goods delivery activities on the public footpath along Kam Wa Street; (iv) the improvement measures to address (iii), such as to widen the footpath along Kam Wa Street; and (v) the adopted trip rates. The associated traffic impact and operational concerns also have not been addressed.

Similar Applications

- 10.10 As mentioned in paragraph 5.4 above, two similar applications (No. A/H9/70 and A/H9/71) for hotel developments (**Plan A-1**) were rejected in 2012 and 2013 respectively, mainly on the grounds that the proposed hotel with PRs of 15 and 13 were considered excessive with respect to the surrounding residential developments which had permitted PRs of 8 to 10. The rejection of the current application is generally consistent with the Committee's previous decisions.
- 10.11 Though there were three similar approved applications (No. A/H9/63, 68 and 73), the approval of Application No. A/H9/63 for converting an existing commercial/office building to a hotel development with a PR of 14.455 was granted mainly on the consideration that the proposed development involved no increase in the PR, SC and BH of the existing building. For both applications No. A/H9/68 and 73, the proposed PR of 12 was considered acceptable in terms of development intensity (details in paragraphs 5.2 and 5.3 above).
- 10.12 Though the applicant has indicated that there were four similar approved applications on Hong Kong Island (No. A/H5/412, A/H5/421, A/H7/183 and A/H3/420), the first three applications, with PRs of 15 or above, were related to non-hotel developments situated in neighbourhoods where high-rise commercial buildings with a PR of 15 are found across the street. These sites either had previous approved schemes or approved building plans, or the proposed development had a PR similar to that of the existing building. Application No. A/H3/420 for a proposed hotel (with a PR of about 15.19) was approved mainly

on the grounds that the application site had all along been used for hotel purpose, and that there was already an approved set of building plans for a hotel development which remained valid.

Public Comments

- 10.13 Amongst the eight public comments received, five objected to/ expressed adverse comments on the application and two expressed views/ concerns mainly on traffic grounds, excessive development, incompatibility with surrounding uses/ developments, and similar approved applications are not applicable to the current application. The departmental comments, applicant's justifications and responses, and planning assessments as set out in paragraphs 2, 8, 10.2 to 10.12 above are relevant.

11. Planning Department's Views

- 11.1 Based on the assessments made in paragraph 10 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 9 above, the Planning Department does not support the application for the following reasons:

- (a) the proposed development, with a plot ratio (PR) of 15, is considered excessive and incompatible, in terms of development intensity and hence building bulk, with the surrounding residential developments with permitted PRs of 8 to 10; and
- (b) the applicant fails to demonstrate that the proposed development will not have adverse traffic impact.

- 11.2 Alternatively, should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 14.8.2030, 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 conditions of approval and advisory clauses are suggested for Members' reference:

Approval Conditions

- (a) the submission of a revised Traffic Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport or of the Town Planning Board; and
- (b) the implementation of the local sewerage upgrading/ sewerage connection works identified in the revised Sewerage Impact Assessment to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board.

Advisory Clauses

The recommended advisory clauses are attached at **Appendix V**.

12. Decision Sought

- 12.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to reject the application, Members are invited to advise what reason(s) for rejection should be given to the applicant
- 12.3 Alternatively, 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.

13. Attachments

Appendix I	Application Form received on 21.4.2026
Appendix Ia	SPS received on 21.4.2026
Appendix Ib	SI received on 23.4.2026
Appendix Ic	SI received on 24.4.2026
Appendix Id	FI received on 28.5.2026
Appendix Ie	FI received on 18.6.2026
Appendix II	Similar Applications
Appendix III	Detailed Departmental Comments
Appendix IV	Public Comments
Appendix V	Recommended Advisory Clauses
Drawings A-1 to A-10	Indicative Floor Plans
Drawing A-11	Proposed Elevation Plan
Drawing A-12 to A-16	Photomontages
Drawing A-17	Artistic Impression (Façade Painting)
Drawing A-18	Artistic Impression (Overall Planning and Design Merits)
Drawing A-19	The proposed run-in/out of the proposed hotel development and the affected PLB Stand cum Part-time Parking Lay-by along Kam Wa Street
Plan A-1	Location Plan
Plan A-2	Site Plan
Plan A-3	Aerial Photo
Plan A-4a and 4b	Site Photos
Plan A-5	BHs in the Vicinity of the Site