

**Minutes of 1247th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 18.6.2021**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport 3),
Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

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
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y. S. Wong

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Kitty S.T. Lam

Opening Remarks

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1246th Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1246th meeting that was conducted by circulation were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) **Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans**

3. The Secretary reported that on 1.6.2021, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/I-TCTC/24) and the draft Tseung Kwan O OZP (renumbered as S/TKO/28) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The approval of the said OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 18.6.2021.

(ii) **Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans**

4. The Secretary reported that on 1.6.2021, the Chief Executive in Council referred the

approved Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/30 and the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6 to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 11.6.2021.

(iii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 2 of 2021

Temporary Storage Use for a Period of 3 Years in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lots 293 S.A ss.1 (Part), 293 S.A ss.2 (Part), 293 S.B ss.1 (Part) and 293 S.B ss.2 (Part) in D.D. 122, Ping Shan, Yuen Long

(Application No. A/YL-PS/611)

5. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 4.6.2021 against the decision of the Board on 9.4.2021 to reject on review an application (No. A/YL-PS/611) for temporary storage use at a site zoned “Village Type Development” (“V”) on the then approved Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-PS/18.

6. The review application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:

- “(a) the applied use is not in line with the planning intention of the “V” zone which is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. No strong justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and
- (b) approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “V” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such similar applications would result in general degradation of the environment of the area.”

7. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iv) Appeal Statistics

8. The Secretary reported that as at 15.6.2021, a total of 8 cases were yet to be heard by the TPAB and four decisions were outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	37
Dismissed	166
Abandoned/Withdrawn/invalid	208
Yet to be heard	8
Decision Outstanding	4
<hr/>	
Total	423

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority To Kwa Wan Road/Wing Kwong Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA3/A Prepared Under Section 25 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance and Proposed Amendments to the Approved Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/26
(TPB Paper No. 10743)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

9. The Secretary reported that the draft Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with URA:

- Mr Ivan M.K. Chung]
(as Director of Planning)] being a non-executive director of the URA Board
] and a member of its Committee;
- Mr Andrew C.W. Lai]
(as Director of Lands)]
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being the deputy chairman of Appeal Board Panel
of URA;
- Mr Y.S. Wong being a non-executive director of the URA Board
and a member of its Committees;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]
] his firm having current business dealings with
Dr Conrad T.C. Wong] URA;
]
- Mr K.K. Cheung]
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having business dealings with
URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal
Fund of URA, and a director and Chief Executive
Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which
was a licensed user of a few URA's residential
units in Sheung Wan;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
Renewal Fund of URA;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
Renewal Fund of URA;

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a former non-executive director of the URA Board and its Committees' former chairman/member, and a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member and an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues; and
- Mr L.T. Kwok - the institution he was serving had received sponsorship from URA.

10. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Y.S. Wong and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. Dr. Lawrence W.C. Poon informed the meeting that he was previously involved in the discussion of the DSP. The interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Lincoln L.H. Huang and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were direct, and they left the meeting at this point.

11. Members agreed that as the interests of Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu, Wilson Y.W. Fung, Daniel K.S. Lau and L.T. Kwok and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were indirect, and Messrs K.K. Cheung and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the DSP, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- Ms Katy Fung - District Planning Officer/ Kowloon (DPO/K)
- Mr C.H. Mak - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

- Mr Wilfred C.H. Au - Director, URA
- Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan - General Manager, URA
- Ms Mable M.P. Kwan - Senior Manager, URA

13. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the meeting. She then invited the representatives of PlanD and URA to brief Members on the TPB Paper No. 10743 (the Paper).

