

**Minutes of 1262<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 7.1.2022**

**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

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr Gary C.H. Wong

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

Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr C.H. Tse

**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  
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu

## **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 1261<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 17.12.2021

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1261<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 17.12.2021 were sent to Members before the meeting. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 10.1.2022, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 10.1.2022 without amendment.]

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

### Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

#### (i) Approval of Draft OZP

3. The Secretary reported that on 7.12.2021, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Yuen Long Outline Zoning Plan (re-numbered as No. S/YL/25) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the draft plan was notified in the Gazette on 17.12.2021.

(ii) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Proposed Comprehensive Development with Wetland Enhancement (including House, Flat, Wetland Enhancement Area, Nature Reserve, Visitor's Centre, Social Welfare Facility, Shop and Services) and Filling of Land/Pond and Excavation of Land at Lots 1520 RP, 1534 and 1604 in D.D. 123 and Adjoining Government Land, Nam Sang Wai and Lut Chau, Yuen Long, New Territories (Application No. A/YL-NSW/242)

4. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was against the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s decision to reject on review an application (No. A/YL-NSW/242) for a proposed comprehensive development with wetland enhancement (including house, flat, wetland enhancement area, nature reserve, visitor's centre, social welfare facility, shop and services) and filling of land/pond and excavation. The appeal was heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) from November 2020 to March 2021. On 31.12.2021, the appeal was allowed by TPAB. Legal advice was being sought regarding TPAB's decision to allow the appeal and the Secretariat would report back to the Board in due course.

**General**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open meeting]

Briefing on Urban Renewal Authority's Yau Mong District Study  
(TPB Paper No. 10795)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

5. The Secretary reported that the Yau Mong District Study (the Study) was conducted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) for the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok areas (YM areas) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of URA. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the URA or AECOM; and/or owning properties in the areas:

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung<br>( <i>as Director of Planning</i> ) | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee;                               |
| Mr Andrew C.W. Lai<br>( <i>as Director of Lands</i> )    | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee;                               |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang<br>( <i>Vice-Chairperson</i> )     | - | 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  | - | having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;   |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong                                      | - | having current business dealings with URA and his spouse owning a flat at Prince Edward Road West, Mong Kok; |

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund (URF), 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;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung ]  
] being former directors of the Board of the
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] URF;  
]
- 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 URF;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues;

- Mr L.T. Kwok - the institution he was serving had received sponsorship from URA;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governor of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received funding from the URF before;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - co-owning with spouse a flat at Sham Mong Road, Mong Kok;
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - his spouse being a director of a company which owned a property at Nathan Road, Mong Kok; and
- Mr C.H. Tse - owning a flat at Canton Road, Mong Kok.

6. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai, Stanley T.S. Choi, L.T. Kwok and C.H. Tse had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and agreed that since the item was general in nature focusing on the briefing of key study findings/recommendations by the URA, all other Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

7. The following representatives from the URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr C.S. Wai ] Managing Director
- Mr Eric S.W. Poon ] Executive Director (Commercial)
- Mr Wilfred C.H. Au ] Director (Planning and Design)
- Ms Ophelia Y.S. Wong ] Expert Advisor (Planning and Design)
- Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak ] General Manager (Planning and Design)



8. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She remarked that urban renewal for the YM areas would be an incremental process to be implemented over a long period of time. The Study was aimed to kickstart the process and provide insights, as well as a broad framework and roadmap on the way forward. The briefing was arranged for URA to present to Members the key findings of the Study, and to exchange views with Members. This being the case, there would not be any recommendations requiring approval of the Board under the agenda item. Proposals to amend the Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) or endorse any relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines (TPB-PG) would be submitted for the Board's consideration at a suitable juncture in future. She then invited the representatives from URA to brief Members on the Study.

