

**APPLICATION FOR PERMISSION**  
**UNDER SECTION 16 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE**

**APPLICATION NO. A/H19/87**

<b><u>Applicant</u></b>	New Season Global Limited represented by KTA Planning Limited
<b><u>Site</u></b>	44 Stanley Village Road, Stanley
<b><u>Site Area</u></b>	About 7,645.5m <sup>2</sup>
<b><u>Lease</u></b>	<p>Rural Building Lot (RBL) 333 R.P. :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- with a term of 75 years from 9.11.1931 and an option of renewal for one further 75 years</li><li>- no restrictions on user, gross floor area (GFA), site coverage (SC), building height (BH) and landscaping</li><li>- not to erect more than 3 houses of European type</li><li>- a right-of-way (ROW) leading from the main road crossing RBL 333 s.A is reserved</li></ul>
<b><u>Plan</u></b>	Approved Stanley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H19/16
<b><u>Zoning</u></b>	<p>“Other Specified Uses” annotated “Residential Development with Historic Building Preserved” (“OU(RDHBP)”) :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- any new development, or demolition of, addition, alteration and/or modification to or redevelopment of the Maryknoll House requires permission from the Town Planning Board (the Board); and</li><li>- a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.75, a maximum SC of 30% and stepped BH restrictions of 64mPD and 75mPD</li></ul>
<b><u>Application</u></b>	Proposed Residential Development with Minor Relaxation of PR, BH and SC Restrictions

**1. The Proposal**

- 1.1 The applicant seeks planning permission for a preservation-cum-residential development with minor relaxation of PR, BH, and SC restrictions at the application site (the Site), which is zoned “OU(RDHBP)” on the OZP (**Plan A-1**). According to the Notes of the OZP for the “OU(RDHBP)” zone, ‘Flat’ is a Column 2 use which requires planning permission from 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).

- 1.2 The current application (the 'Current Scheme') proposes a residential development comprising (i) adaptive reuse of the Grade 1 Maryknoll House (75mPD at the main roof), 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) (**Drawings A-1 to A-4**); (ii) alterations to the western, eastern and southern façades, including the addition of a one-storey extension to the west (67.7mPD at the main roof), a three-storey extension above one level basement carpark to the east (75mPD at the main roof), and two new loggias at G/F to the south (**Drawings A-1 to A-4 and A-11**); (iii) a four-storey new residential block above one level carpark (64mPD at the main roof) on the southern platform formed from the existing garden and slope (**Drawings A-5 to A-10**); and (iv) a one-storey guard house (66.65mPD at the main roof) at the entrance of the Site (**Drawing A-1**). The total GFA and SC of the proposed development are 6,881.019m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to a PR of 0.9) and 36% respectively. As the proposed PR (0.9), BH of the proposed western extension (67.7mPD), and SC (36%) exceed the permissible PR (0.75), BH (stepped BH restrictions of 75mPD in the north and east and 64mPD in the south and west to preserve the public views of the historic building from the south and southwest and reflect the existing BH of the Maryknoll House (**Plan A-1**)), and SC (30%), minor relaxation of the restrictions is required. The Site is accessible via an existing access road from Stanley Village Road through the Stanley Knoll, which is a non-exclusive ROW under the assignment between owners of RBL 333 s.A (Stanley Knoll) and RBL 333 R.P. (the Site) (**Plan A-2**).
- 1.3 The Site is the subject of a s.16 application (No. A/H19/82) submitted by the same applicant for adaptive reuse of Maryknoll House for residential development, which was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (the Committee) of the Board on 24.12.2021 (the 'approved 2021 Scheme'). Compared to the approved 2021 Scheme, the Current Scheme primarily involves increase in PR from 0.75 to 0.9 (i.e. +0.15 or 20%) and SC from 30% to 36% (i.e. +6% or 20%) in order to provide additional incentives for the applicant to enhance the public interpretation arrangement of the heritage building (details provided in paragraph 1.5 below). The two residential blocks on the southern platform in the approved 2021 Scheme will be combined into a single residential block and a new security guard house is proposed under the Current Scheme. The BH of the new residential block on the southern platform will slightly increase from 62.2mPD to the permissible 64mPD under the OZP. The number of private car parking spaces will increase from 43 to 55, and the number of loading/unloading (L/UL) bays will increase from one to two. Other development parameters, including the site area, BHs (in terms of mPD and number of storeys) of the Maryknoll House and its extensions, and the number of residential units, remain unchanged. A comparison of the major development parameters between the two schemes is provided below:

