

## **TOWN PLANNING BOARD**

### **Minutes of 761<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the Metro Planning Committee held at 11:25 a.m. on 14.3.2025**

#### **Present**

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

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 Bond C.P. Chow

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**

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Melissa C.H. Kwan

**Agenda Item 1**

Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 760<sup>th</sup> MPC Meeting held on 28.2.2025

[Open Meeting]

1. The draft minutes of the 760<sup>th</sup> MPC meeting held on 28.2.2025 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

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

## **Deferral Cases**

### Section 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, Members' declaration of interests for the cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 1**.

#### 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.

## **Cases for Streamlining Arrangement**

### Section 16 Applications

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Committee noted that there were two cases selected for streamlining arrangement and the Planning Department had no objection to the applications. Details of the planning applications, Member's declaration of interests for the cases and the Committee's views on the declared interests were in **Annex 2**.

#### Deliberation Session

6. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications on the terms of the applications as submitted to the Town Planning Board subject to the approval conditions stated in the Papers. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicants to note the advisory clauses as set out in the appendix of the Papers.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

[Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK) and Ms Jacqueline Y.H. Chan, Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 3**

**Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

A/TWW/129            Proposed Social Welfare Facility and Training Centre with Permitted Flat, and Proposed Minor Relaxation of Plot Ratio and Site Coverage Restrictions in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, Lot 94 in D.D. 388 and Adjoining Government Land, Castle Peak Road – Tsing Lung Tau, Tsuen Wan  
(MPC Paper No. A/TWW/129A)

---

7.            The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. Dr Tony C.M. Ip had declared an interest on the item for having current business dealings with AECOM. As Dr Tony C.M. Ip had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

8.            With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) did not support the application.

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

- (a) with the Government’s policy initiative of ‘single site, multiple use’ and anticipated demand for residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) development due to the aging population in Hong Kong, what land

administration-related policies were in place for developers intending to pursue such a development;

- (b) whether the concern on the building bulk of the proposed development could be resolved if the development intensity was reduced by the applicant; and
- (c) according to the Air Ventilation Assessment – Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) submitted by the applicant, whether the proposed development would result in wind blockage and induce adverse impact on the surrounding wind environment.

10. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Michael K.K. Cheung, STP/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development was generally in line with the Government's policy initiative of 'single site, multiple use'. Should policy support from the Social Welfare Department (SWD) be obtained, the Lands Department (LandsD) might exempt eligible RCHE premises with a cap of no more than 12,000m<sup>2</sup> in total gross floor area from payment of land premium in land transactions for new private development in accordance with the Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE Premises in New Private Developments – Time Limited Enhancements (the Incentive Scheme) (Land Administrative Office Practice Note Issue No. 5/2023);
- (b) each application for minor relaxation of development restrictions should be considered on its individual merits. As the development intensity of the proposed development was considered excessive and there were insufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and site coverage (SC) restrictions, the current application was recommended to be rejected. Should the applicant submit a revised proposal with reduced development intensity and enhanced planning and design merits, PlanD would assess the application, taking into account its compatibility with the surrounding environment, among others; and

- (c) the AVA-EE submitted by the application demonstrated that with the implementation of mitigation measures, such as building setbacks, L-shaped building block design above 9/F and permeable opening at the western portion of G/F, the proposed development would unlikely induce significant adverse impact on the surrounding wind environment. The prevailing wind from the sea on the south and southeast would flow over/through the proposed development towards the inland area.

### Deliberation Session

11. The Chairperson recapitulated that PlanD recommended rejecting the application on the grounds of the excessive extent of minor relaxation of PR and SC restrictions from 2.1 to 5.73 (i.e. +173%) and from 17.5% to not exceeding 95% (i.e. up to +443%) and insufficient planning and design merits to justify such relaxation.

12. Some Members opined that the development intensity of the proposed development was incompatible with the surrounding medium-rise and medium-density residential developments. The extent of the proposed relaxation of PR and SC restrictions was considered excessive and inappropriate to be pursued under a section 16 application for minor relaxation. Instead, a section 12A application for rezoning the application site (the Site) to a suitable zone with appropriate development restrictions would be more appropriate to facilitate the proposed development. Approving of the current application could set an undesirable precedent for similar applications.

