

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

Minutes of 756th Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 20.12.2024

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Assistant Commissioner/Urban,
Transport Department
Mr B.K. Chow

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South),
Environmental Protection Department
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Tommy T.W. Wong

Agenda Item 1

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 755th MPC Meeting held on 6.12.2024

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 755th MPC meeting held on 6.12.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

Deferral Cases

Sections 12A and 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Committee noted that there were two cases requesting the Town Planning Board to defer consideration of the applications. Details of the requests for deferral were in **Annex**.

Deliberation Session

4. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer decisions on the applications as requested by the applicants pending submission of further information, as recommended in the Papers.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K1/28
(MPC Paper No. 5/24)

5. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the Tsim Sha Tsui (TST) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved relaxing the building height restriction (BHR) of the main campus of Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) (the Site) to facilitate its future development/redevelopment (Amendment Item A). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Professor Roger C.K. Chan - being the Professor and Divisional Head, College of Professional and Continuing Education, PolyU;
and

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse's company owning properties in TST.

6. The Committee noted that Professor Roger C.K. Chan had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the properties owned by the company of Mr Stanley T.S. Choi's spouse had no direct view of the amendment item, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)

Mr Kervis W.C. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)

Ms Niki Y.C. Wong - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)

8. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, briefly introduced the background of Amendment Item A with the following main points:

- (a) the Site covering the PolyU Hung Hom campus had been zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) since 1960s;
- (b) the BHRs were imposed on various zones on the TST OZP in 2008. A BHR of 45mPD was imposed on the “G/IC” zone covering the Site to reflect the general building heights (BH) of the existing buildings at that time;
- (c) since the imposition of BHR in 2008, there had been a substantial increase in the floor area demand for education and research purposes at PolyU. To partially meet such demand, three applications for planning permission had been submitted by PolyU for minor relaxation of BHR for redevelopment of individual buildings within the Site, which were all approved (three previously approved applications) by the Committee; and
- (d) to better utilise the scarce land resources within the Site, which was zoned “G/IC”, PolyU proposed to relax the BHR from 45 mPD to 90mPD. The proposal had obtained policy support from the Secretary for Education (SED) and was supported by various technical assessments. After consultation with relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), Amendment Item A, together with other proposed amendments to the Notes of the OZP, was submitted for the Committee’s consideration.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD’s introduction.]

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Niki Y.C. Wong, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the details of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. Apart from Amendment Item A, other proposed amendments included revisions to the Notes of the OZP to provide flexibility for provision of supporting/ancillary uses within piers and/or ferry terminals.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Messrs Paul Y.K. Au and Ricky W.Y. Yu joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

10. As the presentation of PlanD's representatives was completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

11. Noting that the Amendment Item A involved relaxation of BHR of the Site, Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu informed the Committee that he was an alumnus of PolyU and a consultant of a Faculty of PolyU. The Committee noted that Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had not participated in the redevelopment project, and as the interests were considered indirect, he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

12. Mr Stanley T.S. Choi declared an interest on the item that his parent owned a property in TST which had direct view of the Site. The Committee noted Mr Choi's interest and agreed that he should refrain from participating in the discussion of the item.

Long-term Development Plan of PolyU

13. Noting that the proposed relaxation of BHR aimed at meeting the existing and future demand for floor area up to 2030, a Member enquired if PolyU had any long-term plan to cater for additional demand for floor area in the coming 20 to 30 years, and whether the proposed relaxation of BHR to 90mPD could cater for such long-term demand for floor area. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that the proposed relaxation of BHR could allow an additional 150,000m² gross floor area (GFA), of which 130,000m² was needed to meet an existing GFA deficit for accommodation of the existing 31,500 students and staff. An additional 15% of GFA (i.e. 20,000m²) was required to accommodate the future demand arising from the forecasted rise of about 10% in the number of students and staff by 2030 as

well as the need for additional floor space for education and research purposes. The proposed BHR of 90mPD was considered adequate to meet the future demand for floor area up to 2030 according to PolyU. Should there be any further demand for floor space in the future resulting in development proposal with BH over 90mPD, PolyU could seek planning permission from the Committee for minor relaxation of BHR. Each application would be considered based on individual merits by the Committee. As for the long-term development/redevelopment plan and programme within the Site, no information had been provided by PolyU apart from the three previously approved applications and the potential redevelopment of the House of Innovation, which remained at a preliminary design stage.

