

**Minutes of 1317th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 26.4.2024**

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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr Vico P. Cheung

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Lands

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms W.H. Ho

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1316th Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1316th meeting were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approvals of Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/NE-KTS/20) on 26.3.2024; and the draft Fu Tei Au and Sha Ling OZP (renumbered as S/NE-FTA/18), the draft Chai Wan OZP (renumbered as S/H20/27), the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui OZP (renumbered as S/FSS/28) and the draft North Point OZP (renumbered as S/H8/28) on 9.4.2024 under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approvals of the first OZP and the other four OZPs were notified in the Gazette on 12.4.2024 and 19.4.2024 respectively.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan

3. The Secretary reported that on 16.4.2024, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-KTS/20 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 26.4.2024.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plan

4. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Mid-levels East Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H12/13. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 2.2.2024, the draft Mid-levels East OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, three valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for June 2024.

5. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 4 above.

(iv) Update on Matters in respect of Judicial Review

Judicial Review Application (HCAL 2260/2023) Lodged against Decision of the Town Planning Board on section 12A Application No. Y/H5/7

6. The Secretary reported that the judicial review (JR) application was lodged by the Hostford Development Limited, the Dialogue in the Dark (HK) Foundation Limited and Wong Wang Tai (the JR Applicants) against the decision of the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on a section 12A application No. Y/H5/7 (the s.12A application) in respect of a site at St. Francis Street and Sau Wa Fong in Wan Chai (the Site) (the Decision) made by the Great Kinetic Limited, the Full Glory Development Limited and the Ever Genius Limited (the s.12A Applicants). Mr Simon Y.S. Wong had declared interests on the item for owning flats in Wan Chai and his spouse owning shops in the district. As the item was only to update Members on matters in relation to a JR application, Members agreed that Mr Simon Y.S. Wong could stay in the meeting.

7. The Secretary reported that Members were informed under the Matters Arising at the Board's meeting on 5.1.2024 that a JR was filed by three commenters of the s.12A application (i.e. the JR Applicants) on 15.12.2023 against the Decision on 22.9.2023. The Decision was a partial agreement to the s.12A application for rezoning the Site from "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)"), "Residential (Group C)" ("R(C)") and an area shown as 'Road' to "R(A)9" on the Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP). The Court had fixed the hearing of the JR on 23 and 26.8.2024. On 28.3.2024, the s.12A Applicants sent a letter to the Planning Department (PlanD) with a copy to the Board urging for starting early the proposed amendments to the OZP to reflect the Decision given that there was no order from the Court to stay the Decision and thus the Decision was still valid. PlanD would reply to the s.12A Applicants that the proposed amendments to the OZP were under preparation and the proposed amendments would be submitted to the Board for consideration as per the established practice in due course. As a related issue raised in the Board's meeting on 5.1.2024, PlanD had taken follow-up actions and invited the s.12A Applicants to explore with the JR Applicants ways to address their concern on pedestrian safety, with a view to settling the matter through a non-litigation route. The s.12A Applicants had indicated their intention to proceed with the JR proceedings.

8. The Chairperson remarked that the Board's decisions were subject to JR and there had been JR applications lodged against the decisions of the Board in the past. Regarding the subject JR application, since there was no order from the Court to stay the Decision, the Board could proceed with the ongoing town planning procedures. As the town planning procedures and legal proceedings were being carried out in tandem, the Secretary, representing the Board in handling matters relating to the JR application, would pay attention to the progress of the JR and take into account any implications of the court's decision on the town planning procedures. The Board would be kept informed, as appropriate.

9. Members noted the s.12A Applicants' letter and PlanD's follow-up actions, as well as the latest progress of the JR.

[Mr Terence S.W. Tsang and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during the reporting of the JR application.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kwun Tong Town Centre Development Scheme Plan – Main Site No. S/K14S/URA1/3
(TPB Paper No. 10967)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

10. The Secretary reported that the amendment items on the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Development Scheme Plan (the DSP) mainly involved a proposed high-density mixed-use development (Item A) and a completed development in Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) (Item B). Two representations were submitted by URA (R1) and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R59). The following Members had declared interests on the items:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung] being a non-executive director of the URA Board
(*as Director of Planning*) and a member of its Committee;

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai]
(*as Director of Lands*)

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and Development Project Objection Consideration Committee of URA; and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund (URF);

Professor B.S. Tang - being a non-executive director of the URA Board;

Dr Tony C.M. Ip] having current business dealings with URA;

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip]

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a former director of the Board of URF;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former executive director of URA;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL; and
- Professor Simon K.L. Wong - being the director of a company which rented premises in the Item B site for catering services.

11. Members noted that Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor B.S. Tang had not yet joined the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Timothy K.W. Ma, and Dr Tony C.M. Ip were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Item B was to reflect a completed development and the interest of Professor Simon K.L. Wong was considered indirect, and Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Ben S.S. Lui had no involvement in the DSP and/or submission of the relevant representation, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Timothy K.W. Ma, and Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

12. 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.

13. The following government representatives, representer and representer's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Mr Steven Y.H. Siu	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng	- Town Planner/Kowloon

Representer and Representer's Representatives

R1 – URA

Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan]
Ms Y.T. Li] Representer's Representatives
Ms Clarice N.S. Ho]

R58 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

14. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representer and representer's representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer and the representer's representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer and representer's representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representer and representer's representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representer and representer's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would then deliberate on the representations in their absence and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

15. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K,

PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the DSP, the grounds/views of the representers and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10967 (the Paper). The amendment items on the DSP were:

- (a) Item A – to rezone a site (about 2.46 ha) to the north of Kwun Tong Road (the Site) from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) with building height (BH) restrictions of 30/100/360mPD to facilitate a mixed development; and
- (b) Item B – to rezone a site (about 2.18 ha) to the south of Mut Wah Street from “CDA(1)” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with a BH restriction of 180mPD to reflect the completed development.