Draft Development Scheme Plan

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, briefed Members on the DSP as detailed in Paper, including the background, the proposed development parameters of the DSP and the notional scheme (the Scheme) prepared by URA.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) in accordance with the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS), the DSP aimed to restructure and rationalize the land uses in the Kowloon City Action Area 1 (KCAA1) by redeveloping the dilapidated buildings and providing more open space and community/welfare facilities, and enhancing the townscape. The URA had already commenced seven redevelopment projects in the KCAA1 within To Kwa Wan under the district-based and planning-led approach. The DSP at the western fringe of KCAA1 aimed to achieve the URS objectives and to bring planning merits through continuation of the holistic planning and urban renewal action in KCAA1;
- (b) according to the Scheme, the proposed domestic and total plot ratios (PRs) were 7.5 and 9 respectively to provide about 900 small to medium sized flats. An additional gross floor area (GFA) of not less than 5,500m²

(equivalent to PR of 1) for Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities as required by government would be provided and was proposed to be exempted from PR calculation;

- (c) the Scheme proposed two towers at staggered building height (BH) of 110mPD and 140mPD along To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road and a Low Block in the eastern portion of the Scheme area. The building height restriction (BHR) of the DSP was proposed to be relaxed from 100mPD on the outline zoning plan (OZP) to 140mPD. Sensitivity tests of lower BHRs had been conducted but it was considered that the proposed BHR at 140mPD would allow more flexibility in building form and layout to achieve planning and design merits and address the site constraints;
- (d) two urban windows (not less than 15m in height and 15m in width) at pedestrian level were designed to facilitate air ventilation and enhance visual permeability along the main roads. A full-height building setback of not less than 45m of the residential portion above podium would be provided from the north-eastern boundary at Ngan Hon Street to allow a more open design and to maintain the east-west breezeway. The relaxed BHR would still allow staggered BH cascading down from inland to the waterfront;
- (e) the Scheme comprised a five-storey podium partly to accommodate more GIC facilities and social welfare facilities and to mitigate the traffic noise and air quality impacts from the abutting major roads. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) initially advised that elderly facilities should be provided and URA would further liaise with the relevant stakeholders and government departments on details of the facilities to be provided;
- (f) an all-weathered communal space was proposed underneath the Low Block. It would either be at grade or partly sunken with open design on the sides to enhance air ventilation and visual openness. There would be some commercial uses abutting the communal space and it would be a place for people to gather, sit out and exercise etc. The communal space

was close to an open space to be provided in another URA project at Kai Ming Street to the south;

- (g) the pedestrian environment of the Scheme area was currently unsatisfactory due to unauthorised occupation of pavement areas and parking at the roadside. The Scheme would involve closure and diversion of three existing road sections (i.e. portions of Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street and the whole section of Yuk Shing Street) to enhance walkability and street vibrancy. The planned pedestrian area in KCAA1 would increase to about 70% as compared to 60% without the Scheme. A footbridge was proposed at the western part of the Scheme area to connect with MTR To Kwa Wan Station across To Kwa Wan Road to enhance the overall accessibility of KCAA1; and
- (h) the Stage 2 Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Report indicated that about 61% of the 723 households and 59% of the 110 business operators supported, while 4% of the households and 6% of the business operators objected to the DSP. URA had organised briefing sessions to answer queries of those affected by the DSP and would continue to provide assistance in accordance with their existing practice.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during URA's presentation.]

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, continued to brief Members on the planning assessment of the draft DSP, as detailed in paragraph 11 of the Paper, that PlanD had no objection to the draft DSP including the proposed PR, BHR, exemption of floor space for GIC facilities required by the government; the restructuring and re-planning of the traffic and pedestrian network; and the proposed all-weathered communal space. Regarding the public comments received during the inspection periods, the planning assessments and departmental comments in the Paper were relevant and other matters relating to acquisition, compensation and re-housing would be dealt with by URA according to the established policies.

Proposed Amendments to the Approved OZP

17. Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, continued to brief Members on the proposed amendments to the approved Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/26 as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper. The amendments were to re-designate two existing developments zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) (the Kerry Hotel Hong Kong) and “CDA(2)” (the One HarbourGate) to appropriate zonings to reflect the Metro Planning Committee’s decision on 28.5.2021 on the latest CDA Review, as well as technical amendments to incorporate the latest Master Schedule of Notes (MSN) endorsed by the Board on 28.12.2018, and amendments to the Schedule of Uses to allow flexibility for planning application for ‘Flat’ use in “Commercial” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel” zones.

[Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting at this point.]

18. As the presentations of the representatives of PlanD and URA had been completed, the Chairperson invited Members to consider whether the draft DSP was acceptable for exhibition under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). She remarked that the Scheme now provided by URA was notional, mainly for providing background information to facilitate the Board to consider the DSP, hence Members should focus on considering the key parameters proposed in the DSP rather than the detailed design of the Scheme. URA and/or its joint venture partners would further work out details of the proposed scheme in the later stage. She also indicated that the other proposed amendments to the approved OZP were mainly to reflect completed developments and technical amendments. She then invited questions from Members.

Statutory Planning Matters

19. In response to a Member’s question and the Chairperson’s request, Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, explained the statutory planning procedures for the DSP and the planning controls proposed in the DSP. She said that URA submitted the draft To Kwa Wan Road/Wing Kwong Street DSP No. S/K9/URA3/A to the Board for consideration in accordance with section 25(5) of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance. If agreed by the Board, the DSP would be exhibited for public inspection in accordance with the provision under section 5 of the Ordinance. Representations to the DSP would then be processed according to the provisions under the

Ordinance. URA proposed that the Scheme area be zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with PR and BH restrictions stipulated under the Notes and the key planning and design features of the Scheme outlined in the Explanatory Statement (ES). The Notes and ES were included in Annex H of the Paper.

20. A Member enquired whether the BHR of 140mPD would be imposed for the whole Scheme area and whether there would be control on the building layout. The Chairperson further requested PlanD’s representative to explain and compare the key development parameters of the existing “R(A)” zone on the OZP and the one proposed in the DSP. In response, Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, said that under the existing OZP, the Scheme area was mainly zoned “R(A)” subject to a maximum domestic PR of 7.5 and total PR of 9 with some areas shown as ‘Road’. Under the DSP, the entire Scheme area was proposed to be zoned “R(A)” with the same PR restrictions. The BHR under the existing OZP was 100mPD and the proposed BHR for the DSP was 140mPD. It was also proposed in the DSP that certain uses that were normally permitted in the lowest three floors of a building or in the non-residential portion of an existing building be also permitted in ‘the purpose-designed non-residential portion of a building with the all-weathered communal space’. GIC facilities as required by the government were proposed to be exempted from PR calculation. There would be no control stipulated on the detailed design or building layout under the proposed “R(A)” zone although the main planning and design features of the Scheme were highlighted in the ES.

21. In response to a Member’s question on whether there were other examples to permit a podium with five-storey as proposed in the Scheme, Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, said that under “R(A)” zones, certain types of commercial uses were normally permitted in the lowest three floors of the building (excluding car parks and mechanical floors). She was aware of a previous planning application for a five-storey podium for commercial uses in Sham Shui Po.

Building Height and Visual Impact

22. A Member asked about the visual impact of the Scheme at 140mPD on the ridgeline; and whether the BHR could be further relaxed or the height of both residential towers be increased to 140mPD to maximise flat production. With the aid of a photomontage as viewed from the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre (which was one of the strategic view points from Hong Kong Island for ridgeline protection), Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, said that

although the Scheme at 140mPD would encroach into the 20% building-free zone for protection of the ridgeline, the Chatham Gate development (at +145mPD) was in the foreground and thus, adverse visual impact arising from the Scheme was not anticipated. Moreover, visual impact in the local context also had to be considered and the proposed BHR of 140mPD was considered compatible with the surrounding developments as shown in the photomontages for the local vantage points in Drawings 3A to 3G of the Paper. Besides, the Scheme at the proposed BHR could fully accommodate the proposed domestic PR of 7.5 and total PR of 9.0. Hence, it was considered that the BHR should not be further relaxed. Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, supplemented that the proposed BH of 140mPD would allow a staggered BH profile, achieve planning purpose such as the provision of a five-storey podium to address site constraints and provision of GIC facilities and would be compatible with existing and planned developments in the surrounding area, including Chatham Gate and Lok Man Sun Chuen upon its redevelopment. Further increase in BH might create wall effect.