	<b>Approved 2021 Scheme (a)</b>	<b>Current Scheme<sup>(1)</sup> (b)</b>	<b>Difference (%) (b) - (a)</b>
Site Area <sup>(2)</sup>	7,645.5 m <sup>2</sup>	7,645.5 m <sup>2</sup>	No change
GFA <sup>(3) (4)</sup>	5,734.183 m <sup>2</sup>	6,881.019m <sup>2</sup> <sup>(2)</sup>	+1,146.836m <sup>2</sup> (+20%)
- Maryknoll House Building	2,512.067m <sup>2</sup>	2,661.621m <sup>2</sup>	+149.554m <sup>2</sup> (+5.95%) <sup>(5)</sup>
- New Extensions and New Buildings	3,222.116m <sup>2</sup>	4,219.398m <sup>2</sup>	+997.282m <sup>2</sup> (+30.95%)
PR	0.75	0.9	+0.15 (+20%)
SC	30%	36%	+6% (+20%)
BH			
- Maryknoll House Main Building/ Chapel & Library Wings	75mPD/ 74.3mPD	75mPD/ 74.3mPD	No change
- Proposed Eastern Extension	75mPD	75mPD	No change
- Proposed Western Extension	67.7mPD	67.7mPD	No change
- New Residential Block on the Southern Platform	62.2mPD	64mPD	+1.8m (+2.89%)
- New Security Guard House	-	66.65mPD	-
No. of Storeys <sup>(6)</sup>			
- Maryknoll House Main Building/ Chapel & Library Wings	3 storeys/ 2 storeys	3 storeys/ 2 storeys	No change
- Proposed Eastern Extension	3 storeys above 1 storey of carport	3 storeys above 1 storey of carport	No change
- Proposed Western Extension	1 storey	1 storey	No change
- New Residential Block at the Southern Platform	4 storeys above 1 storey of carport	4 storeys above 1 storey of carport	No change
- New Security Guard House	-	1 storey	-
No. of Block	3	3	No change
No. of Unit	23 <sup>(7)</sup>	23 <sup>(8)</sup>	No change
No. of Private Car Parking Spaces	43	55	+12 (+27.91%)
No. of Motorcycle Parking Spaces	1	1	No change
No. of Loading/ Unloading Bay	1	2	+1 (+100%)
Communal Open Space	About 569m <sup>2</sup>	Not less than 308.2m <sup>2</sup>	-260.8 (-45.8%)

Remarks:

(1) According to the applicant, the proposed development will be completed in 2028.

- (2) The exact site area and the total GFA based on a PR of 0.9 are subject to change due to further site survey at the building plan submission stage.
- (3) According to the Notes of the OZP, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as car park, loading/unloading bay, plant room and caretaker's office, or caretaker's quarters and recreational facilities for the use and benefit of all the owners or occupiers of the domestic building or domestic part of the building, provided such uses and facilities are ancillary and directly related to the development or redevelopment, may be disregarded from the GFA and SC calculation.
- (4) The GFA exemption for recreational and E&M facilities is subject to BA's decision at the building plan submission stage.
- (5) According to the applicant, the GFA of the Maryknoll House building under the approved 2021 Scheme did not include the area designated for interpretation panels located within the resident's recreation facilities, which may qualify for GFA exemption. In the Current Scheme, the GFA of the Maryknoll House building has increased mainly due to the newly proposed Heritage Gallery, which is accountable for GFA.
- (6) According to the current proposal, the proposed floor-to-floor height of the eastern and western extensions is 3.6m - 3.7m, and the proposed floor-to-floor height of the new 4-storey building on the southern platform is 3.3m - 4.05m.
- (7) Under the approved 2021 Scheme, the average flat size of the proposed development is 250m<sup>2</sup> by calculation.
- (8) According to the current proposal, the average flat size of the proposed development is 273.8m<sup>2</sup>.

1.4 A comparison of the main uses by floor between the two schemes is provided below. A comparison of the floor plans and section plans is provided at **Drawings A-12 to A-22**.

Floor	Approved 2021 Scheme	Current Scheme
<b>Maryknoll House and its Eastern and Western Extensions</b>		
LG/F	Carpark, E&M Facilities	Carpark, E&M Facilities
G/F - Chapel Wing - Library Wing	Flats, Lobby, Communal Garden, Swimming Pool - E&M Facilities - Recreational/E&M Facilities	Flats, Lobby, Communal Garden, Swimming Pools - <b>Heritage Gallery</b> - Recreational/E&M Facilities
1/F - Chapel Wing  - Library Wing	Flats, Lobby - Recreational/E&M Facilities, <b>Interpretation Area for Maryknoll House History</b> - Recreational/E&M Facilities, <b>Interpretation Area for Maryknoll House History</b>	Flats, Lobby - <b>Heritage Gallery</b>  - Recreational/E&M Facilities
2/F	Flats, Lobby	Flats, Lobby
<b>New Residential Building on the Southern Platform</b>		
LG/F	Carpark, Lobby, E&M Facilities	Flats, Carpark, Lobby, E&M Facilities
G/F	Flats, Garden, Swimming Pool, Lobby, E&M Facilities	Flats, Garden, Swimming Pools
1/F	Flats, Garden, Swimming Pool, Lobby	Flats
2/F	Flats, Lobby	Flats
3/F	Flats, Lobby	Flats

#### Conservation Management Plan (CMP)

1.5 The applicant has submitted an updated CMP to support the Current Scheme (Appendix C of **Appendix Ia**). The key features of the Maryknoll House,

including the pitched roof with green glazed tiles, red brick elevation, verandahs and timber windows, will be preserved in-situ. Some alterations proposed in the approved 2021 Scheme will be carried on under the Current Scheme:

- (a) addition of a new 1-storey extension to the west, a 3-storey extension to the east, and two loggias to the south (**Drawings A-1 to A-4, A-12 to A-15**); and
- (b) the areas between the main building and the Chapel and Library Wings will be modified and converted into circulation cores to accommodate the relocated staircases, including the timber flooring and metal balustrade with timber handrail. New lifts and staircases will be provided to meet current building and fire safety requirements (**Drawings A-2 to A-4, A-13 to A-15**). The existing octagonal glass windows on the Chapel and Library Wings will be restored at the façade of circulation cores (**Drawings A-26 and A-27**).

1.6 Compared to the approved 2021 Scheme, several new alterations are currently proposed, including:

- (a) 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 (**Drawing A-25**);
- (b) installation of a new free-standing canopy at the Entrance Porch to provide better weather protection for future residents (**Drawing A-28**);
- (c) erection of a glazing system on the southern front of the 1/F and 2/F to enhance the living environment (**Plan A-13**); and
- (d) enclosing the top level of the eastern extension block to create more habitable space for future residents (**Drawing A-24**).