16. The Chairperson then invited the representer and the representer's representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – URA

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Y.T. Li, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) KTTC, also known as Project K7, was the largest and most complicated redevelopment project ever undertaken by URA to date. Project K7 mainly covered areas in and around Yue Man Square, which previously comprised residential and commercial uses, government, institution and community (GIC) and public transport facilities. Owing to urban decay problems, many of the buildings were dilapidated, the infrastructure was outdated, hygiene and environmental conditions were deteriorating and traffic problems were serious. Urban redevelopment was much-needed;
- (b) URA commenced the KTTC redevelopment project in 2007. URA had conducted extensive public consultation to gauge the views of the public and the stakeholders on their aspirations for the redevelopment, which had been taken into account in formulating the planning vision and design concepts of

the redevelopment project. The planning vision of the redevelopment project was to facilitate comprehensive re-planning and redevelopment of KTTC with a view to optimising site utilisation, promoting efficient land uses, providing fit-for-purpose GIC facilities, public open space (POS) and public transport interchange (PTI) so as to improve environmental and traffic conditions and enhance pedestrian connectivity and vitality;

- (c) KTTC comprised the Main Site and the Yuet Wah Street (YWS) Site under two separate DSPs. Both DSPs were approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) in 2008. KTTC consisted of five development areas (DAs), with DA 1 within the YWS Site and DAs 2 to 5 within the Main Site. Developments at DA 1 (i.e. the residential (namely Park Metropolitan) cum public clinic development) were completed in 2014, developments at DAs 2 and 3 (i.e. a composite development known as Grand Central in Item B) were completed in 2021 while developments at DAs 4 and 5 (i.e. the Site in Item A) had yet to commence;
- (d) for the Site, the latest section 16 application submitted by URA was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board in September 2022 to allow built-in flexibility over the actual non-domestic gross floor areas (GFAs) within specified ranges (i.e. “floating parameters”) for office, hotel and retail uses (the Approved Scheme) while maintaining the main development parameters and design concepts of the previously approved schemes. However, since the unsuccessful tendering of the commercial development at the Site in early 2023, URA had been exploring ways to enhance the development flexibility for the Site;
- (e) URA repackaged the Site from a purely commercial development into a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development, notably to introduce domestic use in the development mix with a view to optimising the development potential of the Site in response to changing market needs (the Proposed Scheme). To take forward the Proposed Scheme, the Site was rezoned to “OU(MU)” on the DSP (Item A);

- (f) under the Proposed Scheme, the maximum total GFA was 251,100m² (+25% from 201,220m² under the Approved Scheme); the maximum domestic GFA was 110,100m²; the maximum non-domestic GFA was 153,700m²; and the maximum BH was 360mPD (as compared to 285mPD under the Approved Scheme), with three BH bands of 360mPD for the high zone, 100mPD for the mid zone and 30mPD for the low zone;
- (g) URA had explored the possibility of providing additional GFA for the provision of more GIC facilities to meet the acute demand in the local community. A total GFA up to 17,200m², which had doubled the original provision of 8,600m² under the Approved Scheme, would be reserved for the provision of GIC facilities and public transport facilities under the Proposed Scheme. The actual provision of GIC facilities would be timely confirmed subject to liaison/agreement with and confirmation of the uses and funding from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds);
- (h) the Proposed Scheme and the proposed amendments on the DSP were submitted to the Board for consideration in November 2023, and Members generally supported or had no objection to the proposed amendments; and
- (i) 60 representations were received during the two-month plan exhibition period. Majority of the representations supported the amendments while a few representations provided views or opposed the amendments. URA had the following responses to the grounds/comments of the representations:
 - (i) with a view to positioning the Site as a multi-purpose town centre for “live, work and play”, URA had taken the opportunity to enhance the development scheme to bring about more planning gains to the community, including the provision of additional GFA for GIC facilities and provision of multi-level outdoor communal spaces of not less than 4,000m². The key planning merits and design commitments under the Approved Scheme would be retained, including the iconic egg-shaped GIC building, a landmark tower with an observation deck, and at-grade POS of not less than 7,200m²;

- (ii) with regard to the provision of POS, although there was about 4,000m² planned POS in KTTC before redevelopment, they were scattered and only some of them had been implemented. The redevelopment project provided a good opportunity to restructure and re-plan the land uses, street pattern and pedestrian network in KTTC and hence, facilitating the creation of a well-integrated and comprehensive network of POS/landscaped areas/greenery and pleasant street environment. With the proposed at-grade POS of not less than 7,200m² at the Site and the existing at-grade POS of about 2,400m² in DAs 2 and 3, about 9,600m² at-grade POS would be provided in KTTC as a whole, which had doubled the originally planned provision of at-grade POS in KTTC. Apart from at-grade POS, not less than 4,000m² multi-level outdoor communal spaces would be provided at the Site, together with the existing 4,000m² podium-level POS in DAs 2 and 3, the whole redevelopment project would provide about 8,000m² outdoor communal spaces for public enjoyment. The proposed multi-level outdoor communal spaces at the Site would comprise a mix of uncovered and open-sided spaces and a combination of active and passive features, providing a wide range of experiences for visitors;
- (iii) various GIC and public transport facilities were planned at the Site to meet the community needs having considered population increase and ageing population. Apart from the existing public clinics, hawker bazaar and PTI provided in DAs 1 to 3, a GFA of about 8,600m² was reserved for reprovisioning of certain GIC and public transport facilities at the Site to compensate for those affected by the KTTC redevelopment, including post office, Kwun Tong District Office and government offices, etc. As an additional planning gain, URA had explored the possibility of providing additional GIC facilities at the Site with a total GFA up to 17,200m². The Social Welfare Department (SWD) had preliminarily confirmed that elderly and child care facilities would be provided at the Site. URA would continue

to liaise with SWD and other concerned B/Ds for the provision of more social welfare facilities at the Site;