9. Mr C.S. Wai said that the Study covered an area of about 210 hectares. Many buildings in the YM areas were aged and dilapidated, with very little redevelopment potential. There was only a small number of redevelopments in the past. There was a need for new approaches to tackle the urban decay and the slow redevelopment momentum. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak then briefed Members on the background of the Study and the key findings and proposals as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10795 (the Paper).

[Ms Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting during the representation.]

10. As the presentation by URA was completed, the Chairperson invited comments and questions from Members.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

11. Members generally considered that the Study was comprehensive and had provided some good recommendations to tackle urban renewal issues in the YM areas. Some Members had the following comments and questions:

*General*

- (a) thinning out the population in the YM areas under the “-“ scenario and improvement in livability by increasing space on a per capita basis for the “+” and “0” scenarios were supported;

- (b) the “-“ scenario assumed a reduction of population for the YM areas by 63,000 persons. While such reduction in population might help enhance the overall living environment, some of the local stakeholders might not want to move out as they had strong sentiment for the area or just preferred to live closer to their work place;

*Facilitation of Urban Renewal and Private Participation*

- (c) agreed that there was a need to find ways to speed up the urban renewal process and measures to enhance the implementation mechanisms. Measures to expedite the rezoning process should be further explored. In this regard, whether the URA had proposed any mechanism for encouraging private land owners to participate in the urban renewal process;

*Building Height Restriction (BHR) and Air Ventilation*

- (d) with the proposal to increase the plot ratio (PR) at some sites, the relevant BHR might need to be relaxed to avoid resulting in bulky buildings. A varying building height profile would create a more vibrant skyline for the area. In this regard, the principle for protection of views of the ridgeline might need to be suitably relaxed for some sites with strong justifications. Nevertheless, due regard should be given to the overall visual impact on the area;
- (e) a comprehensive redevelopment strategy could provide an opportunity to improve the overall air ventilation for the area;

*Open Space and Tree Preservation*

- (f) the concept for the GreenLink and open space network with clear hierarchy and good spatial planning was supported. Synergising with the flower market, it was hoped that new visually-pleasing and vibrant public spaces

along the Nullah Road urban waterway could be created as a focal gathering place for the community's enjoyment;

- (g) URA might further explore the scope to provide additional open spaces on different levels of the future buildings/developments to create a three-dimensional public space network;
- (h) suitable mechanisms to enhance tree preservation in redevelopment projects should be proposed. There might be scope to explore off-site reprovisioning of affected trees;
- (i) urban biodiversity should be duly considered in the proposed green network;

#### *Transport Infrastructure*

- (j) URA might explore whether there was scope to enhance the infrastructural capacity on an area-wide basis to allow an increase of development intensities;
- (k) initiatives to promote smart mobility in the YM areas should be duly considered in a holistic manner;

#### *Transfer of Plot Ratio (TPR)*

- (l) TPR could be one of the innovative planning tools to consider for facilitating redevelopment of YM areas and to better utilise land resources. With more experience gained, consideration could be given to study whether such approach could be extended to other areas;

#### *Gentrification*

- (m) urban redevelopment might lead to substantial increase in price for both properties and daily necessities in local shops, which would become

unaffordable for the original residents. As a result, the original residents, workers and business owners, many of whom were grassroots or elderly, would be driven out. In this regard, whether the urban renewal process would address the social impact of gentrification of the YM areas;

*Preservation of Social, Historic and Cultural Elements*

- (n) the YM areas had a long history of settlement and commercial activities. There were many traditional shops in the YM areas, such as those in New Reclamation Street and Shanghai Street. The Jade Market in Yau Ma Tei, besides being a tourism attraction, also carried exceptional cultural and historic values, in that it was once the biggest market for jade trade in the world. In this regard, how the social, historic and cultural elements could be preserved in the urban renewal process;
- (o) there were a number of unique character streets in the area, for example the ‘Sneakers Street’ (i.e. Fa Yuen Street), ‘Goldfish Street’ (i.e. Tung Choi Street) etc. Efforts should be given to preserve the special character of these streets as much as possible, and to ensure the new buildings would be compatible with them;
- (p) while the resident population for the YM areas was about 200,000, many more people go to the YM areas for different purposes such as work or shopping on a daily basis. There were several thematic shopping streets, lower-end retail and trendy shops which were very popular amongst shoppers. A wide variety of shops and businesses, including many small businesses or start-ups by young people, were located in the area. During the redevelopment process, consideration should be given to creating an environment for these smaller businesses to continue to thrive while preserving the character of the thematic streets;