23. In response to a Member's question on the separation distance between the Scheme area and the existing lower-rise buildings at Anhui Street and Kiang Hsi Street, Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, advised that the lower-rise buildings at Anhui Street, that was further west of the MTR To Kwa Wan Station, was about 200m from the Scheme area.

24. The Chairperson remarked that whilst the BHs of the residential towers under the Scheme were 110mPD and 140mPD, only a BHR of 140mPD would be stipulated in the DSP to provide design flexibility at the detailed design stage.

Development Intensity

25. In response to a Member's question on the feasibility of increasing the PR of the proposed redevelopment, Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, advised that the Kowloon Density Study (KDS) Review had recommended a domestic PR of 7.5 and total PR of 9.0 for the "R(A)" zones in Kowloon after taking into account constraints on infrastructural capacity. The same development intensities had been adopted in "R(A)" zones on all OZPs in Kowloon and West Kowloon. It was necessary to strike a balance between increasing flat production and sustainability of existing and planned infrastructure, and it was considered appropriate to retain the current PR restrictions under "R(A)" zones. Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, supplemented that according to their preliminary assessments, further increase in development intensity for the

Scheme would result in more massive podiums and increase the potential adverse visual and air ventilation impacts.

Building Design

26. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) flat size of the small to medium sized flats to be provided in the Scheme;
 - (b) whether there was building setback from To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road, and how the wall effect of the podium could be reduced, and how the streetscape and microclimate could be improved;
 - (c) BH of the Low Block;
 - (d) whether the overhang areas of existing buildings could be included in the net site for PR calculation;
 - (e) whether sufficient space could be provided along Ma Tau Wai Road for users of public transport;
 - (f) whether the footbridge and covered communal space were accountable for GFA calculation; and
 - (g) what waste management and recycling strategy was proposed in the Scheme or KCAA1.
27. In response, Messrs Wilfred C.H. Au and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, made the following main points:
- (a) for the Scheme, an average flat size of about 500 ft² was adopted as the assumption for conducting technical assessments. Whilst there was no restriction on flat size under the proposed “R(A)” zone of the DSP and the flat mix would be decided at the detailed design stage, it was URA’s policy

that flats in their projects should not be smaller than 300 ft² (excluding balcony areas). In some projects, URA had also stipulated that small and medium sized flats should not be more than 50% of the total number of flats in a project;

- (b) there would be setback at ground level along To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road and opportunities for road side planting to provide shading would be explored. Two urban windows with retail shop fronts were proposed to break down the podium façade and attract people to go into the communal space. In addition, the residential portion above podium would be setback from Ngan Hon Street by not less than 45m;
- (c) the proposed BH of the Low Block was about 32mPD;
- (d) whilst the Scheme area included pavement areas where the affected buildings had overhang, those pavement areas would be excluded from the net site area for PR calculation;
- (e) the reorganization of bus stops at Ma Tau Wai Road as well as the location of the footbridge landings would be considered with the relevant parties at the detailed design stage to provide a convenient and comfortable environment for people using public transport;
- (f) the footbridge and covered communal space would be countable for GFA calculation under the building regime; and
- (g) given the large number of households involved in KCAA1, it was difficult to provide centralised facilities for waste handling or recycling. However, URA would continue to explore means to facilitate waste reduction and recycling with their joint venture partners.