- (iv) to enhance pedestrian circulation, pedestrian connections would be provided at multi-levels to establish a comprehensive barrier-free pedestrian network. To improve pedestrian circulation and alleviate the congestion at Exit A of MTR Kwun Tong Station, a landscaped deck was proposed to connect the station concourse with the Site. The new connection could facilitate the diversion of pedestrian flow from Exit A to the less-congested Exit C of Kwun Tong Station and provide more direct pedestrian routes and pleasant entrance point for the proposed development at the Site. Various internal connections would also be provided to connect the key pedestrian nodes within KTTC, including the public transport facilities, GIC facilities and outdoor communal spaces within the Site, as well as the retail portions, PTI and hawker bazaar at DAs 2 and 3. Elevated connections linking the Site with the two existing footbridges on Kwun Tong Road, i.e. the APM Millennium City footbridge and the Tsun Yip Lane footbridge, were also proposed. At the street level, pedestrian connections between the proposed at-grade POS and the surrounding areas would be provided;
- (v) to alleviate traffic congestion at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout, traffic improvement measures such as road widening and traffic rearrangement measures were proposed with a view to re-distributing the traffic;
- (vi) URA consulted the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) on the Proposed Scheme on 7.3.2023, 4.7.2023 and 23.1.2024. KTDC members generally welcomed the Proposed Scheme; and
- (vii) stepped height profile and cascading built form were proposed. BH bands of 360mPD, 100mPD and 30mPD had been stipulated for the landmark tower (high zone), the cascading GIC-cum-commercial

block (mid zone) and the POS (low zone) respectively. Various design features such as tower separations, building setbacks and intervening spaces/urban windows were incorporated into the Proposed Scheme to enhance visibility and permeability. An air ventilation assessment (AVA) had been conducted to compare the pedestrian wind environment under the Proposed Scheme and the Approved Scheme. The results concluded that the pedestrian wind environments in the surrounding area were very similar between the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Scheme under annual and summer conditions.

R58 – Mary Mulvihill

18. Taking the opportunity of attending the representation hearing, Ms Mary Mulvihill expressed her views on the appointment of new Members and the composition of the Board. She was disappointed that majority of the Members were from development-related sectors and with only a few female Members. There was also a lack of Members representing the sectors of conservation, arts and culture as well as the ethnic minority. She hoped that Members, on behalf of the general public, would fully exercise their rights to ask questions and ensure that the questions were properly answered.

19. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points in respect of her representation:

Item A

- (a) she strongly objected to Item A;
- (b) the most striking issue was that the maximum accountable plot ratio (PR) of the Proposed Scheme would be about 12, which had not taken into account the GFA of 17,200m² for GIC and public transport facilities due to the exemption from GFA calculation. Such important information was only indicated in the footnote of the Paper. As a normal practice, a development with residential use should have a lower PR than a pure commercial

development;

- (c) mega towers were socially unsustainable as they often led to social isolation, self-withdrawal and physical inactivity of its residents due to a disconnection from nature;
- (d) mega towers were economically and environmentally unsustainable. The resources involved in constructing and operating such a large-scale development were incongruous with the worldwide practice of reuse and reduction in facing socio-economic challenges nowadays;
- (e) co-location of domestic and non-domestic uses on the same floor would give rise to security concerns and duplicate the provision of building services such as lifts;
- (f) mega towers would lead to difficulties in rescue and evacuation in the event of emergencies;
- (g) the proposed tall buildings would create adverse microclimatic effects due to wind funnelling/acceleration and turbulence at the foot of the buildings near public streets/POS, causing discomfort to pedestrians, park users and/or the neighbouring residents. They would also create shadowing effect and result in a loss of sunlight in the surrounding area;
- (h) the Proposed Scheme was financially motivated, which deviated from the objective of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance in addressing the problems of urban decay and improving the living conditions in the old districts. The future residential units would likely be unaffordable to most people;
- (i) amidst the gloomy economic outlook, there was a lack of justification to substantiate the need for more residential units, shopping malls and office floor spaces at the Site. The proposed development would result in many vacant premises in the future. There were already many shopping malls in

the vicinity, including Telford Plaza, APM, Mega Box, Yue Man Square, Airside and Mikiki Mall, offering a total of more than six million ft² retail floor spaces. Besides, there were retail facilities in many of the new developments nearby;

- (j) there was a lack of POS in KTTC. According to the 'Provision of Open Space and Major GIC Facilities in Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area' in Annex VI of the Paper, there was serious deficit in the provision of district open space (DO). The existing DO provision of about 18.26 ha only met half of the requirement of about 30.96 ha under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (k) while the current temporary public spaces at the Site had provided a venue for hosting community events and served a genuine town centre function, the proposed development would take that function away from the local community. The future public spaces would be provided in pockets at various levels and some of them would be under cover, implying that they would not be active in nature;
- (l) the KTTC redevelopment project should aim at providing the densely populated district with a genuine town centre where residents and visitors could congregate and mingle with a view to injecting energy to the community;
- (m) the Central Government had called for new mindset in Hong Kong and expected local officials to take more proactive approach to boosting the economy and tackling deep-rooted issues. President Xi in 2020 also instructed that mega skyscrapers should be banned. It implied that the idea of developing mega skyscrapers ran contrary to the latest policies adopted in the Mainland and was out-dated. Reconsideration should be given to turning the Site into a genuine town plaza with abundant at-grade POS, GIC and recreational facilities to foster social interaction and gathering. While there would be cost implications, the social gain for the community would far outweigh the potential revenue loss by URA; and

Item B

- (n) the amendment item was merely for housekeeping purpose.

20. As the presentations of the PlanD's representative, the representer and the representer's representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer and the representer's representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties.

“Vertical City” Development and Mixed-Use Development

21. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the rationale for introducing “Vertical City” development at the Site;
- (b) the concept of “Vertical City” development;
- (c) the positioning/theme of “Vertical City” development at the Site; and
- (d) noting that domestic and non-domestic uses might be placed together as illustrated in Drawing 3 of the Paper, whether there were effective means to physically segregate the domestic and non-domestic uses from each other to avoid possible interface problem.

22. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) to enhance the planning and design of the originally proposed commercial development at the Site, URA had introduced the “floating parameters” for office, hotel and retail uses under the Approved Scheme. However, the tendering of the Site was unsuccessful in early 2023. In response to the

changing market needs and to optimise the development potential of the Site, it was proposed to introduce residential use in the proposed development and repackage the Site from a purely commercial development into a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development with a view to facilitating the early implementation of the project. Besides, the Site possessed the following elements which made it suitable for “Vertical City” development:

- (i) the Site was strategically located in the centre of Kwun Tong, with residential areas located to its north and business areas located to its south. The Site, situated in the transition area, was suitable for high-density, vertically-integrated and mixed-use development;
 - (ii) the Site was highly accessible to public transport services. It was located adjacent to the Kwun Tong Station and there were over 70 bus routes to/from different parts of Hong Kong passing through KTTC; and
 - (iii) the Site, with an area of about 25,000m², was sizable for a landmark and high-density mixed-use development with considerable area allocated for at-grade POS and multi-level outdoor communal spaces for public enjoyment;
- (b) “Vertical City” was not a new concept and there were many examples of “Vertical City” developments in both developed and developing countries, such as in Dubai, Seoul, Ho Chi Minh City, Jakarta, Bangkok, London and New York. “Vertical City” was a development concept where different land use functions of a city or urban area were amalgamated and developed vertically through high-rise developments. By better utilising precious land resources and incorporating mixed-use design, an efficient and sustainable urban environment could be created and more at-grade open spaces could be released for public enjoyment. For instance, about 9,600m² at-grade POS would be provided in KTTC as a whole, including 7,200m² at the Site and 2,400m² in DAs 2 and 3. Such a provision was comparatively large in the urban area. The concept of “Vertical City” development at the Site

originated from the concept of mixed-use development. The Board introduced the “OU(MU)” zone in 2011 through the promulgation of the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 42 on Designation of “OU(MU)” Zone and Application for Development within “OU(MU)” Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 42). The Board recognised that there were merits in functionally and physically integrating different types of compatible uses within a building or over a spatial area, in particular when it helped create vitality and diversity in an area;

- (c) the positioning of the Site was a multi-purpose regional hub for “live, work and play” which could help strengthen KTTC’s role in supporting Kowloon East as the second Core Business District of Hong Kong; and
- (d) to avoid interface problem between domestic and non-domestic uses, due regard would be given to building design of the proposed landmark tower, including –
 - (i) different uses would be placed in different vertical zones with separate entrance lobbies and lifts within the proposed landmark tower. An efficient vertical transportation system was being explored making reference to the vertical transportation arrangements in high-rise buildings in other cities, e.g. London and Tokyo; and
 - (ii) it was desirable to allow flexibility in the combination of various types of compatible uses such as commercial and residential uses, either vertically or horizontally within a building to meet changing market needs. According to the Railway Noise Impact Assessment (RNIA), since the southern part of the Site facing the elevated MTR Kwun Tong Line on Kwun Tong Road was subject to railway noise problem, residential use could not be accommodated in that south-facing portion below 150mPD in accordance with the statutory noise control requirements. Hence, residential use could only be proposed on the portions below 150mPD not facing the Kwun Tong Line or at the mid-to-high levels of the landmark tower. A higher BH of 360mPD was

required for the accommodation of the intended residential use. In any case, physical segregation would be provided between the non-domestic and domestic portions and due regard would be given to the building design, such as the provision of separated entrances/lifts/staircases, to avoid possible nuisance and interface problems.

23. The Chairperson remarked that given the global trend of combining live, work and play in a single neighbourhood, the “OU(MU)” zoning was increasingly advocated in the planning for new development areas. For example, when planning Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands as the third Central Business District (CBD) of Hong Kong, mixed-use development was introduced to provide a mix of residential, commercial, retail and/or recreational uses over a spatial area. Mixed-use development was generally accepted by the public, particularly the young generation as they considered that it was not necessary to draw a clear line between living and working places. Besides, mixed-use development could enhance vitality and diversity of the area as the traditional CBD had always encountered the problem of lack of vibrancy at nighttime.

24. Some Members considered that a “Vertical City” development should embrace the concepts of smart city and sustainability with the objectives of achieving zero-carbon emission, promoting smart waste management and energy-saving, and providing fit-for-purpose GIC facilities and POS for the wellness of the community, etc. In view of that, they enquired whether smart and sustainable elements had been considered and incorporated in the proposed “Vertical City” development.

25. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) emphasis of the proposed “Vertical City” development was put on wellness enhancement and social interaction. In addition to the provision of at-grade POS of not less than 7,200m², multi-level outdoor communal spaces of not less than 4,000m² would be introduced under the Proposed Scheme. The outdoor communal spaces would comprise a mix of uncovered and open-sided spaces, with a combination of hard and soft landscaping elements, as

well as passive and active features. The various forms of outdoor communal spaces, including cascading landscaped terraces, sky gardens and amenity areas situated across different levels, would create a network to integrate the indoor uses and outdoor environment seamlessly. A wide range of experiences for visitors, from quiet contemplation areas to more active recreational spaces, would promote dynamic and vibrant environment and create opportunities for social interaction, recreation and community engagement. Reference had been made to the vertically-integrated multi-level communal spaces in Parco Shibuya in Japan and Pan Pacific Orchard in Singapore. POS/communal spaces would create shared open spaces for the public from all walks of life, encouraging place-making and social gathering;

- (b) the Site was strategically located in the centre of Kwun Tong and easily accessible by public transport. With the provision of a wide range of community and retail facilities as well as POS/communal spaces at one location, people could access those facilities within a short period of time, which helped minimise the number of commuting trips and hence, reduce carbon emission;
- (c) the proposed “Vertical City” development might not be able to achieve zero carbon emission but URA committed to reducing carbon emission as far as possible; and
- (d) the principles of 3Rs, namely “Reduce, Reuse and Recycle”, would be duly observed in the proposed “Vertical City” development. Green and smart elements, such as smart car park, recycling facilities (recycling bins and food waste collection bins), etc. would be incorporated in the proposed development. The provision of more green and smart facilities would be further considered at the detailed design stage.

Increase in GFA

26. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the maximum total GFA for the Site would be increased by 25% or 33% as both figures were mentioned; and
- (b) apart from tendering consideration, whether there were other reasons for increasing the maximum total GFA in the Proposed Scheme.

27. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) both figures were correct, depending on whether the increase in GFA referred to the total GFA or total accountable GFA. The total GFA for the Site was increased by 67,080m² (about 33%) from 201,220m² under the Approved Scheme to 268,300m² under the Proposed Scheme, while the total accountable GFA was increased by 49,880m² (about 25%) as a GFA of 17,200m² for GIC and public transport facilities as required by the Government would be exempted from GFA calculation under the Proposed Scheme. Therefore, the maximum total accountable GFA for the Site was 251,100m²; and
- (b) since the unsuccessful tender, URA had studied the reasons behind it, and some developers expressed that the lack of domestic element had made the project less attractive. In response to the changing market needs and to optimise the development potential of the Site, URA had examined not less than 40 scenarios for an alternative scheme. Having taken into account various factors including infrastructural capacities (such as traffic and sewerage), noise impact and other urban design considerations, it was considered feasible to pursue a mixed-use development by incorporating domestic use and reducing non-domestic uses, with an increase in total GFA of 67,080m². With the maximum total, domestic and non-domestic GFAs of 251,100m², 110,100m² and 153,700m² respectively, the stated maximum domestic GFA would only apply if the non-domestic GFA was correspondingly reduced, and vice versa.

Need for Commercial Space

28. A Member enquired about the need for more retail and office floor spaces at the Site, noting the presence of several shopping malls such as APM and Mega Box in the vicinity, as well as vacant office/commercial spaces in East Kowloon. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, explained that in view of the downturn in the tourism and retail industries due to the COVID-19 pandemic, URA considered it necessary to allow flexibility for its future joint venture partners or assignees (i.e. the future developers) to adjust the development mix in response to changing market needs. To this end, URA had introduced the "floating parameters" for office, hotel and retail uses at the Site under the Approved Scheme in 2022, which allowed flexibility in the actual non-domestic GFAs for each category of non-domestic uses. The introduction of "floating parameters" was considered in the right direction. Taking the example of hotel use, while there had been many vacant hotel rooms during the pandemic period, there was strong demand for hotel rooms nowadays due to the recovery of tourism industry after the pandemic. Thus, it was necessary to add resilience in the Proposed Scheme for the future developers to adapt to changing market needs.

POS and Outdoor Communal Spaces

29. Noting that the Proposed Scheme would bring an additional 4,000 population compared to the Approved Scheme, two Members asked for details about the provision of POS/outdoor communal spaces at the Site and the amount of open space per person. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, said that under the first approved Master Layout Plan (MLP) for KTTC redevelopment in 2007, only about 8,700m² at-grade POS was proposed. Under the latest development proposal, about 9,600m² at-grade POS (i.e. about 7,200m² at the Site and about 2,400m² in DAs 2 and 3) would be provided for the KTTC redevelopment. In view of the increase in population and as an additional planning gain, multi-level outdoor communal spaces of not less than 4,000m² would be provided at the Site, in addition to 4,000m² POS on the podium level of DAs 2 and 3. The at-grade POS and outdoor communal spaces managed by URA or the future developers would allow flexibility to include facilities such as restaurants. The open space provision for the KTTC redevelopment met the HKPSG standards, i.e. 1m² DO and 1m² local open space (LO) per person.

30. The Chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the demand and provision of open space in Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area;
 - (b) whether the HKPSG standards for open space provision could meet the expectation of the local residents and whether a more visionary approach should be taken to provide additional open space; and
 - (c) the requirements for the provision of POS at the Site.
31. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD made the following main points:
- (a) based on HKPSG's requirements, the demand and provision of open space in Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area was detailed in Annex VI of the Paper. Although there would be a slight shortfall of about 1.19 ha in the planned DO, there would be a surplus of about 28.23 ha in the planned LO. The overall open space provision was considered generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area, including the KTTC redevelopment and other planned/committed developments. DO referred to medium-sized sites (where possible at least 1 ha) to meet the needs of a district population while LO were smaller sites (where possible at least 500m² in the urban areas) to serve the neighbourhood population. It was considered that the surplus in the planned LO could meet the needs of local residents;
 - (b) the HKPSG standards for open space provision were formulated some years ago and were currently under review. A higher standard for open space provision had been recommended in the 'Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030' Study as a long-term goal. In that connection, the open space provision standards were being reviewed and the HKPSG standards would be updated in due course. According to URA, private open space for the future residents would be provided according to the latest HKPSG standards, which would be subject to review at the

general building plan submission stage; and

- (c) according to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP, not less than 7,200m² of at-grade POS and not less than 4,000m² of accessible outdoor communal spaces across multiple levels should be provided at the Site. The multi-level outdoor communal spaces would consist of uncovered and open-sided areas, with a mix of hard and soft landscapes, and active and passive elements for public enjoyment. The proposed at-grade POS of 7,200m² had been counted towards the planned LO in the Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area while the proposed multi-level outdoor communal spaces of 4,000m² were considered an additional planning gain.

GIC Facilities and Planning Gains for the Community

32. Two Members enquired about details of the provision of GIC facilities at the Site, which were considered as planning gains for the community. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) for the whole KTTC redevelopment project, GIC facilities such as Kwun Tong Community Health Centre and an occupational health centre had been provided in DA 1 while a hawker bazaar, PTI and a refuse collection point had been provided in DAs 2 and 3. For the Site, a GFA of about 8,600m² was reserved for the reprovisioning of certain GIC and public transport facilities affected by the KTTC redevelopment, including a post office, the Home Affairs Department's public service enquiry centre, other government offices and the Environmental Protection Department's air quality monitoring station, etc. As an additional planning gain, URA had explored the possibility of providing additional GIC facilities with a total GFA up to 17,200m² at the Site. SWD had preliminarily confirmed the provision of some elderly and child care facilities such as a co-parenting support centre and a day care centre for the elderly at the Site. URA would continue to liaise with SWD and other concerned B/Ds for the provision of more social welfare and community facilities at the Site, leveraging its central location and accessibility to the public transport; and

- (b) apart from the provision of GIC facilities, a GFA of not less than 1,300m² would be reserved for social enterprises to conduct activities and promote social entrepreneurship.