*Others*

- (q) some parties might have reservation on the iconic landmark proposed at the West Kowloon Gateway;
- (r) it was agreed that there was room to increase the PR of commercial sites at selected locations to increase financial viability for redevelopments; and
- (s) during the redevelopment process, suitable urban design and green building designs should be adopted to help achieve the environmental target for carbon neutrality.

12. Mr C.S. Wai thanked Members for their comments and support of the recommendations of the YM Study, and said that many of the issues faced in urban renewal could not be resolved solely by the work of the URA. Government policies, efforts from relevant government departments and participation of the private sector were all vital to the success of the urban renewal process. In terms of financial viability, if the URA were to shoulder the entire urban redevelopment of the YM areas, under the existing mechanism, the cost of resumption alone was estimated to exceed \$1,100 billion, incurring a \$400 billion net loss after discounting the revenue generated from the property developments, and the redevelopment of the area might take over ten decades to complete. That was clearly not a practical approach, therefore, new mechanisms had to be put in place to facilitate the redevelopment process to be undertaken by both the URA and the private sector. He then made the following main points in response to questions raised by Members:

*General*

- (a) there was a need for reducing the population in the YM areas in order to improve its livability. The three sets of Master Urban Renewal Concept Plans (MRCPs) under “+”, “-“ and “0” scenarios were aimed to provide a dynamic and responsive approach to be implemented over time to achieve the target of thinning out in the long run. In general, the “+” MRCP would be implemented first to create the resources needed to kick start effective urban renewal in the district; when land and financial resources were made

available from new land supply sources at the New Development Areas, “0” or “-” MRCs would be implemented to thin out the population and density to realise the Hong Kong 2030+ vision. However, whether the population for the YM areas could be thinned out eventually would also depend on the implementation of other government policies, such as those promulgated under Hong Kong 2030+;

*Facilitation of Urban Renewal and Private Participation*

- (b) at the moment, the interests from the private sector for redevelopment in the YM areas were generally very low. In the past 20 years, only 53 Occupation Permits (OP) were issued by the Buildings Authority in the YM areas for redevelopment of the existing domestic and composite buildings. By increasing the PR and gross floor area (GFA) permitted in some specific sites, the redevelopment potential could be increased to provide incentive for private sector to participate in urban redevelopment;
- (c) the designation of sites as “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) might not be suitable for area-wide urban redevelopment. As observed from past experience, implementation of “CDA” sites was often slow, partly due to the complicated development procedures involved. On a broader perspective, there might be scope for the government and the Board to streamline some of the development procedures under the building, lands and planning regimes. To further expedite the statutory planning process, the Board’s consideration of submissions could also be more focused on broad planning and urban design issues, rather than on detailed building design while the related technical assessments can be considered in a more scientific way;

*BHR and Air Ventilation*

- (d) the Study proposal to increase the PR at designated development nodes would inevitably result in taller buildings and might create some visual impact on the ridgeline. URA would handle the visual impact issue

diligently, strive to minimise any such impact and adopt suitable mitigation measures;

- (e) URA would take due consideration the incorporation of green and smart building features in its redevelopment projects at implementation stage with a view to creating a desirable urban environment and work towards carbon neutrality;

#### *Transport Infrastructure*

- (f) one of the major constraints to further increase the overall PR in the YM areas was the infrastructural capacities. It was impractical for the URA to overhaul the infrastructure within the existing urban fabric of the YM areas. As such, it was more feasible to increase the development intensities at selected sites at suitable locations;