14. Noting that over 80 hectares of land had been reserved in the Northern Metropolis for the “Northern Metropolis University Town” (NMUT), a Member asked if PolyU had applied for land allocation in NMUT and if there was any urgent need for the proposed relaxation of BHR for development/redevelopment within the Site. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that while PolyU had expressed interest in campus expansion in NMUT for new curricula, development/redevelopment of suitable buildings within the Site with the proposed relaxation of BHR was still necessary to meet the existing and future demand for floor space. According to PlanD’s estimation, redevelopment of the existing buildings with the same site coverage in the high zone as shown on Drawing 5 of the Paper up to the existing BHR (i.e. 45mPD) could only provide a total GFA of about 40,000m², falling short in fulfilling the existing GFA deficit of 130,000m². The proposed relaxation of BHR from 45mPD to 90mPD could better utilise scarce land resources already available in the urban area while providing additional floor area for campus expansion. The Chairperson supplemented that the proposed BHR of 90mPD could also allow design flexibility for development/redevelopment of the campus.

15. The Vice-chairperson enquired whether capacity creation approach should be adopted to relax BHR of the Site beyond 90mPD to allow more space for PolyU’s future development, or if the consideration should be based on the current and future demand while taking into account the local character of the area. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the proposed BHR of the Site had struck a balance between visual compatibility with surrounding developments and optimisation of land utilisation. TST was recognised as a high-rise node in the Urban Design Guidelines of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. While

development of relatively high-rise buildings at appropriate locations was allowed, the BH profile of the area was generally stepping down from the inland area towards the harbour, with BHRs of 130mPD to 110mPD for the TST central commercial area located to the southwest of the Site, 80mPD/100mPD for the adjoining Hung Hom area to the northeast, and 95mPD (inland area) to 80mPD (waterfront area) for the TST East commercial area to the south. As the BHR of 90mPD as proposed by PolyU could meet their development needs and was comparable with the BHR of 95mPD for the adjoining inland portion of TST East commercial area, it was considered that the proposed BHR could unleash the development potential of the Site while respecting the BH profile of the area. To avoid excessive/incompatible BH of future development, planning application for minor relaxation of BHR for development/redevelopment exceeding 90mPD should be submitted to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for consideration.

Plot Ratio (PR) Control

16. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) if there was any PR restriction for the Site; and
- (b) if there was any mechanism to control the PR of the Site upon relaxation of BHR, as the proposed BHR of 90mPD could accommodate the floor area of a redevelopment up to PR 15 as permitted under the Building (Planning) Regulations.

17. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) in general, no PR restriction would be imposed on a “G/IC” zone so as to allow greater design flexibility to optimise the development potential of the site; and
- (b) the total PR of the existing main campus at the Site was about 3.4. With the addition of 150,000m² GFA under the proposed relaxation of BHR, the total PR would be increased to about 5. Although there was no PR or GFA restriction, the proposed BHR of 90mPD could keep the future

development/redevelopment to a more compatible scale in terms of BH. Furthermore, as PolyU was a funded university under the University Grants Committee (UGC), the additional GFA for any future development/redevelopment project would be subject to scrutiny by the UGC and relevant B/Ds under the established mechanism, including the need for technical assessments. There was also a dedicated committee in PolyU responsible for reviewing and approving matters related to campus development.