#### Public Interpretation Arrangement

1.7 According to the applicant, while the major heritage conservation elements remain consistent with the approved 2021 Scheme, the Current Scheme aims to enhance public appreciation and enjoyment of the historic Maryknoll House. To improve the interpretation of the Maryknoll House, the applicant proposes to:

- (a) increase the number of free guided tours from eight annually (approved 2021 Scheme) to twelve annually under the Current Scheme;
- (b) provide a larger dedicated Heritage Gallery of approximately 298m<sup>2</sup> on the G/F and 1/F of the Chapel Wing. The applicant considers this represents a significant expansion from the previously proposed two separated areas totaling 44m<sup>2</sup> in the recreational facilities on the 1/F of the Chapel Wing and Library Wing under the approved 2021 Scheme (**Drawing A-14**). Under this arrangement, the proposed guided tour route will avoid passing through the residential recreational facilities, thereby minimising disturbance to future residents (**Drawing A-29**); and

- (c) feature the restored key elements of the Maryknoll House including stained glass panels, columns and vaulted ceiling currently within the Chapel Wing, patterned mosaic floor tiles and floor tiles with religious emblem (**Photos 15 and 17 in Plan A-9 and Photos 20 and 22 in Plan A-10**), and arrange exhibitions focusing on themes such as the historic development of Maryknoll House, its revitalisation, and the Maryknoll Mission in China. Advanced visualization techniques such as virtual reality (VR), augmented reality (AR), and mobile applications to improve heritage interpretation will also be utilized. The applicant believes that the expanded area for Heritage Gallery could offer more flexibility for arranging and organising heritage interpretation programmes.

### Tree Preservation and Landscape Proposal

- 1.8 According to the Tree Preservation and Landscape Proposal submitted by the applicant, the 141 trees approved to be felled under the approved 2021 Scheme had been removed from the Site<sup>1</sup>. Under the Current Scheme, among the 26 existing trees within the Site which are neither old and valuable trees (OVT), potentially registrable OVT, rare species nor protected species, 15 trees are proposed to be felled, one tree to be retained and ten trees to be transplanted within the Site. Further removal of trees are due to amendment of building layout and tree health conditions. . A total of 156 new heavy standard trees are proposed to be planted within the Site to achieve a compensatory ratio of 1:1 in terms of quantity and 1:0.43 in terms of quality, which is consistent with the approved 2021 Scheme (**Drawing A-30**).
- 1.9 In support of the application, the applicant has submitted the following documents:
- |   |   |                       |
|---|---|-----------------------|
| (a) Application Form received on 13.9.2024  | } | ( <b>Appendix I</b> ) |
| (b) Supplementary Planning Statement (SPS) received on 13.9.2024                      |   | }                     |
| (c) Supplementary information received on 23.9.2024                                   |   |                       |
| (d) Further information (FI) received on 28.10.2024 (1 <sup>st</sup> FI) <sup>#</sup> |   |                       |
| (e) FI received on 13.11.2024 (2 <sup>nd</sup> FI) <sup>#</sup>                       |   |                       |
| (f) FI received on 7.2.2025 (3 <sup>rd</sup> FI) <sup>#</sup>                         |   |                       |
| (g) FI received on 10.3.2025 (4 <sup>th</sup> FI) <sup>*</sup>                        |   |                       |
- <sup>#</sup> *accepted but not exempted from publication and recounting requirement*  
<sup>\*</sup> *accepted and exempted from publication and recounting requirement*
- 1.10 On 10.1.2025, the Committee agreed to defer marking a decision on the application for two months as requested by the applicant.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal based the approved 2021 Scheme has been approved by Lands Department on 25.7.2022.

<sup>2</sup> A consolidated report containing SPS, FI, finalised technical assessments and various Responses-to-Comments tables and letters (**Appendix Ia**) submitted by the applicant was received on 20.3.2025, thus the original SPS and FIs as listed from items (b) to (g) are not attached in this paper.

## 2. **Justifications from the Applicant**

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

### In Line With the Planning Intention and Development Intensity of the Area

- (a) The Current Scheme adheres to the planning intention of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone by preserving the historic Maryknoll House in-situ through the proposed preservation-cum-residential development project. This aligns with the Government’s heritage conservation policy, which aims to revitalise historical and heritage buildings for the benefit and enjoyment of the future generations. The applicant is committed to activating and showcasing the Maryknoll House to the public by establishing a Heritage Gallery and offering more frequent guided tours, facilitating closer access to the historic building.
- (b) The Site is situated within a low to medium-density residential neighbourhood, surrounded by several “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) sites, which have a maximum PR of 0.75 and a BH of 3 storeys for domestic purposes to the immediate north, east and south. To the further west, there are a “Residential (Group A)3” (“R(A)3”) site and a “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) site intended for medium-density residential developments. The maximum PR allowed in the “R(C)” zone is 0.9 for developments with four storeys used for domestic purposes under the same OZP. Therefore, the proposed PR of 0.9 is considered generally consistent with the development intensity of the area.

### Improved Public Appreciation and Enjoyment of the Maryknoll House

- (c) The applicant has reviewed the arrangement of guided tours to enhance public appreciation of the historic building and to improve the operation and management of the public interpretation programme, while addressing security and privacy concerns. In the approved 2021 Scheme, the exhibition areas were separately located within the recreational facilities of the Chapel Wing and Library Wing. 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> (**Drawings A-13 and A-14**). Although visitors will still access the Heritage Gallery via the common corridor of the residential portion (**Drawing A-29**), this arrangement will significantly improve the access compared to passing through residents’ recreational facilities, while maintaining the security and privacy of residents.
- (d) The frequency of guided tours has also been increased. Under the approved s.12A and s.16 applications, the number of public tours was limited to biannual and eight times per year respectively. The applicant now proposes to offer twelve free public guided tours annually. During these tours, docents will share insights into the Site’s cultural heritage while guiding visitors through key indoor and outdoor locations of historic significance. Participants will gain an understanding of the building’s transformation, the preservation of key spaces and features, and its revitalization for new uses.

