

**Minutes of 1349<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 14.11.2025**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong  
Transport Department  
Mr Horace W. Hong (a.m.)

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West  
Transport Department  
Ms Vilian W.L. Sum (p.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands  
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning  
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Katy C.W. Fung (a.m.)  
Ms Anny P.K. Tang (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Joan S.Y. So (a.m.)  
Ms Tracy C.Y. Wong (p.m.)

## Hong Kong District

### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan  
No. S/H5/32

(TPB Paper No. 11026)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H5/32 (the draft OZP) involved the rezoning of two sites at St. Francis Street/Sau Wa Fong (Item A) and at Ship Street/Schooner Street (Item B1) in Wan Chai for private residential developments. Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had declared an interest on the item as he and his spouse owned properties in Wan Chai. As the properties owned by Mr Wong and his spouse had no direct view of the amendment item sites, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

5. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representatives and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

## PlanD

Ms Janet K.K. Cheung - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong

(DPO/HK)

Mr Tony K.Y. Yip - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong

(STP/HK)

Mr Boris J.T. Lai - Town Planner/Hong Kong

### **Representers and Representers' Representatives**

#### R1 – Great Kinetic Limited/Full Glory Development Limited/Ever Genius Limited

Mr Fok Chi Wai David	]	
Mr Chin Kim Meng	]	
Ms Chan Ying Yu	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Li Ming Yeung	]	
Mr Lui Wing Hong Johnson	]	

#### R2 – Yuba Company Limited

Ms Wong Delius Hoi Ki	]	
Mr Yeung Kam Yin Albert	]	
Mr To Kin Chung Frank	]	
Mr Li Yuet Sing Andy	]	
Mr Tam Ming Fai Alan	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Ho Chi Ching Ivan	]	
Mr Yuen Chee Hang Alan	]	
Mr Mak Tsz Chung Edmond	]	
Mr Law Lap Yin Martin	]	
Mr Chan Yin Cheung Eric	]	

#### R6 – Office of Dr Tik Chi Yuen, Legislative Councillor (狄志遠立法會議員辦事處)

Ms Pang Yi Ting	]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Tam Wing Cheong	]	

#### R9 – Accessibility Concern Platform (無障礙關注平台)

Mr Muck Yiu Keung	]	Representer's Representatives
-------------------	---	-------------------------------

Ms Chan Ka Man ]

R10 – Hong Kong Society for Rehabilitation (香港復康會)

Ms Leung Wing Han ] Representer's Representatives

Ms Ng Uen Yi ]

R11 – Hostford Development Company Limited

Ms Chan Mou Yin Cynthia ] Representer's Representatives

Mr Ian Brownlee ]

R12 – Lam Kin Chung Morning Sun Charity Fund (林健忠曉陽慈善基金會)

Mr Lam Kin Chung - Representer's Representative

R13 – Hong Kong Gaudeamus Dunhuang Ensemble (香港天籟敦煌樂團)

Mr Kam Shing Hei Kahlen - Representer's Representative

R14 – Wan Wai Hei Wesley

Mr Wan Wai Hei Wesley - Representer

R16 – John Batten

Mr John Batten - Representer

R24 – Cao Nengli

Ms Cao Nengli - Representer

R33 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R38 – Lee Kwan Yee Herrick

Mr Lee Kwan Yee Herrick - Representer

### Deliberation Session

48. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

49. Members supported the amendment items on the draft OZP and expressed some observations/suggestions as set out below.

*Comprehensive Redevelopment through Private Initiative*

50. Some Members considered that the amendments could facilitate urban renewal and revitalisation of the area, and had the following views:

- (a) the comprehensive redevelopment approach could avoid fragmented “pencil” infill buildings abutting stepped streets/streets with steep gradient and provide opportunities for various initiatives to achieve planning gains, including setback/NBAs, barrier-free access and improved pedestrian connectivity, provision of POS, heritage conservation, overall improvement to the environment, and provision of transport facilities within Item A site to avoid such activities at St. Francis Street with steep gradient;
- (b) redevelopment by private developers could strike a balance between financial viability and the delivery of public benefits. Private participation was regarded as a sustainable approach of urban renewal that should be encouraged;
- (c) the area had become increasingly vibrant in recent years, with organic growth of some small shops and eateries, and more visitors, thereby building a local identity in this part of Wan Chai. The two redevelopment proposals were seen as an opportunity to enhance such vitality while addressing local constraints; and
- (d) PlanD’s efforts in liaising with the relevant parties on various initiatives as mentioned in paragraph 50(a) above, and the applicants’ willingness to incorporate them in the redevelopment proposals as planning gains, including the provision of a barrier-free pedestrian network, were appreciated.

*Development Intensity*

51. Upzoning the original piecemeal “R(C)” site under Item A to “R(A)” was considered compatible with the “R(A)” zone in the surrounding areas. Regarding the PR of Item A site, which was about 10, two Members were concerned that the area dedicated for the 24-hour public passageway, while beneficial to the pedestrian environment, might lead to bonus/additional PR to be claimed by the applicants of Item A site. This would increase the site coverage and hence the

building bulk, affecting air ventilation and permeability. Proper control under the planning and/or lands regimes might be required. Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, said that the granting of bonus/additional PR in exchange for dedication of land or area for public passage might be permitted under Regulation 22 of B(P)R subject to approval of BA. In general, there was provision in the Notes of the OZPs for some zones, such as “R(A)”, to allow such additional PR if granted by BA. He remarked that taking an opposite approach, by restricting such additional PR on the OZPs, would require strong justifications. It was considered more appropriate to leave the matter to be dealt with under the buildings regime as in the established practice.