Air Ventilation

28. In response to a few Members' questions about the assessment on air ventilation submitted, Ms Katy Fung, DPO/K, explained that a qualitative air ventilation review (AVR) of

pedestrian level wind environment (which superseded the air ventilation assessment in the planning report) was submitted by URA. According to the AVR, the summer wind was from the southwest, and To Kwa Wan Road and Wan On Street (which would be reserved as open pedestrianised areas) would continue to serve as wind corridors to facilitate air ventilation. The east-west aligned Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street would continue to serve as wind corridors for the annual prevailing easterly wind. In addition, the AVR indicated that the proposed design features (such as not less than 45m building setback of residential portion above podium at the north-eastern boundary at Ngan Hon Street, provision of urban windows, the all-weathered and open design of the communal space as well as setback at ground level of the Low Block) could facilitate air ventilation.

29. In response to a Member's question on how the proposed urban windows and communal space could enhance air ventilation, Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, said that as the urban windows were aligned with Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street, it would facilitate the prevailing easterly wind to pass through the urban windows; and the communal space with open design would also enhance air ventilation within the Scheme area.

Public Open Space, Communal Space and Streetscape

30. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether more open space and greening could be provided within the Scheme area;
- (b) how the communal space underneath the Low Block could be connected to open spaces in other URA projects;
- (c) why the communal space was proposed to be a sunken design with steps which might not allow barrier-free access; and
- (d) whether roof-top of the Low Block could be used as an open space open for public use.

31. In response, Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) whilst the communal space proposed under the Scheme was about 700m² in area, there was ample public open space of about 9.3 ha within 300m of the Scheme area. Under the design intent of having small streets with active and vibrant shop fronts in the Scheme and KCAA1, there were lots of opportunities to provide landscaping along the streets. Additional landscaping would also be considered at the urban windows and along the footbridge;
- (b) under the district-based approach for KCAA1, there was a framework for integration of passive and active open spaces, provision of at-grade landscaped pedestrian walkways and setback areas at various project sites. The pedestrian area within the KCAA1 would be increased from 60% to 70% with the Scheme and the carriageway areas would be correspondingly reduced;
- (c) the communal space was intended to be a gathering place with activities and vibrancy. The semi-sunken design would facilitate air ventilation and the steps could also provide seating areas. Barrier-free access such as escalators would be incorporated into the design. The creation of a sunken level at the communal space could allow creation of underground connections to the surrounding project sites. However, whether a sunken communal space would be adopted was subject to detailed design; and
- (d) the use of the roof top would depend on the future use of the top level of the Low Block that was subject to detailed design. In general, the use of the public space would be subject to reasonable opening hours to minimize nuisance to residents in the residential towers and other users in the Low Block.

Pedestrian Accessibility

32. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the feasibility of a subway or at-grade connection to the MTR Station;
- (b) alignment and public access to the footbridge;
- (c) any pedestrian circulation plan or overall spatial planning to connect people and space (e.g. integrating the GIC facilities and communal space with other parts of the Scheme area, and providing connection between the MTR To Kwa Wan Station and other URA projects and public open space in the surroundings);
- (d) whether all-weathered pedestrian environment would be provided within KCAA1; and
- (e) future management responsibility and public access hours of the pedestrian streets.

33. In response, Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) the feasibility of a subway connection was the first option explored but the existing MTR tunnel under To Kwa Wan Road posed much constraint and would require deep excavation. Hence, the footbridge connection was considered the most preferred option. URA would also explore the feasibility of an at-grade crossing with the Highways Department;
- (b) the alignment of the footbridge was subject to detailed design and the initial proposal was for the footbridge landing to be near the urban window with public access to the communal space. The requirement for 24-hour public access to the footbridge as well as provision of the shortest route from the footbridge to the ground level would likely be stipulated as lease conditions;
- (c) following the district-based approach, the proposed pedestrian network, shopping streets, open spaces (e.g. piazza at KC-009 and open space in KC-013 to the south) and the communal space in the Scheme would

connect the different areas of KCAA1 and facilitate pedestrian accessibility. Access to the MTR To Kwa Wan Station would be provided via the footbridge. The Low Block and the communal space at its ground level would be a major focal point. Extension of the pedestrian connection to parks outside KCAA1 would need to be further explored with relevant government departments;

- (d) there was requirement for their joint venture partner to adopt design solutions that could enhance all-weathered and comfortable pedestrian environment in the projects; and
- (e) the existing public streets that were proposed to be pedestrianized and managed by URA would be open for 24 hours daily. For public space/streets which were created by voluntary setback within the sites, they would also be managed by the URA or their joint venture partners and the opening hours would likely align with those of the commercial uses, which was necessary to minimize nuisance to future residents.