Traffic and Transport Aspect

33. Noting that the traffic was already very congested in KTTC, particularly at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout, a Member enquired whether the proposed development would worsen the traffic conditions in the surrounding areas. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a number of mitigation measures and road improvement works were proposed to enhance traffic circulation in the surrounding areas, including –
 - (i) the ingress/egress of the Site at Kwun Tong Road would only be used as an emergency vehicular access point to minimise traffic impact on this road;
 - (ii) by widening Hong Ning Road and locating the main ingress/egress of the Site there, the traffic generated by the proposed development could gain access to Lam Tin/Tsueng Kwan O and Eastern Harbour Crossing via Kwun Tong Road Underpass without passing through Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout;
 - (iii) as there were currently more than 70 bus routes passing through Kwun Tong Road, Kwun Tong Road eastbound would be widened to three lanes, with the existing 70m-long bus bay increased to about 120m and the addition of a bus lane;
 - (iv) bus stops for different routes would be strategically placed. For example, for those bus routes passing through Kwun Tong Road Underpass such as Bus No. 671 and A22, their bus stops would be placed at the end of the 120m-long bus bay. Such arrangement

would enable the buses to go directly to Kwun Tong Road Underpass after picking up/dropping off passengers without queuing up at Kwun Tong Road; and

(v) a new exclusive left-turn traffic lane on Kwun Tong Road eastbound (i.e. near Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout towards Hip Wo Street northbound) would be provided to avoid the uphill traffic to Sau Mau Ping passing through Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout; and

(b) according to the Traffic Impact Assessment, major road junctions in the vicinity of the Site, including Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout, would operate at or near capacity in the design year of 2036. A sensitivity test had been conducted to compare the junction performance under the Approved Scheme and different scenarios under the Proposed Scheme, including the worst-case scenario of the mixed-use development. Under the Approved Scheme (with commercial uses and no residential use), the design flow to capacity (DFC) at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would be 0.97. Under the Proposed Scheme (with the introduction of residential use and reduced commercial uses), the DFC at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would slightly reduce to 0.95. As the peak hours for trip attraction/generation of commercial and residential uses were different, the traffic condition at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would be slightly improved with the replacement of some of the commercial uses by residential use in the Proposed Scheme.

Pedestrian Circulation

34. Noting that some existing pedestrian connections in Kwun Tong, e.g. Kwun Tong Station Exit A connecting to APM Millennium City, were already very congested, a Member enquired whether the additional 4,000 population brought by the Proposed Scheme would further exacerbate the over-crowded situation and whether there were any proposed measures to enhance pedestrian circulation. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, said that to improve pedestrian circulation and alleviate the congestion at Exit A of Kwun Tong Station, URA had been actively liaising with MTRCL on a proposed landscaped deck to connect the station concourse with the Site. The new

arrangement could provide more direct and effective pedestrian routes and pleasant entrance point for the proposed development, and facilitate the diversion of pedestrian flow from Exit A to the less-congested Exit C of Kwun Tong Station.

35. Another Member queried the effectiveness of directing the pedestrian flow from Exit A to Exit C which was in a less convenient location. Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, said that sensible design, such as locating the entrance point of the residential portion of the proposed landmark tower near Exit C could encourage the future residents to use Exit C. Besides, URA would closely liaise with MTRCL to explore the opportunity of adding exit(s) at the proposed landscaped deck to further enhance pedestrian circulation.

Air Ventilation Aspect

36. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the impacts of the proposed development on the micro-climate and air ventilation;
- (b) details of the methodology adopted in the AVA, noting that the resolution of some of the simulation images was relatively low; and
- (c) noting that the proposed urban windows along the façade at Kwun Tong Road might create channeling effect and the areas near/at Hip Wo Street would have stronger air flow, whether the design of the proposed urban windows and the landscaped deck near Kwun Tong Station Exit C above Hip Wo Street had taken into account the impact during typhoon.

37. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) an AVA – initial study using computational fluid dynamics modelling (AVA-IS) was conducted to compare the surrounding pedestrian wind environments under the Proposed Scheme and the Approved Scheme. The simulation results of the AVA-IS concluded that with the proposed wind enhancement

measures/design elements, including setback from adjoining roads, building separations and urban windows design along the façade at Kwun Tong Road, the surrounding pedestrian wind environment under the Proposed Scheme was generally comparable to that of the Approved Scheme under annual and summer wind conditions. As stated in the ES of the DSP, in the event that the proposed wind enhancement features were not adopted in the future design scheme, further AVA study should be conducted by the project proponent(s) to demonstrate that the wind performance of the eventual development would not be worse than the Proposed Scheme adopted in the AVA-IS. More and better wind enhancement measures would be further explored at the detailed design stage;

- (b) the methodology adopted in the AVA-IS was in accordance with relevant technical circular and accepted by PlanD with a domain dimension of about 11,000m x 11,000m, an elevation of 1500m and more than 54,300,000 grid cells defined to simulate the air flow; and
- (c) unlike new development areas such as the Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands, the Site was located in a compact urban context which generally experienced weak wind conditions. Given that the high-rise and compacted commercial/industrial buildings located to the south of the Site had already blocked much of the wind flow from the sea, the wind speed within the Kwun Tong area was generally low and extreme strong wind would rarely occur. Nevertheless, Member's view was noted and would be taken into account at the detailed design stage.

38. To supplement, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD said that the AVA-IS was to assess the impacts of the proposal on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment. Wind velocity ratio, which indicated how much of the wind availability of a location could be experienced and enjoyed by pedestrians on ground taking into account the surrounding buildings and topography and the proposed development, was used as an indicator for wind performance. Given the general weak wind conditions in Hong Kong, the higher the wind velocity ratio, the less likely the impact of the proposed development on the wind availability would be. Besides, URA had conducted a micro-climatic study for the proposed development

at the Site and appropriate landscaping/greening measures would be devised at the detailed design stage. For example, wind-resistant plants would be planted at locations that would experience stronger winds.