52. Members generally considered that the BH restrictions of 110mPD and 120mPD for the residential developments at Item A site and Item B1 site respectively were compatible with the surrounding context, particularly for Item B1 site, given that the adjacent Hopewell Centre II was subject to a BH restriction of 210mPD. In that regard, adverse visual impact was not anticipated.

#### *Pedestrian Connectivity and Barrier-Free Pedestrian Network*

53. Some Members considered the existing pedestrian conditions and barrier-free access in the area were poor and inadequate, characterised by narrow, steep and discontinuous passageways. The proposed redevelopments could address these constraints by introducing barrier-free access and improved linkages, thereby providing multiple access routes connecting MTR Admiralty Station/Star Street to Hopewell Centre II and Queen’s Road East. In particular, barrier-free access would be significantly improved compared with the current nil provision. Members had the following suggestions:

- (a) enhance promotion of the barrier-free pedestrian network, together with clearer wayfinding signages;
- (b) strengthen public engagement and education, with the Home Affairs Department taking a proactive role in promoting the barrier-free facilities for better community integration;
- (c) further enhance the barrier-free arrangements at Item A site by exploring the feasibility of providing an additional lift and enhancing lift capacity at the detailed design stage; and

- (d) the developers of the two sites were encouraged to collaborate on overall streetscape and accessibility enhancement in the area, particularly for the two NBAs in Items A and B1 sites in Sau Wa Fong.

54. Regarding the representer's proposal for a footbridge over St. Francis Street linking the development at 3, 5, 7 St. Francis Street and 61 Queen's Road East with Item A site, a Member considered that the proposal was subject to uncertainties and constraints, and therefore required further study by the proponent.

55. Some Members acknowledged that the narrowness and steep gradient of St. Francis Street were major constraints for widening, and suggested the Government to explore incorporating setback requirement upon redevelopment of buildings along St. Francis Street for footpath improvement. The Secretary said that the Notes for the "R(A)" zone stipulated the requirement for a minimum setback of 1m from the lot boundary fronting the portion of St. Francis Street in between St. Francis Yard and Queen's Road East, and a plan showing the setback requirement was attached to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP. Besides, under the indicative scheme of the proposed development at Item A site, a 2.5m wide area within the 10m setback fronting St. Francis Street was designated for pedestrian use. Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, said that imposing additional statutory setback requirement on the OZP would require detailed area-wide study, careful assessment and thorough consideration, including potential impacts on private development rights, technical feasibility and justifications.

#### *Heritage Conservation and Arts and Cultural Development*

56. Regarding the conservation of NKT, some Members expressed the following views:

- (a) noting that NKT had remained vacant for a prolonged period, the redevelopment proposal was seen as an opportunity to revitalise and conserve the heritage building, thereby reducing the risk of further deterioration;
- (b) the key viewing corridors to NKT from the east and south as well as along Ship Street would remain open, with a forecourt created in front of NKT and the stone wall fronting Ship Street retained;

- (c) the conservation scheme should safeguard the “spirit” and significance of the place, not merely preserve the physical building. Heritage values of both the building and its wider setting should be clearly conveyed to the public. The developer should avoid adopting a purely engineering-oriented approach in the conservation; and
- (d) through the CMP and detailed design, an overall conservation plan should be formulated, covering not only the historic building of NKT but also its surrounding area, taking into account visibility, public access and treatment of the stone walls and other features including the associated historic architectural features, including the pavilion, water fountain and hexagonal planter in the forecourt of NKT. The developer should closely liaise with AMO in preparing the CMP and implementing the conservation measures to ensure that the historic value of NKT would be maintained for public appreciation.

57. Regarding the arts and cultural elements at Item A site, a Member reiterated that the s.12A application considered by MPC was primarily based on the proposed residential redevelopment and planning merits, while the arts or cultural elements were not the key consideration.

### *Conclusion*

58. The Chairperson concluded that Members supported the amendments on the draft OZP, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed through the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper, as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

59. The Chairperson acknowledged Members’ concerns regarding pedestrian facilities at Item A site, suggesting the applicants of Item A site to explore the feasibility of providing an additional lift and enhancing lift capacity. PlanD could convey the suggestions to the applicants.

60. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1** on Item A, **R2 to R4** on Items B1 and/or B2, and **R5** on Item A, B1 and B2, and decided not to uphold R6 to R38 and considered that the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) Items A, B1 and B2 are to take forward two section 12A (s.12A) applications which were agreed by the Metro Planning Committee of the Board taking into consideration the compatibility of the proposed developments with the surrounding areas in terms of land use and development intensity, findings of relevant technical assessments and comments from the relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds). The amendment items are considered appropriate (**R6 to R38**);
- (b) relevant technical assessments on traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation, landscape, heritage, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, and water supply aspects have been conducted under the two s.12A applications and confirmed that there are no insurmountable technical impacts arising from the proposed developments with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures. The development details and other technical aspects of the proposed developments would be subject to the scrutiny of concerned government departments in the subsequent development stage of building plan submissions and/or land exchange application (**R6 to R38**);
- (c) with the completion of proposed developments at Items A, B1 and B2 sites, there will be a new barrier-free pedestrian network connecting Queen’s Road East to St. Francis Street through Sau Wa Fong serving the local residents and visitors of the area (**R6, R9 to R15, R30 and R33**); and
- (d) the overall provision of open space is considered generally adequate to meet the demand of planned population, and new open space open to the public would also be provided in the proposed development at Item B1 site to meet the needs of the local residents in the area. The existing and planned provisions of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities are

generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in Wan Chai District Council Area in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines, except for child care centre, community care services facilities, residential care homes for the elderly, day rehabilitation services and residential care services. These services/facilities will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise. The provision of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant B/Ds (**R15** and **R33** to **R37**).”

61. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:40 p.m.]

[Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Vincent K.Y. Ho left the meeting during lunch break.]