13. The Vice-chairperson expressed that while ‘single site, multiple use’ development projects by private developers should be encouraged, the development intensity of the proposed development was excessive. Besides, there was a need for a more comprehensive review on how such proposals could help address the long-term development needs in Hong Kong, especially for government, institution and community facilities.

14. Members generally considered that the application should be rejected. The Chairperson remarked that the ‘single site, multiple use’ model with a commensurate development scale initiated by a private developer was welcomed to optimise the



development potential of the Site. Provision of RCHE premises in new private developments could be pursued under the Incentive Scheme, and the relevant concession on land premium would be subject to policy support from SWD. The applicant might revise the proposal by reducing the development intensity and liaise with relevant government departments on the design and implementation of the proposed RCHE, if considered appropriate.

15. After deliberation, the Committee decided to reject the application. The reasons were:

- “(a) the proposed relaxation of plot ratio (PR) and site coverage (SC) restrictions from PR of 2.1 to 5.73 (i.e. +173%) and SC of 17.5% to not exceeding 95% (i.e. up to +443%) cannot be regarded as minor; and
- (b) there are insufficient planning and design merits to justify the proposed relaxation of PR and SC restrictions.”

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

## **Kowloon District**

[Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au and Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Ms Jenny W.C. Lai and Ms Helen K.W. Ip, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

### **Agenda Item 6**

#### **Section 16 Application**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K10/276                      Proposed Social Welfare Facility (Residential Care Home for the Elderly) in “Residential (Group B)” Zone, 349 Prince Edward Road West, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K10/276A)

---

#### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

16.            With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed 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.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

17.            Members had no question on the application.

#### **Deliberation Session**

18.            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 14.3.2029, 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.

**Agenda Items 9 to 11**

**Section 16 Applications**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K22/39 School (Tutorial School) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” Zone, Shop M3-201, Level 2, Kai Tak Mall 3, Kai Tak Sports Park, Kowloon City, Kowloon

A/K22/40 Proposed School (Tutorial School) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” Zone, Shop M3-101a, Level 1, Kai Tak Mall 3, Kai Tak Sports Park, Kowloon City, Kowloon

A/K22/41 School (Tutorial School) in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” Zone, Shop M3-302, Level 3, Kai Tak Mall 3, Kai Tak Sports Park, Kowloon City, Kowloon  
(MPC Paper No. A/K22/39 to 41)

---

19. The Committee agreed that as the three s.16 applications were for the same use at different premises within the same building, they could be considered together.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Helen K.W. Ip, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the applications, the applied/proposed uses, departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the applications.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan left the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

21. Noting that the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) was designated as Hong Kong’s integrated sports, culture and entertainment landmark, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether

only sports-related hobby courses should be provided on the application premises. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, said that the current applications were for tutorial schools offering various hobby courses. Should the applications be approved, there would be flexibility for the applicants to determine the types of courses provided, which might be related to academic subjects and/or sports and hobbies. A Member observed that only one of the three applications, i.e. Application No. A/K22/39 included sports-related hobby courses, such as skipping, yoga and kick boxing, and pointed out that including sport-related hobby courses should not be a primary consideration for those applications.

### Deliberation Session

22. The Chairperson remarked that the KTSP, serving as a landmark for sports, culture and entertainment, comprised about 60,500m<sup>2</sup> floor area for retail, catering, as well as leisure and entertainment facilities. The current applications with floor areas of about 564m<sup>2</sup> in total at Kai Tak Mall 3, which formed part of the KTSP, intended to provide courses on academic subjects, sports and/or hobbies. Should the applications be approved, there would be no specific restrictions on the types of courses offered, allowing flexibility for the applicants to respond to the changing market needs. The Vice-chairperson opined that if the types of courses to be provided by the tutorial schools were not a primary consideration for the applications, the details of the courses should not be taken into account as one of the justifications for approving the applications.