GIC Facilities

34. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was scope to provide more GIC facilities to address the deficits in elderly facilities in Hung Hom, including the possibility to convert some commercial floor space for GIC uses; and
- (b) whether the floor space for GIC facilities in the Scheme was comparable to other URA projects.

35. In response, Mr Wilfred C.H. Au, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) according to their research, there was a large number of residential care home for the elderly in the Hung Hom area. Notwithstanding that, SWD initially advised that elderly facilities including a 200-place residential

care home for the elderly cum day care unit and home care services for frail elderly persons could be provided in the Scheme. According to their discussion with SWD, the proposed floor space of about 5,500 m² for GIC/social welfare facilities was appropriate. There might also be scope to accommodate some institution or community services operated by social enterprises within the commercial portion of the development; and

- (b) in another URA development scheme project YTM-012 (in Shantung Street/Thistle Street), GIC floor space equivalent to a similar PR of 1 was proposed and such provision was on the high side as compared with those provided in other URA projects in general.

Car Parking

36. In response to two Members' question about the car parking provision in the Scheme, Messrs Wilfred C.H. Au and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, advised that a total of 128 ancillary car parking spaces would be provided (i.e. 81 spaces, 42 spaces and 5 spaces for domestic, non-domestic and GIC uses respectively). The car parking ratio was one car parking space for 11 to 12 flats which was similar to those of other URA projects in the area. The provision was at the high end of the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

37. In response to another Member's question about car parking provision in the area, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, said that other than the ancillary car parking in the Scheme, a public vehicle park with about 100 spaces would be provided in the project KC-009 (at Bailey Street/Wing Kwong Street to the south of the Scheme area). In addition, a communal car park for accommodating ancillary car parking for a number of projects in KCAA1 would be provided at the project KC-010 (at Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street abutting the northern end of the Scheme).

Social Impact and Community Network

38. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) existing and planned flat number, flat size and population within the Scheme area and in the redevelopment project respectively;
- (b) how the SIA was conducted and what the main concerns of affected households/business operators were;
- (c) whether the likely usage of the communal space by domestic helpers had been taken into account in the SIA;
- (d) social impacts of URA redevelopment projects in KCAA1, and what the proposed measures were to minimize adverse social impact and facilitate re-building of community network;
- (e) what synergies could be created with cultural facilities in the district and whether space could be provided for cultural activities such as traditional festivals;
- (f) whether the Scheme would be the last project to be commenced by URA in the area; and
- (g) the impact of the Scheme and other projects in KCAA1 on the supply of low rental units in To Kwa Wan and what rehabilitation works would be undertaken by URA for the old buildings in the area.

39. In response, Messrs Wilfred C.H. Au and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA, made the following main points:

- (a) there were 418 existing flats in the Scheme area according to occupation permits of existing buildings, which accommodated about 720 households according to their survey, and the average floor space per household was 33.7 m². Upon redevelopment, there would be 900 flats (for 900 households) with an average flat size of about 46m²;
- (b) regarding the SIA, URA had conducted surveys with the affected households and business operators to collect their views. Their main

concerns were compensation and rehousing issues. In the past, the URA would only approach the affected residents regarding compensation and rehousing issues after approval of the projects. In recent years, they had implemented a “Project Engagement” programme and a special team would visit and engage the affected households and business operators at an earlier stage to explain the policies of URA, and compensation and rehousing arrangements etc. The purpose of these earlier contacts was to identify the specific needs of individual households and to offer assistance in a timely manner;