Traffic Impact

18. Noting that there would be an increase of 10% in the number of students and staff upon relaxation of BHR, a Member asked for the details of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) and whether the proposed relaxation of BHR would result in any adverse traffic impact. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that according to the TIA, majority of the commuting trips of the additional students and staff would be made via public transport with reference to the existing pattern. Based on this assumption, it was assumed that there would be an increase of 5 to 15 passenger car units per hour during the morning and evening peak hours, which would have minimal impact on the existing road network. The existing provision of car parking spaces within the Site could adequately cope with the future increase in parking demand. In terms of public transport, the Site was situated next to the MTR Hung Hom Station. With the commission of new railways (i.e. Tuen Ma Line and East Rail Line Cross-Harbour Extension), the capacity of the railway network had been substantially expanded. Furthermore, as students had different class schedules, the commuting trips would be scattered at various periods of time rather than concentrating in peak hours, which would further minimise the impact on the existing public transport facilities.

Interface with Other Proposals

19. A Member enquired if there was any information on the redevelopment of the MTR Hung Hom Station and its surrounding area (HHS Redevelopment), noting that the BH(s) of the HHS Redevelopment could be considered when evaluating the proposed BHR at the Site. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that as announced in the 2023 Policy Address (PA), MTR Corporation Limited had been invited to conduct a preliminary

study (the preliminary study) to re-plan the Hung Hom Station and its surrounding area, including the waterfront and pier sites to the south of the Hong Kong Coliseum. Findings of the preliminary study were not yet available.

20. A Member asked if the proposed green deck over the Cross Harbour Tunnel Toll Plaza, which would connect to PolyU with the Hung Hom Station, would be pursued. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that the green deck proposal was initiated by PolyU and would be taken into account in the above-mentioned preliminary study.

Public Access to the Site

21. Noting that an audit report was released in 2024 which raised concerns about the public access to the Site and having considered that PolyU was situated next to various public transport facilities, a Member enquired whether the current arrangements for public access to the campus would be reviewed, allowing public access to the campus and upon its redevelopment, and whether the technical assessments were conducted on the premise that the existing arrangement of limited public access to the Site would be maintained. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that there was no information on the future arrangement of public access to the Site in the planning report and technical assessments submitted by PolyU. Similar concerns were raised by members of the Yau Tsim Mong District Council during the consultation on the proposed OZP amendments, in which representatives of PolyU indicated that the current public access arrangement could accommodate the growing number of students and staff, allowing them to enjoy the space and facilities without overloading the capacity of the densely developed campus; and that members of the public could gain access to the Site through completing simple registration procedures.

Proposed Revisions to the Notes of OZP for Piers and Ferry Terminal

22. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the rationale for the proposed revisions of the Notes to include 'Shop and Services' and 'Eating Place' uses as Column 1 uses for various piers and/or ferry terminal, considering that the primary function of piers/ferry terminal

should be for transportation instead of for commercial uses; and

- (b) if such amendment would be applied to other piers and/or ferry terminal(s) to provide flexibility for the provision of ancillary/supporting facilities.

23. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed amendments involved three piers on the OZP, namely the Hong Kong China Ferry Terminal (the Terminal), the Star Ferry Pier and the Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7, which were zoned “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Ferry Terminal”, “OU” annotated “Kowloon Point Piers” and “OU” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) respectively. The former two were government properties. The proposed revisions to include ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses under Column 1 uses of the Notes could provide flexibility for the provision of ancillary/supporting uses within the Terminal and the Star Ferry Pier, enhancing the convenience of the ferry passengers/visitors. Providing ferry services to the public would remain as the main uses of the concerned ferry terminal and pier. Since the Terminal and Star Ferry Pier were government properties, any commercial uses within these premises would require approval by the relevant B/Ds under the established mechanism. Regarding the Kowloon Permanent Pier No. 7, ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses were Column 2 uses and the current Remarks of the Notes for the “OU(Pier)” zone stipulated that kiosks not greater than 10m² each in area and not more than 10 in number for uses as retail shop and services trades were considered as ancillary to pier use. To provide flexibility for provision of ancillary uses within the “OU(Pier)” zone, it was proposed to revise the concerned Remark so that provision of kiosks or premises for ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ uses ancillary to pier use not in excess of a maximum total non-domestic GFA of 100m² could be allowed; and
- (b) similar amendments had been incorporated into other piers covered by the Discovery Bay and Tsuen Wan OZPs. Such amendments would be incorporated into piers on other OZPs where appropriate and when

opportunities arose.