23. A Member enquired about the positioning of the KTSP and factors affecting its operation and tenancy mixture. The Committee noted that Kai Tak Sports Park Limited, which primarily managed the operation and tenancy of the KTSP, was supervised and monitored by the Culture, Sports and Tourism Bureau (CSTB). The KTSP fell within an area zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Stadium” (“OU(Stadium)”), which was primarily intended for provision of a multi-purpose stadium complex including a main stadium, a secondary stadium, an indoor sports arena and other ancillary leisure and recreational facilities. While ‘school’ was a Column 2 use requiring planning permission from the Town Planning Board, uses such as place of recreation, sports or cultures, eating place and shop and services, were Column 1 uses that were always permitted. There were three retail malls within the KTSP providing a one-stop sports, leisure, catering and shopping

experience for citizens, tourists, and the local community. From policy perspective, CSTB considered that the applied/proposed schools were small in scale and not incompatible with other uses within the same building.

24. Noting from the site photos shown in Plans A-3 to A-5 of the Paper that the two application premises under applications No. A/K22/39 and A/K22/41 had already been well-furnished and were in operation as tutorial schools, a Member pointed out that planning permission should be obtained before commencement of the operation. Moreover, the Member queried whether the tutorial schools should be regarded as 'Educational Institutions'. The Committee noted that relevant advisory clause was incorporated to remind the applicants that prior planning permissions should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application premises. Besides, tutorial school was regarded as 'School' but not 'Educational Institution' according to the Definition of Terms Used in Statutory Plans.

25. In response to the Vice-chairperson and a Member's concern about the potential cumulative effects of similar applications on the positioning and operation of the KTSP in the future, the Chairperson explained that each application should be considered on its individual merits. CSTB and other relevant government departments would be consulted to ensure that the applied/proposed use would not adversely affect the operation of the KTSP and would not contravene the planning intention of the "OU(Stadium)" zone. CSTB was closely monitoring the operation of the KTSP to ensure that the integrity and character of the area were maintained while accommodating the needs of the community. A Member opined that the applied/proposed schools in Kai Tak Mall 3 could serve as ancillary facilities supporting various users within the KTSP and helping to maintain its smooth operation.

26. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the applications, considering that the application premises were small in scale and compatible with other uses within the same building.

27. After deliberation, the Committee decided to approve the applications. For Applications No. A/K22/39 and A/K22/41, no time clause for the commencement of the development was proposed as the 'School (Tutorial School)' use was already in operation. For Application No. A/K22/40, the permission should be valid until 14.3.2029, 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 Committee also agreed to advise the applicants of Applications No. A/K22/39 and A/K22/41 to note the advisory clause as set out in the Paper.

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

**Agenda Item 12**

**Any Other Business**

[Open Meeting]

28. This was the last Metro Planning Committee meeting chaired by Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, before his retirement. On behalf of all Members, the Vice-chairperson extended a vote of thanks to Mr Chung for his contributions to the Committee over the years and wished him a happy and healthy retirement. Mr Chung thanked Members for their support and dedication to the Committee's work.

29. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:30 p.m.

**Minutes of 761<sup>st</sup> Metro Planning Committee  
(held on 14.3.2025)**

**Deferral Cases**

Requests for Deferment by Applicant for 2 Months

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.*</b>	<b>Times of Deferment</b>
4	A/KC/509	1 <sup>st</sup>
7	A/K11/246	1 <sup>st</sup>

**Declaration of Interests**

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Members' Declared Interests</b>	
4	The application site was located in Kwai Chung.	- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi for being a supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung -
7	The application premises were located in San Po Kong.	- Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity

The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan was considered direct, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Item 7.

\* Refer to the agenda at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/761\\_mpc\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/761_mpc_agenda.html) for details of the planning applications.

**Minutes of 761<sup>st</sup> Metro Planning Committee  
(held on 14.3.2025)**

**Cases for Streamlining Arrangement**

Applications approved on a permanent basis

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Planning Application</b>
5	A/K5/873	Proposed Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business (1)” Zone, Unit 6, G/F, 676 Castle Peak Road, Cheung Sha Wan, Kowloon
8	A/K14/834	Shop and Services in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” Zone, Unit 6 (Part), G/F, 1 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

**Declaration of Interests**

The Committee noted the following declaration of interests:

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Member’s Declared Interests</b>	
5	The application premises were located in Cheung Sha Wan.	- Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity
8	The application premises were located in Kwun Tong.	- Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan for being an independent non-executive director of a company with rental premises for shop use in the vicinity

As the interests of Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan were considered direct, the Committee agreed that she could stay in the meeting but should refrain from participating in the discussion for Items 5 and 8.