- (c) the respondents to the survey of the SIA and participants of their briefing sessions were mainly owners and tenants of the domestic units and business operators. Nevertheless, community participation would be carried out in future which could include collecting views of stakeholders including domestic helpers on the detailed design and proposed usage of the communal space;
- (d) 3,441 existing households were affected in the seven redevelopment projects commenced by URA since 2016, and URA had implemented those projects in stages to minimise the overall social impact and facilitate timely rehousing for affected residents. With regard to community network re-building, URA had gained experience from other projects such as at Wing Lee Street (H19) where a ‘community making’ approach was adopted to facilitate re-building of community network between existing and new households;
- (e) other than the Ko Shan Theatre, other cultural facilities in the district were mainly serving the locals. Whilst there was no particular cultural facilities proposed in the Scheme, the communal space could provide a gathering ground for holding various activities which might enhance integration of the community;
- (f) URA’s redevelopment projects were kept confidential until the day of commencement, therefore they were not in a position to advise whether the Scheme was the last project in KCAA1. URA would continue its

urban renewal strategy and, depending on the conditions and age of the buildings, undertake either redevelopment or rehabilitation; and

- (g) though redevelopment might affect the supply of rental housing units for low-income families, URA would provide assistance to affected households in their projects in accordance with their existing practice. Eligible domestic tenants would be re-housed in units provided by the Hong Kong Housing Authority or Hong Kong Housing Society and with such rehousing arrangements, the clearance rate for their projects in the area had reached over 90%. Under URA's rehabilitation strategy, they would continue and focus their work on rehabilitating 'younger' buildings within KCAA1 to prolong their lifespan and slow down the pace of urban decay.

Proposed Amendments to the draft OZP

40. Members had no question to raise on the proposed amendments to the OZP which were to reflect the completed commercial and hotel developments and other technical amendments.

[Dr Roger C.K. Chan, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Wilson Y.W. Fung and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting during the presentation and question sessions.]

41. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

42. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

[Messrs Philip S.L. Kan and Daniel K.S. Lau and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representation and Comments on the Draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/24

(TPB Paper No. 10744)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

43. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved the rezoning of a site donated by Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) and another rezoning to take forward the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee on a s.12A application No. Y/YL/11 which was submitted by Winpo Development Ltd., a subsidiary of New World Development Co. Ltd. (NWD). Representation and comments had been submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill, Winpo Development Limited represented by Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui Welfare Council Limited (SKH Welfare Council) represented by Arup. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - his firm having current business dealings with SHK and Arup; |
| Mr K.K. Cheung | - his firm having current business dealings with SHK, NWD, Arup, SKH Welfare Council, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm having business dealings with SHK, NWD, Arup, SKH Welfare Council and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - his firm having current business dealings with Arup, and his spouse being an employee of SHK; |

- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Company (1933) Limited (KMB) and SHK was one of the shareholders of KMB;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - his firm having current business dealings with SHK;
- Dr C.H. Hau - being a principal lecturer and programme director of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and K11 Concept Limited of NWD had been sponsoring his student projects in HKU since 2009;
- Ms Lilian Law - being a former Executive Director and committee member of The Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had received sponsorship from SHK; and
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which had received donations from Chow Tai Fook Charity Foundation (related to NWD).

44. Members noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Tai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had already left the meeting. Members agreed that as the item was procedural in nature, all other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

45. The Secretary briefly introduced TPB Paper No. 10744 (the Paper). On 29.1.2021, the Board considered and agreed that the Draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL/24 (the OZP) was suitable for publication under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. Upon expiry of the two-month exhibition period, one representation was received. On 9.4.2021, the representation was published for three weeks and three comments were received.

46. Since one representation and three comments were received, it was considered more appropriate for the full Board to hear the representation and comments without resorting to the appointment of a Representation Hearing Committee. In view of the similar nature of the representation and comments, it was recommended the hearing of the representation and comments be considered collectively by the Board. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representation and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for August 2021.

47. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representation and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter.

Agenda Item 57

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

48. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:05 p.m.