Other Potential Impacts

39. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed development would create shadowing effect on the surrounding area; and
- (b) noting that the commercial portion of the proposed development might install reflective glass and the lighting might cause glare impact on the neighbouring residents, whether there were any mitigation measures or effective means to minimise such impact.

40. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) although there was no requirement to conduct daylight and sunlight assessments for the proposed development, URA had conducted an in-house shadow analysis to examine the shadowing effect of the proposed development on the surrounding area under the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Scheme at different times during summer solstice. The findings showed that the shadowing effects were similar under the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Scheme. In the highly developed context of Hong Kong, the shadowing effect of one development on its neighbouring developments could not be avoided. Besides, the photomontages showing the view from the podium-level POS in DAs 2 and 3 demonstrated that the proposed increase in BH of the landmark tower from 285mPD to 360mPD would not result in significant adverse visual impact; and
- (b) development agreements between URA and the future developers would be made to ensure that the design of the external wall of the buildings would not

create glare impact on the neighbouring area. URA could scrutinise and monitor the design and development of the Site through the development agreements.

41. Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD supplemented that all building works would need to comply with the Buildings Ordinance and relevant regulations, while taking into consideration the relevant Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP), including PNAP APP-2 on the external reflectance of glazing and other relevant guidelines.

Landscaping and Greening

42. A Member enquired how the landscaping/greening proposal of the Proposed Scheme could enhance biodiversity. In response, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, said that the two Old and Valuable Trees in the Site would be preserved in-situ, and hundreds of new trees would be planted. In formulating the landscaping/greening proposal at the detailed design stage, due regard would be given to the selection of appropriate flora species. For example, native species, which were more adaptive to the local climate and could help create habitats for the natural nurturing of fauna, would be selected. Besides, URA would examine whether there were any special fauna species within the Site and its vicinity, and adopt appropriate mitigation measures if necessary. It was envisaged that a well-landscaped green urban environment would be created upon completion of the KTTC redevelopment project, which would help enhance urban biodiversity. In addition, a landscaping clause would be included in the lease of the proposed development specifying relevant landscaping requirements that would be monitored and enforced by relevant government departments.

Design Details

43. Some Members raised the following questions/suggestions to R1's representatives:
- (a) details of the design of egg-shaped building and utilisation of floor spaces within the egg-shaped building;
 - (b) whether the windows of the residential portion of the proposed landmark

tower could be opened for health consideration;

- (c) the design and location of private/local open spaces within the proposed development to address the concerns on the limited space and views for those open spaces;
- (d) given that the residential portion of the proposed landmark tower (for example, drying racks on the external walls) might affect its outlook, whether there were any measures to avoid such problems; and
- (e) consideration should be given to the design of the proposed development (e.g. user-friendly and suitable directional signage) to cater for people with special needs.

44. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) during the public consultation stage of the KTTC redevelopment project in 2006/2007, KTDC and the public had asked for the provision of an iconic building in KTTC and they generally welcomed the provision of an egg-shaped GIC building at the southwestern corner of the Site. As the building would have an egg-shaped exterior design, some of the internal floor spaces might not be fully utilised under such design. With a view to striking a balance between the public aspiration for an iconic egg-shaped building and the construction cost for the non-conventional building design, URA committed to further refining the design of the egg-shaped building at the detailed design stage for better utilisation of internal floor spaces;
- (b) the residential portion of the landmark tower was regarded as 'Flat' use and openable windows were assumed under the Proposed Scheme. According to the RNIA and Air Quality Impact Assessment for the Proposed Scheme, no insurmountable impacts on the air quality and noise aspects were anticipated for the residential portion of the proposed landmark tower;

- (c) some podiums/roof areas at the landmark tower would be required for the provision of private/local open spaces for the future residents in accordance with HKPSG's requirements. Due regard would be given to the design and location of the private/local open spaces at the detailed design stage;
- (d) utility platforms/balconies would usually be provided in residential developments for drying clothes. Development agreements would be signed between URA and the future developers under which URA could scrutinise and monitor the design and development of the Site. The Deeds of Mutual Covenant (DMC), which spelt out the rights and obligations of the owners, would also be signed by individual owners; and
- (e) Members' suggestions on the design matters were noted and would be taken into account at the detailed design stage. Indeed, URA had consulted relevant organisations providing services to people with special needs, including a centre for the visually-impaired nearby. Taking into account the valuable suggestions provided by the visually-impaired users on the design of the directional signage, the proposed development would be carefully designed with a view to providing user-friendly facilities for those with special needs.

45. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the proposed number of flats was 1,750 and the assumed average flat size was about 63m² under the Proposed Scheme, whether there were any planning requirements/restrictions on the number of flats to be provided and the flat size to be adopted; and
- (b) noting that an observation tower would be provided at the proposed landmark tower, whether the provision of the observation tower was a planning requirement under the DSP.

46. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) there was no restriction on the number of flats to be provided and the flat size to be adopted under the DSP. The proposed development was subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 110,100m² as stipulated in the Notes of the DSP. While the Government had included a requirement on the minimum flat size of 26m² (i.e. around 280 ft²) in the lease of residential sites, there was no such requirement in the planning regime; and
- (b) the requirements on the provision of an observation deck in the landmark tower and the iconic egg-shaped building were stipulated in the ES of the DSP. Although they were not statutory requirements, URA would honour those requirements to fulfil its commitments made to the public.

Management and Implementation Issues

47. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that the proposed mixed-use development would include residential and commercial uses, POS/outdoor communal spaces and GIC facilities, whether URA had an overall management strategy to ensure that the future management and maintenance (M&M) responsibility would be properly assigned to different owners including the individual owners of the residential portion of the proposed landmark tower; and
- (b) noting that the implementation programme of the redevelopment project had been delayed for some times, whether the proposed development could be completed in phases, with GIC building, POS and pedestrian connections could be completed earlier for public use.

48. In response, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, R1's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) development agreements would be signed between URA and the future developers under which URA could scrutinise and monitor the implementation issues of the project. The future developers would

formulate their own management strategies in accordance with the requirements set out in the development agreements; and

- (b) the suggestion on phased development was noted and would be taken into account in formulating the implementation programme.

49. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD supplemented that different tiers of development control mechanisms would be adopted to govern the future development of the Site, including the land grant conditions to be signed between the Government and URA, the development agreements between URA and the future developers, and the DMC between the future developers and the individual owners. The above established practice had long been effective in governing the redevelopments in Hong Kong.

Others

50. A Member asked Ms Mary Mulvihill, R58, about her preferred use at the Site given that URA had spent substantial financial resources in land acquisition for the KTTC redevelopment project. In response, Ms Mulvihill said that money spent should not be a relevant consideration. There was a lack of POS in KTTC. The proposed at-grade POS at the Site was not a genuine open space for public enjoyment as it was just a narrow strip of land surrounded by high-rise buildings subject to poor air ventilation and shadowing effect. The design of the proposed multi-level outdoor communal spaces was also not satisfactory. The Site should be turned into a genuine public park/town plaza with abundant at-grade POS, GIC and recreational facilities to facilitate social interaction and gathering. While there might be cost implications, the social gain for the community would far outweigh the potential revenue loss by URA.

51. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer and the representer's representatives and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Professor Simon K.L. Wong and Mr Paul Y.K. Au left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

52. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Timothy K.W. Ma, and Dr Tony C.M. Ip rejoined, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor B.S. Tang joined the meeting at this point.]

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-LT/762

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 623 RP in D.D. 8, Ma Po Mei Village, Lam Tsuen, Tai Po
(TPB Paper No. 10968)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

53. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan	- District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)
Mr Kevin K.W. Lau	- Senior Town Planner/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (STP/STN)
Mr Wong Yuk Wing] Applicant’s Representatives
Mr Hung Shu Ping]

54. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the review

hearing. She then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kevin K.W. Lau, STP/STN, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site) and the surrounding areas, the applicant's proposal and justifications, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10968 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

56. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application.

57. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Wong Yuk Wing, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) he was the father of the applicant;
- (b) with reference to some photos showing the land within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Ma Po Mei Village, about half of the land within the "V" zone was Tso/Tong land. The indigenous villagers of Ma Po Mei Village were unable to acquire the Tso/Tong land for Small House (SH) development;
- (c) a piece of land within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village was occupied by the Tso/Tong of another village while two large pieces of land within the "V" zone were owned by developers. As the developers were not indigenous villagers and not entitled to build SH, their land was left vacant;
- (d) as the land within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village was not available for SH development, the Site was the only piece of land owned by his family for SH development for his two sons;
- (e) the Site was the subject of a previous planning permission granted to him for

SH development in 2001. Since he was not in Hong Kong at that time and his lawyer had not informed him of the validity period of the previous planning permission, he had not applied for an extension of time for commencement of the development and the planning permission had lapsed; and

- (f) the above situations warranted sympathetic consideration by the Board.

58. Mr Hung Shu Ping, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) while PlanD considered that the proposed SH development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone on the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the Site was located entirely within the village 'environs' ('VE') of Ma Po Mei Village (i.e. the area within a 300-foot radius from the edge of the last village type house built in Ma Po Mei Village) and an indigenous villager was entitled to apply for SH development within the 'VE' of a recognised village in accordance with the SH policy. It was considered that the proposed SH development was in line with the SH policy;
- (b) although planning approval was granted for SH development at the Site in 2001, there was no public sewerage system in Lam Tsuen at that time and the approved SH development could not be implemented due to no connection with the public sewers. The public sewerage system in Lam Tsuen had largely been completed nowadays and the proposed SH could connect with the public sewers; and
- (c) not much land was available within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village for SH development as majority of the land was Tso/Tong land. It was extremely difficult for the applicant to acquire land within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village for SH development.

59. As the presentations of the PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

60. Two Members raised the following questions to the applicant's representatives:

- (a) whether figure on the area of Tso/Tong land within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village was available; and
- (b) noting that the proposed SH would be the living place of Mr Wong's two sons, the ages of his two sons and their current living place.

61. In response, Mr Wong Yuk Wing, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) there was no information on the area of Tso/Tong land at hand; and
- (b) his sons, aged 20 and 26, were currently living and working in the United Kingdom.

62. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant's representatives and would inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

63. The Chairperson remarked that the planning application was rejected by RNTPC mainly on the grounds that the proposed SH development was not in line with the planning intention of the "AGR" zone and land was still available within the "V" zone of Ma Po Mei Village to meet the outstanding SH applications. The applicant had not provided strong planning justifications in the review application for a departure from the planning intention. The Chairperson then invited views from the Members.

64. Members generally agreed with the decision of RNTPC to reject the application. A Member asked about details of the Interim Criteria and background of the more cautious

approach. In response, the Secretary said that the main purpose of the Interim Criteria was to provide a framework for the Board to assess New Territories Exempted House (NTEH)/SH applications in a consistent manner. According to the Interim Criteria, sympathetic consideration might be given if not less than 50% of the proposed NTEH/SH footprint fell within the 'VE' of a recognised village and there was a general shortage of land in meeting the demand for SH development in the "V" zone of the village. In considering if there was a general shortage of land in meeting the SH demand, factors including the number of outstanding SH applications provided by the Lands Department (LandsD), the 10-year SH demand forecast provided by the village representatives and the land available within the "V" zone for SH development would be taken into account. Since the 10-year SH demand forecast provided by the village representatives could not be verified by relevant government departments and its accuracy and basis were in doubt, the Board had formally adopted a more cautious approach since August 2015. Under the more cautious approach, in considering if there was a general shortage of land in meeting the SH demand, more weighting would be put on the number of outstanding SH applications being processed by LandsD, amongst others. In response to the Member's enquiry on the need to incorporate the more cautious approach in the Interim Criteria, the Secretary said that the current practice had been operated effectively and a review of the Interim Criteria would be subject to the review of the SH policy by the Government. The Chairperson remarked that in view of the latest circumstances, the matter could be considered at a later time.

65. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Tai Mong Che and Ma Po Mei which is primarily intended for Small House

development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.”

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

66. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 1:50 p.m.