24. The Chairperson recapitulated that should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments to the approved OZP, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Board for consideration.

25. While Members generally had no objection to Amendment Item A as it could provide flexibility for the future development/redevelopment of PolyU with increased floor area to meet the educational and research needs, some Members expressed concerns that the Government should consider and address the development/redevelopment needs of universities, taking into account the overall development of Hong Kong. There was insufficient information from PolyU such as details on the long-term development/redevelopment plan, buildings/facilities within the campus to be redeveloped, implementation programme as well as the interface with the HHS Redevelopment. A Member opined that either the Notes or the Explanatory Statement of the OZP should state that the BHR of 90mPD was to allow the additional GFA of about 150,000m² to cater for PolyU's campus expansion.

26. A Member indicated support for the proposed revisions to the Notes to provide flexibility for provision of ancillary/supporting uses in the piers and ferry terminal, as the existing monitoring mechanism for commercial uses within piers and ferry terminal by B/Ds could strike a balance between allowing flexibility for supporting uses and maintaining the key function of piers and/or ferry terminal for public transport.

27. The Chairperson explained that the 2023 PA set out initiatives to develop Hong Kong into an international hub for post-secondary education, which had been reaffirmed in the 2024 PA. The SED had granted policy support for the current PolyU's proposal from the perspective of higher education development. The proposed BHR of 90mPD could create capacity for additional floor area for PolyU, addressing both the current and future development needs while respecting the local context and surrounding environment. Whilst there were other policy initiatives aimed at promoting the development of post-secondary education such as the NUMT, the Education Bureau was currently formulating the NUMT Development Conceptual Framework, which was tentatively scheduled for announcement in

the first half of 2026. Should there be any university development/redevelopment project requiring a higher BH exceeding the statutory restriction, an application for planning permission for minor relaxation of BHR could be submitted to the Board for consideration and each application assessed on its individual merits. As a general practice, the scale of development within “G/IC” zone was regulated by the imposition of BHR under the Notes of the OZP. In response to Members’ concerns, the Chairperson proposed and the Committee agreed to revise the Explanatory Statement to include that the BHR of 90mPD was intended to allow an additional GFA of 150,000m² to cater for PolyU’s campus expansion which had obtained policy support and had been demonstrated to be feasible by relevant technical assessments. PolyU should take into account Members’ views and suggestions, as appropriate, in its future work to take forward the redevelopment at the Site.

28. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Tsim Sha Tsui Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K1/28 and that the draft Tsim Sha Tsui OZP No. S/K1/28A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered as S/K1/29 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for public exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Tsim Sha Tsui OZP No. S/K1/28A (to be renumbered as S/K1/29), after incorporating the proposed revision set out in paragraph 27 above, as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

29. Members noted that as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES (including incorporating that the BHR of 90mPD was to allow an additional GFA of about 150,000m² as mentioned in paragraph 27 above), if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

[Post-meeting note: The statement “The maximum building height restriction for the Hong Kong Polytechnic University’s main campus at Yuk Choi Road is 90mPD. This is intended to allow an additional GFA of about 150,000m² to cater for its campus expansion which has obtained policy support and has been demonstrated to be feasible by relevant technical assessments.” was added to paragraph 8.5.6 of the ES of the OZP.]

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

[Messrs Michael K.K. Cheung and Matthew H.H. Law, Senior Town Planners/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STPs/TWK), and Mr H.Y. Wong, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/130 Submission of Layout Plan for Permitted ‘Flat’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ Uses in “Residential (Group B) 2” Zone, Tsuen Wan Inland Lot 5 and Lot 429 in D.D. 399, Ting Kau, Tsuen Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/130A)

30. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Levenson Limited which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Dr Tony C.M. Ip declared interests on this item for his firm currently working with SHK on ongoing projects and having current business dealings with AECOM.

31. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip’s interest in relation to SHK was considered direct, the Committee agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting temporary at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed development, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department had no objection to the application.

Submission of Layout Plan (LP)

33. A Member enquired about the reason for incorporating the requirement for submission of LP in the “Residential (Group B) 2” zone. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, explained that during consideration of the proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan West OZP on 25.11.2022 to reflect the agreed section 12A application (No. Y/TWW/7) (the s.12A application) for the application site (the Site), the Committee agreed to include the requirement for submission of an LP to demonstrate that the potential air quality and road traffic noise impacts and the respective mitigation measures could be identified and implemented through the section 16 (s.16) planning application mechanism so as to ensure an acceptable living environment for the future residents, taking into account the comments of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and that the Site was held under virtually unrestricted lease.

Provision and Design of Social Welfare Facilities

34. The Vice-chairperson and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any difference in the provision of social welfare facilities between the s.12A application and the current s.16 application (the current application) and whether residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) was proposed in the s.12A application; and
- (b) whether there was any improvement in the access arrangement of the day care centre for the elderly (DE) under the current application when compared to the s. 12A application.

35. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the DE had been proposed by the applicant under the s.12A application and was retained in the current application, with an improved design in terms of internal layout and provision of open space for the DE users. No RCHE had been proposed under the s.12A application; and
- (b) under the current application, the DE would be located at street level on one floor with direct access from the Site entrance. Moreover, there would be dedicated car parking and loading/unloading spaces outside the DE for exclusive pick-up/drop-off, which would be separated from the residential portion of the proposed development.

Public Comment

36. A Member enquired about the reference to ‘the landmark with historical and cultural value’ in the objecting views. In response, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, said that this referred to the existing hotel, namely Royal View Hotel.

Deliberation Session

37. The Chairperson recapitulated that the s.12A application was for rezoning the Site for a proposed private residential development with the provision of social welfare facilities through wholesale conversion of the existing hotel development while the current application was for proposed redevelopment of the existing hotel with an enhanced design in the layout of the proposed development and the DE. The requirement for the submission of an LP was incorporated during the consideration of the proposed amendments to the Tsuen Wan West OZP by the Committee, taking into account the advice from DEP to address potential air quality and road traffic noise impacts. DEP had no objection to the current application subject to incorporation of relevant approval conditions. The Chairperson then invited Members’ views on the application.

38. Some Members expressed support or no objection to the current application as the provision of a DE with an enhanced design compared to the s.12A application could address the need for social welfare facilities in the district. In addition, the proposed private housing development was in response to the changing market demand for hotel development.

39. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board. The permission should be valid until 20.12.2028, and after the said date, the permission should cease to have effect unless before the said date, the development permitted was commenced or the permission was renewed. The permission was subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/K5/869 Columbarium in “Government, Institution or Community (1)” and “Green Belt” Zones, G/F, Sheung Tsang Hall and Chap Tak Hall, Hong Kong & Kowloon Fuk Tak Buddhist Association Limited, Ching Cheung Road, Sham Shui Po, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K5/869)

Presentation and Question Sessions

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr H.Y. Wong, TP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the applied use, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.

41. Members had no question on the application.

Deliberation Session

42. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the application, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the approval conditions stated in the Paper. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Paper.

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

Agenda Item 8

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

43. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:45 a.m.

**Minutes of 756th Metro Planning Committee
(held on 20.12.2024)**

Annex

Deferral Cases

(a) Request for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

Item No.	Application No. *	Times of Deferment
6	A/TWW/131	1 st

(b) Request for Deferment by Applicant for 1 Month

Item No.	Application No. *	Times of Deferment
3	Y/H5/8	1 st

* Refer to the agenda at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/756_mpc_agenda.html for details of the planning applications.