The Scale of Relaxation Sought is Minor and Acceptable

- (e) Along with the newly proposed Heritage Gallery in the Chapel Wing, about 585m<sup>2</sup> of GFA (equivalent to about 10.2% of the total GFA of the approved 2021 Scheme) has been dedicated to maintaining various heritage features, including the heritage façade and relocated staircases. The applicant therefore seeks a minor relaxation of the PR restriction to provide additional incentives for the preservation of the privately-owned historic building.
- (f) The Current Scheme has a total GFA of 6,881.019m<sup>2</sup> and a PR of 0.9. Most of the additional GFA is 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. The proposed relaxation of PR and SC restrictions by 20% (i.e. increasing PR from 0.75 to 0.9 and SC from 30% to 36%) is considered minor in nature.
- (g) A minor relaxation of BH from 64mPD to 67.7mPD is required for the addition of a new contemporary extension to the west of the Maryknoll House, aiming to resemble the original symmetrical building expression. This additional height is barely distinguishable, and the main building will remain the tallest structure on the Site (with a roof height of +79.0mPD). Public views of the western façade will also be maintained (**Drawing A-31**). This relaxation of the BH restriction for the western extension was previously approved by the Committee under the approved 2021 Scheme.
- (h) To ensure that the new extensions and residential block on the southern platform are compatible with the Maryknoll House, the Current Scheme adopts a stepped building height profile, ensuring that the residential building does not impede public views of the Maryknoll House's facades from surrounding viewpoints (**Drawings A-32 to A-35**).

Slight Modifications to Align the Building with Modern Living Standards and Expectations

- (i) The Maryknoll House was originally established as a rest home and retreat center. With the transition of the building to residential use, modifications to this historic building will enhance and create habitable space to meet modern living standards.

No Adverse Technical Impacts

- (j) The technical assessments, including Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), Environmental Assessment (EA), Drainage and Sewerage Impact Assessment (DSIA) and Visual Impact Assessment (VIA), attached in the SPS demonstrate that the Current Scheme will not have adverse impact on traffic, environmental, drainage, sewerage or visual aspects. Appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed where necessary.

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

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

#### **4. Background**

- 4.1 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 (AAB) confirmed its Grade 1 status<sup>3</sup> for architectural merit and authenticity during a meeting on 8.12.2016. The Maryknoll House was not open for public access or visit before.
- 4.2 The Site was previously zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) on the then OZP No. S/H19/12. On 11.7.2018, the owner of the Site (i.e. the applicant) submitted a s.12A application (No. Y/H19/1) to rezone it to “R(C)2” or “OU(RDHBP)” for the proposed preservation-cum-development project for the Maryknoll House. On 4.1.2019, the Committee considered the rezoning application and partially agreed to rezone the Site to “OU(RDHBP)”.
- 4.3 On 15.5.2020, the Committee agreed proposed amendments to the OZP to take forward its decision. The following development restrictions for the “OU(RDHBP)” zone are imposed:
- (a) residential uses, including ‘Flat’ and ‘House’, are specified under Column 2, requiring planning permission from the Board. Relevant technical assessments are required to demonstrate that no adverse impacts would be resulted from the proposed uses at the Site;
  - (b) 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 Maryknoll House requires permission from the Board to ensure adequate control over the in-situ preservation of Maryknoll House. This allows the Board to examine and control the future design and layout of the proposed preservation-cum-development project through the consideration of planning application and impose suitable approval condition(s) in order to properly manage the change of uses while conserving the Maryknoll House; and
  - (c) development restrictions include a PR of 0.75, SC of 30%, and stepped BH of 64mPD and 75mPD.
- 4.4 During the deliberation, members expressed concerns regarding the architectural design of the proposed development and the public access arrangement of the Maryknoll House. To address these issues, the requirement for the submission and implementation of a CMP and the provision of reasonable public access to the Maryknoll House for public appreciation are specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP for the Site. The draft OZP No. S/H19/13, incorporating the above amendments, was gazetted on 5.6.2020.

---

<sup>3</sup> By definition, historic buildings accorded with Grade 1 status are buildings of outstanding merit, which every effort should be made to preserve if possible. The grading system is administrative in nature and will not affect the ownership, usage, management, and development rights of the buildings that have been graded. The historic building appraisal, location, extent and grading status of the Maryknoll House are available at [www.aab.gov.hk](http://www.aab.gov.hk).

## **5. Previous Applications**

- 5.1 As mentioned in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.4 above, the subject “OU(RDHBP)” zoning is based on a s.12A application (No. Y/H19/1) submitted by the same applicant to rezone the Site from “G/IC” to “OU(RDHBP)” to facilitate a proposed preservation-cum-development project. The s.12A application was partially agreed by the Committee on 4.1.2019.
- 5.2 Subsequently, a s.16 application (No. A/H19/82) was submitted by the same applicant for the adaptive reuse of the Maryknoll House for residential development with a minor relaxation of the BH restriction. The Committee approved this application with conditions on 24.12.2021, as it aligned with the planning intention of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone; the proposed design of the new residential blocks and extensions was considered compatible with the Maryknoll House; the proposed development struck a balance between heritage conservation and development, and the proposed preservation and partial alterations to the facades of the new extensions and loggias as well as significant features of the Grade 1 historic buildings were acceptable; the overall scale of the proposal, in terms of BH and building mass, was considered respectful of the heritage features and not incompatible with surrounding developments in visual terms; and the proposed residential development would not induce adverse impacts on traffic, landscape, water supplies or geotechnical impacts on the surroundings.
- 5.3 Details of the applications are summarised at **Appendix II**, with their locations shown on **Plan A-1**.