#### *Gentrification*

- (g) if URA did not step in to drive the redevelopment of YM areas, many of the residents in the area would soon face problems associated with urban decay such as deteriorated living environment and hygiene conditions. However, the newly redeveloped buildings would be built to meet the latest prevailing standards that would substantially improve the living environment in YM areas. Shortage of land and housing units was the main cause of elevating property prices;

#### *Preservation of Social, Historic and Cultural Elements*

- (h) at project implementation stage, the URA would conduct social impact assessment to identify the socio characteristics and to propose mitigation measures. On the aspect of preservation of historic structures, streets or areas with special characters were identified in the Study and some 30 heritage buildings on top of those graded by AMO, were proposed for preservation;

- (i) since YM areas were already densely built-up, it was practically impossible to identify decanting sites within the areas to rehouse all affected residents. While it was inevitable that some of the current residents or business owners of the YM areas would be displaced during the lengthy urban redevelopment process, suitable support would be provided to assist the affected stakeholders;
- (j) it was important to differentiate and identify the elements that were truly worthy of preservation. An area-wide urban renewal plan could offer opportunities to resolve issues of urban decay at the fundamental level while creating resources to preserve selected suitable social/historic/cultural elements and characters of the YM areas;

*Others*

- (k) the proposed West Kowloon Gateway would serve as an extension to the West Kowloon Cultural District, connecting the old YM areas to the attractions and transport hub in West Kowloon;
- (l) the development of multi-level public spaces could be explored;
- (m) on character streets, it was proposed to preserve the character of these streets which were assets in the area to add tourism appeal. These streets were proposed to be rezoned to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” to reflect its planning intention, to meet demand for commercial uses and to enhance vibrancy; and
- (n) the URA would soon conduct a carbon neutrality review covering its works.

13. The Chairperson remarked that the Members generally appreciated the effort of the URA in putting forth proposals for urban renewal of YM areas. The findings of the Study were noted. The URA had provided some directions that could be further explored in order to incentivise private sector participation in the urban renewal process. For the way forward



outlined in paragraph 38 of the Paper, some of the tasks might commence in 2022, such as working out the first batch of OZP amendments on increasing PR for the Nathan Road commercial spine, and incorporating interchangeability between domestic and non-domestic uses for “Residential (Group A)” and “Residential (Group E)” zones. Criteria and requirements for transfer of PR would be drawn up and be submitted to the Board for consideration separately when ready. The implementation mechanisms for the street consolidation area and other proposals would be further explored down the road.

14. As Members had no further question, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comment in respect of the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/27  
(TPB Paper No. 10796)

---

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

15. The Secretary reported that the amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) involved two sites in Hung Hom area and representation/comment were submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill (R2/C1). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation with the representer/commenter or owning property in the Hung Hom area:

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung   | - his firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;            |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai | - his former firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; and |

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - owning a flat in Hung Hom.

16. Members noted that Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and agreed that as Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the representer/commenter (R2/C1)'s submission, he could stay in the meeting.

17. Members noted that a set of replacement pages (Annex IV) which was an extract of the Board's minutes of meeting held on 18.6.2021, was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

18. The following government representatives and representer/commenter or the representative of the representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

#### ***Planning Department (PlanD)***

Ms Katy C.W. Fung ] District Planning Officer/Kowloon  
(DPO/K)

Mr C.H. Mak ] Senior Town Planner/Kowloon  
(STP/K)

#### ***Representers/Commenter***

##### R1 – Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

*Designing Hong Kong Limited* ] Representer's Representative  
Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel

##### R2/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill ] Representer and Commenter

19. 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 and comment. The representers and commenter would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenter and their representative 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 representers, commenter and their representative had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenter or their representative. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representers, commenter and their representative would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comment in their absence and inform the representers and commenter of the Board's decision in due course.

20. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comment.