## **6. Similar Application**

There is no similar application for proposed residential development with a minor relaxation of PR, BH and SC restrictions in the Stanley area.

## **7. The Site and Its Surrounding Areas (Plans A-1 to A-3, and Photos on Plans A-4 to A-8)**

- 7.1 The Site is:
- (a) situated on a hilltop platform overlooking the Stanley area, making it visually prominent from public viewpoints such as Blake Pier and Stanley Promenade;
  - (b) occupied by a Grade 1 historic building (the Maryknoll House), which includes a 3-storey main building and two 2-storey wings (i.e. the Chapel and Library Wings) extending at both ends, along with ancillary facilities. A garden and a sloping area with vegetation is located in the south; and
  - (c) accessible via an existing access road from Stanley Village Road through Stanley Knoll.

- 7.2 The surrounding areas comprise predominantly low- to medium-density residential developments interspersed with densely vegetated hillslopes, government, institution and community facilities as well as some commercial developments. To the north and east lie low-rise residential developments such as Stanley Knoll, Carmel Hill, Gordon Terrace and Stanley Court. To the west, northwest and southwest across Carmel Road is a cluster of medium-rise residential developments, including Ma Hang Estate and Lung Tak Court, as well as a bus terminus, Stanley Plaza, Murray House, Blake Pier, and Stanley Ma Hang Park. Further southeast are the popular tourist destinations of Stanley Market and Stanley Promenade.

## **8. Planning Intention**

- 8.1 The “OU(RDHBP)” zone is intended primarily to preserve the historic building of the Maryknoll House in-situ through the preservation-cum-development project.
- 8.2 As set out in the ES of the OZP, in order to facilitate appropriate planning control over the design and layout of the preservation-cum-development project, planning permission from the Board is required for residential use.
- 8.3 The BH restriction is to preserve the public views of the historic building from the south and southwest and to maintain the character and setting of Stanley. Any application for minor relaxation of BH restriction should not lead to blocking the public view of the main façades of the Maryknoll House. Minor relaxation of the stated restrictions may be considered by the Board on application under s.16 of the Ordinance. Each application will be considered on its own merits.

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

- 9.1 The following bureau/government departments have been consulted and their views on the application are summarised as follows:

### **Heritage Conservation**

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

- (a) No in-principle objection to the overall preservation-cum-development proposal from heritage conservation point of view.
- (b) Since November 2016, CHO and AMO have been exploring with its current owner preservation-cum-development proposals for the Maryknoll House. CHO rendered policy support for amending the approved Stanley OZP No. S/H19/12 to rezone the Maryknoll House site for the proposed residential development. The OZP amendment was eventually agreed by the Board on 15.1.2021. On 24.12.2021, the Committee approved application No. A/H19/82

with conditions for the preservation-cum-development of the Maryknoll House.

- (c) According to the preservation-cum-development proposal outlined in the information submitted by the applicant for the current application, the Maryknoll House would be preserved in-situ for residential development. New additions and alterations are proposed to the Maryknoll House to meet the needs of the residential development.
- (d) It is appreciated that the applicant has increased the frequency of tours from eight to twelve per year, with complimentary transportation to be arranged.
- (e) The applicant proposed relocating the cross to the Heritage Gallery to enhance its preservation and protection while also enabling better public appreciation. Given its significance as a character-defining element of the Maryknoll House, the cross should be carefully handled. Taking into account the fact that the Maryknoll House will be converted into a religiously neutral residential development and that the placement of the cross in the Heritage Gallery may indeed facilitate viewing by visitors at a closer distance and at a more religious setting with interpretative information, there is no objection to the applicant's proposal provided that the relocation works are properly done. For any proposed modifications to the cross, the applicant should assess the technical feasibility whilst ensuring that the historic fabric of the building is properly preserved.
- (f) Similar to the approved application No. A/H19/82, the following approval condition is suggested for protection of the Maryknoll House should the captioned planning application be approved:  
  
the submission of a revised CMP with detailed arrangement of free guided tours prior to the commencement of any works, and 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.
- (g) Other detailed comments are provided in **Appendix III**.

### **Land Administration**

9.1.2 Comments of the District Lands Officer/Hong Kong West & South, Lands Department (DLO/HKW&S, LandsD):

- (a) RBL 333 is governing by Conditions of Sale No. 3114 ("the Lease") and the Lease contains, inter alia, restrictions of "not more than ten houses", "houses of European Type only" and "Design, disposition and height" clause. There are no restrictions on user, GFA, site coverage and building height under the Lease.

- (b) RBL 333 was carved out into RBL 333 s.A (i.e. Stanley Knoll) and RBL 333 RP (i.e. the Site) by an assignment of RBL 333 s.A dated 17.10.1975 (the Assignment). According to the Assignment, the Vendor and the Purchaser mutually agreed, inter alia, not to erect more than three houses upon RBL 333 RP and not to erect more than seven houses upon RBL 333 s.A without prejudice to their respective rights to apply for lease modification to permit more houses. A lease modification was subsequently executed in 1976 for RBL 333 s.A to remove, inter alia, the houses restriction.
- (c) Special Condition No. 9 (SC(9)) of the lease stipulated that ROW outside RBL 333 to be approved by the then Director of Public Works will be given to the purchaser of RBL 333 and the ROW alignment as shown coloured Brown on the plan No. MH623a was approved under SC(9) of the lease on 14.9.1977. Besides, as stipulated under the Assignment, the Purchaser of RBL 333 s.A should provide the owners and occupiers of RBL 333 RP a full free and uninterrupted ROW within RBL 333 s.A. The Assignment was a private agreement between the owners of RBL 333 s.A and RBL 333 RP and the Government does not have any role in dealing with the disputes of the ROW in RBL 333 s.A.
- (d) As far as the Lease is concerned, development of three houses of European type within the Site would not be considered in breach of lease condition subject to compliance with type of building restriction under the Lease and therefore a modification to implement the proposal is not required. The applicant shall refer to Lands Administration Office Practice Note Issue Nos. 3/2000 and 3/2000A regarding “House” Restrictions under Government Leases promulgated in the webpage of LandsD. She reserves comments on the details and design of the proposed conservation-cum-development project, which will be considered when the lot owner submits building plans for approval under the Lease.

### **Urban Design and Visual**

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

- (a) no objection to the application from visual impact perspectives;
- (b) judging from the photomontages in the SPS and the VIA (Appendix H of **Appendix Ia**), views to the Maryknoll House is preserved. The two proposed eastern and western extensions, and the new residential block at the southern platform are partially visible with lower floors being screened off by vegetation. The overall scale of the proposal in terms of BH and building mass are considered to have respected the heritage features and the adaptive reuse of the historic building of the Maryknoll House are generally in line with the urban design considerations for heritage as stated in Section 6.2 (6) of the Urban Design Guidelines (Chapter 11) of

the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)<sup>4</sup>; and

- (c) according to the VIA, the proposed development would cause negligible to moderately adverse visual impacts when viewed from the nine selected public viewing points (VPs). Eight out of nine of the visual impacts from the selected VPs are rated negligible and slightly adverse. In view of the above, the proposed development is considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments in visual terms.

9.1.4 Comments of the Chief Architect/Advisory & Statutory Compliance, Architectural Services Department (CA/ASC, ArchSD):

- (a) no adverse comment from architectural and visual impact points of view; and
- (b) it is noted that the overall visual impacts of the proposal from different vantage points in the surrounding context would range from negligible to slightly adverse. It appears that the proposed development may not be incompatible with the surrounding environment. However, the applicant may wish to consider the treatment/articulation of the building in the design stage to blend in more harmoniously with the surrounding environment.

**Landscape**

9.1.5 Comments of CTP/UD&L, PlanD:

- (a) based on the aerial photo of 2023, the Site is located in an area of Residential Urban Fringe landscape character surrounded by low to medium residential buildings, school, prison and vegetated slopes. A Grade 1 historic building, the Maryknoll House, is located at the centre of the Site. The proposed development under the current application is considered not incompatible with its surrounding environment;
- (b) according to the updated tree survey carried out on 23.2.2024, the 141 trees approved to be felled under the approved 2021 Scheme had been removed from the Site. Among the 26 existing trees proposed to be retained/transplanted within the Site in the approved 2021 Scheme, 15 trees are proposed to be felled, one tree to be retained and ten trees to be transplanted within the Site under the Current Scheme. Further removal of retained/transplanted trees are due to amendment of building layout and tree health conditions. 156 new heavy standard trees are proposed to be planted within the Site to compensate for the loss of 141 trees approved to be

---

<sup>4</sup> According to Section 6.2(6) of Chapter 11 of the HKPSG, effort should be made to create a suitable setting to make a design response to those heritage features of historic buildings. The re-use should be compatible with the surroundings. Views to the heritage features should be preserved and opened up. Scale, proportions, colour, materials or architectural design of the new development should be compatible with the heritage feature.

felled under the previous Tree Preservation and Removal Proposal based on the 2021 Scheme approved by LandsD on 25.7.2022 and 15 trees proposed to be felled under the current application. The proposed compensatory tree planting ratio is 1:1 by number and 1:0.43 by Diameter Breast Height (DBH), which are the same as the approved 2021 Scheme;

- (c) various landscape treatments such as new tree and shrub planting are proposed along the northern, eastern and western boundaries, the internal access and common areas and among the building elements within the Site. Communal landscaped areas, swimming pools, private gardens and a vertical green wall are also proposed within the Site. 1,721.40m<sup>2</sup> of planting area will be provided within the Site with greenery coverage of approximately 22.52%, which has increased by 103.40m<sup>2</sup> as compared with the approved 2021 Scheme. Communal open space of 308.2m<sup>2</sup> will be provided. Further adverse impact on the existing landscape resources within the Site arising from the proposed development is not anticipated;
- (d) noting the site located on the top of a hill is surrounded by existing vegetation buffer on slope at its south and there is no major public frontage along the site boundary, should the Board approve this application, it is considered not necessary to impose a landscape condition; and
- (e) approval of the application does not imply approval of the greenery coverage requirements under Buildings Department (BD)'s Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-152 and/or under the lease. The greenery coverage calculation should be submitted separately to BD/LandsD for approval. Similarly for any proposed tree preservation/removal scheme, the applicant shall be reminded to approach relevant authority/government department(s) direct to obtain the necessary approval.

### **Traffic**

#### **9.1.6 Comments of Commissioner for Transport (C for T):**

- (a) no adverse comment on the application;
- (b) after reviewing the TIA, it is noted that the junctions are performing within their capacity and the car parking provision is in accordance with the HKPSG requirements; and
- (c) it is noticed that twelve guided tours will be provided per year during non-peak hours. Having reviewed the proposed arrangement of the guided tours, it is considered that it will not create adverse traffic impact to the public road network regardless of the guided tour is arranged monthly, weekly or daily.

**Others**

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

- (a) no in-principle objection to the application;
- (b) detailed comments under the Buildings Ordinance will be given upon formal building plan submission; and
- (c) other detailed comments are provided in **Appendix III**.

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

- (a) no in-principle objection subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of D of FS. Detailed fire safety requirements will be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans; and
- (b) applicant is advised to observe the requirements of emergency vehicular access as stipulated in Section 6, Part D of the Code of Practice for Fire Safety in Buildings 2011 which is administrated by BD.

9.2 The following government departments have no objection to/ no adverse comment on the application:

- (a) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD);
- (b) Head of Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department (H(GEO), CEDD);
- (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 (DEP);
- (g) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services; and
- (h) District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department.

**10. Public Comments Received During Statutory Publication Periods**

10.1 During the statutory publication periods, 202 public comments (**Appendices IVa and IVb**) were received from individuals, with 144 supporting (**Appendix IVa**) and 58 opposing (**Appendix IVb**) the application.

10.2 The major views of the public comments on the application are summarised below:

**Supporting Comments (Appendix IVa)**

- (a) the proposed development would exemplify the conservation and revitalization of heritage buildings through private initiatives, leading to better utilization of land resources;

- (b) increased frequency of public tours and the consolidation of separate exhibition areas into a Heritage Gallery would enhance access to the Maryknoll House and promote its historical significance;
- (c) the proposed changes to the previously approved scheme are considered minor and acceptable;
- (d) the proposed landscaping and design strategies would minimize environmental and visual impacts on the surroundings;
- (e) the proposal successfully balances development and conservation;
- (f) the relocation of the rooftop cross to the Heritage Gallery is deemed appropriate, as it is unrelated to the proposed residential use;

**Opposing Comments (Appendix IVb)**

- (g) the proposed minor relaxation of BH and PR would obstruct public views of the southern façade of Maryknoll House, compromising community interests and the historic character of Maryknoll House;
- (h) the proposed increase in parking spaces from the previously approved scheme would generate additional vehicular traffic, particularly affecting Stanley Village Road, with potential adverse traffic impacts;
- (i) the proposed development would lead to the loss of original trees and other vegetation at the Site, while the provision of open space has been reduced compared to the previous scheme;
- (j) the proposed alteration to the exterior façades would undermine the architectural integrity and historical value of Maryknoll House, and the rooftop cross should be preserved in its original location;
- (k) the proposed development would obstruct views from nearby residential developments and create disturbances due to increased pedestrian flow; and
- (l) the proposed development may result in adverse environmental impacts, such as air and noise pollution, with insufficient mitigation measures proposed.

**11. Planning Considerations and Assessments**

- 11.1 The application seeks planning permission for a preservation-cum-residential development involving in-situ preservation of the Maryknoll House (a Grade 1 historic building), addition of new extensions to the east and west and two new loggias to the south of the Maryknoll House, and 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%) exceed the PR, BH and SC restrictions (i.e. 0.75, 64mPD

and 30%) stipulated on the OZP, minor relaxation of these restrictions is required. Compared to the approved 2021 Scheme, the Current Scheme primarily involves increases in PR from 0.75 to 0.9 (i.e. +0.15 or 20%) and SC from 30% to 36% (i.e. +6% or 20%) to provide more incentives to the applicant for enhancing the public interpretation arrangement, including the setting up of a Heritage Gallery with a larger area (from 44m<sup>2</sup> to 298m<sup>2</sup>) for showcasing the history of the Maryknoll House, its artifact and other conservation elements.

### Heritage Conservation

- 11.2 The proposed adaptive reuse of the Maryknoll House for residential development is in line with the planning intention of the “OU(RDHBP)” zone, which is intended primarily to preserve the historic building of the Maryknoll House in-situ through the preservation-cum-development project. The applicant has submitted an updated CMP that highlights the historical development of the Maryknoll House, identifies the character-defining elements with their respective levels of significance, and outlines the recommended mitigation measures to safeguard the Maryknoll House from the proposed development. Similar to the approved 2021 Scheme, the key architectural features of the Maryknoll House, including the pitched roof with green glazed tiles, red brick elevation, 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 to achieve the adaptive reuse of the historic building. Regarding the partial alterations to the facades for the new extensions and the modification to the southern elevation with the provision of two loggias, CHO and AMO have expressed no adverse comments on these modifications.
- 11.3 Compared to the approved 2021 Scheme, the 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 (**Drawing A-24**); (iii) provision of a new free-standing canopy at the Entrance Porch to provide better weather protection for future residents (**Drawing A-25**); and (iv) installation of a new glazing system at the verandahs on 1/F and 2/F of the main building to provide a more comfortable living environment (**Plan A-13**). CHO and AMO acknowledge the need to alter the Grade 1 historic building to accommodate the proposed residential use, and have expressed no in-principle objection to the proposed development from a heritage conservation perspective. CA/ASC of ArchSD also has no adverse comment on the proposal from an architectural perspective. 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 12.2 below. Additionally, an advisory clause is recommended to remind the applicant to consider the treatment and articulation of the building in the design stage, so that the proposed development will be blended in with the surrounding environment.
- 11.4 To enhance public appreciation of the Maryknoll House, the exhibition areas have been consolidated from the previously separated locations in the recreational facilities on the 1/F of the Chapel Wing and Library Wing under

the approved 2021 Scheme. A designated Heritage Gallery has been established 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>. In addition to the display and exhibition of the Maryknoll House's history, artefacts and conservation elements, advanced visualisation techniques such as VR, AR and mobile applications will be utilised to improve heritage interpretation. The proposed Heritage Gallery and guided tour route will also feature the restored key elements of the Maryknoll House, including stained glass panels, patterned mosaic floor tiles, and floor tiles with religious emblem, and columns and vaulted ceiling currently within the Chapel Wing. The applicant believes that the expanded Heritage Gallery will offer more flexibility for arranging and organising heritage interpretation programmes. Additionally, the applicant is committed to arranging free guided tours for the public twelve times per year, which is more frequent than the half-yearly tours proposed under the previous s.12A application and the eight times per year in the approved 2021 Scheme. This balances the opportunities for public appreciation of heritage conservation and the maintenance of privacy for future residents of the Maryknoll House and its neighbourhood. CHO and AMO have expressed appreciation for the applicant's efforts in increasing the frequency of guided tour and enhancing the tour experience. The requirement on provision of free guided tours with detailed arrangement is included in the proposed approval condition set out in paragraph 12.2.

#### Development Intensity, BH and SC

- 11.5 The surrounding areas comprise predominantly low- to medium-density residential developments interspersed with densely vegetated hillslopes, government, institution and community facilities, as well as some commercial developments. 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, given that the Site is surrounded by several "R(C)" sites which have 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 which has a PR of 1.65 and a BH of 84mPD to the west across Carmel Road (**Plan A-12**).
- 11.6 Although no specific design merits have been proposed for the proposed increase in GFA under the Current Scheme, the resultant PR is compatible to the PRs of the surrounding residential developments as mentioned in paragraph 11.5. The proposed new western extension of the Maryknoll House with a BH of 67.7mPD, although exceeding the BH restriction of 64mPD, is considered acceptable as the additional height is barely distinguishable (**Drawing A-23**). As demonstrated in the photomontages submitted by the applicant (**Drawings A-31 to A-35**), the increase in BH would still maintain the two stepped BHs and would not lead to the blocking of public views of the main façades of the Maryknoll House from the public viewpoints at Blake Pier, Stanley Plaza and Stanley Ma Hang Park. CHO and AMO consider that the public could continue to appreciate the western and southern façades of the Maryknoll House. CTP/UD&L of PlanD advises that the overall scale of the proposal in terms of BH and building mass is considered to have respected the heritage feature, and is not incompatible with the surrounding developments in visual terms. CA/ASC of ArchSD also has no adverse comment on the proposal from visual perspective.

- 11.7 Various landscape treatments, such as new tree and shrub planting, are proposed by the applicant along the northern, eastern and western boundaries, the internal access and common areas, and among the building elements within the Site to mitigate the potential visual and landscape impact arising from the proposed minor relaxation of development restrictions (**Drawing A-30**). Communal landscape areas, private gardens and a vertical green wall are also proposed within the Site (**Drawing A-30**). The applicant has provided about 1,721.40m<sup>2</sup> of planting area within the Site, with a greenery coverage of approximately 22.52%, which represents an increase of 103.40m<sup>2</sup> compared to the approved 2021 Scheme. CTP/UD&L of PlanD advises that adverse impact on the existing landscape resources within the Site arising from the proposed development is not anticipated.

#### Technical Considerations

- 11.8 Various technical assessments submitted by the applicant have demonstrated that the proposed residential development would not induce adverse impacts on the surrounding environment from road traffic noise, waste management, traffic, water supplies, drainage, sewerage, and geotechnical aspects. Relevant departments, including DEP, C for T, CE/C of WSD, CE/HK&I of DSD and H(GEO) of CEDD, have no adverse comment on or no objection to the application.

#### Public Comments

- 11.9 Regarding the adverse public comments received during the publication period, the planning assessment in paragraphs 11.2 to 11.8 above and departmental comments in paragraph 9 above are relevant.

### **12. Planning Department's Views**

- 12.1 Based on the assessment made in paragraph 11 above and having taken into account the public comments mentioned in paragraph 10, PlanD has no objection to the application.
- 12.2 Should the Committee decide to approve the application, it is suggested that the permission shall be valid until 28.3.2029, 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 arrangement of free guided tours prior to the commencement of any works, and 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**.

12.3 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.

### **13. Decision Sought**

- 13.1 The Committee is invited to consider the application and decide whether to grant or refuse to grant permission.
- 13.2 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.
- 13.3 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.

### **Attachments**

<b>Appendix I</b>	Application Form received on 13.9.2024
<b>Appendix Ia</b>	Consolidated Report received on 20.3.2025
<b>Appendix II</b>	Previous Applications covering the Site
<b>Appendix III</b>	Detailed Departmental Comments
<b>Appendices IVa and IVb</b>	Public Comments
<b>Appendix V</b>	Recommended Advisory Clauses
<b>Drawings A-1 to A-9</b>	Layout Plans
<b>Drawings A-10 and A-11</b>	Section Plans
<b>Drawings A-12 to A-22</b>	Comparison of the Approved 2021 Scheme and Current Scheme
<b>Drawings A-23 to A-28</b>	Proposed Building Alterations
<b>Drawing A-29</b>	Proposed Route of Guided Tour
<b>Drawing A-30</b>	Landscape Master Plan
<b>Drawings A-31 to A-35</b>	Photomontages
<b>Plan A-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan A-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan A-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans A-4 to A-11</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan A-12</b>	Plot Ratio and Building Heights of Nearby Existing/ Planned Residential Developments
<b>Plan A-13</b>	Proposed Glazing System by Applicant

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
MARCH 2025**