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, briefed Members on the representations and comment, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views of the representers and commenter, planning assessments and PlanD's responses to the representations and comment as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10796 (the Paper).

22. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenter and their representative to elaborate on their representations/comment.

#### R1 – Paulus Johannes Zimmerman

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel made the following main points:

- (a) in recent years, the focus on harbourfront development had gradually shifted from making the waterfront accessible to linking up the various waterfront and creating spaces for users to stay and experience the waterfront;
- (b) many of the waterfront promenades around the Victoria Harbour lacked sitting areas and dining facilities. On the other hand, taking the examples of Sai Kung, Stanley and Discovery Bay, there were alfresco dining facilities near the waterfront and those were very popular for visitors and very vibrant;

- (c) the Paper indicated that by not stipulating a mandatory requirement for provision of alfresco dining in the non-building area (NBA) at the sites rezoned to “Commercial (7)” (“C(7)”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Hotel (1)” (“OU(Hotel)1”) (the representation sites), it could provide more flexibility for the developers/operators. However, such approach was ineffective in bringing about the needed dining facilities for creating a vibrant waterfront;
- (d) when the developer of the Kerry Hotel at the “OU(Hotel)1”) site consulted the then Harbour-front Enhancement Committee (HEC), a photomontage with alfresco dining in the area designated as NBA was shown to the HEC. However, such vision for alfresco dining had not been realised and much of the NBA was currently fenced-off;
- (e) similar issue was observed at the waterfront development at the ex-North Point Estate (i.e. the Harbour North development). There was difference between the photomontages presented by the developer at the planning stage and the actual development. For Harbour North, there was only one dining facility near the waterfront promenade. Most shops could only be accessed from within the shopping mall with blank walls and plant rooms facing the waterfront. The public at the waterfront promenade could only see the ‘back’ of the shops, affecting the enjoyment of the waterfront promenade;
- (f) taking the example of Papillons Square in Tseung Kwan O South, the alfresco dining there used to be very popular. However, the outdoor seating area of the restaurants had to cease operation due to complaints from the residents above. If the provision of alfresco dining was stated clearly in the OZP and the relevant lease/sales brochure of the development, there would be public expectation for alfresco dining facilities and the potential dispute between restaurant operators and occupants/users of the building could be avoided; and

- (g) the open space in the NBA at the “C(7)” site was mainly a landscaping area with a narrow passageway for the public. The 30m-wide NBA which could be opened for public’s enjoyment was fenced off.

[Professor Johnathan W.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

R2/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

24. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) it was unclear why the proposed amendments to the Hung Hom OZP involving sites in Hung Hom and the Urban Renewal Authority To Kwa Wan Road/Wing Kwong Street Development Scheme Plan (the DSP) involving a site at To Kwa Wan were bundled under one paper for consideration by the Board in June 2021 but now the representations for the two plans were presented in two papers to be considered separately under different agenda items at the meeting today;
- (b) the seat of the district council member of the constituency covering the subject area in Hung Hom was vacated during the plan amendment period, hence the claimed public consultation process was flawed and ineffective;
- (c) she was a frequent visitor to the area near the representation sites. It appeared that the 6,200m<sup>2</sup> of gross floor area (GFA) for eating place and shop and services uses as required under the Notes of the OZP had not been provided within the “C(7)” site;
- (d) there was a 1.2 ha deficit of district open space provision under the Hung Hom OZP. The patch of green space within the “C(7)” site was fenced off. Instead of serving as a public open space (POS), the only part of the 30m-NBA that was accessible to the public was a narrow passageway linking up the inland to the waterfront promenade. The terrace at One Harbour Gate at the “C(7)” site was only accessible by workers/users of that building. On weekends, the Hung Hom Promenade was frequently

visited by the public, including many families and domestic helpers. There were concerns that if the areas designated as NBA along the southern boundaries of both representation sites were used by the adjoining commercial developments for retail and catering, it would result in gentrification of the waterfront area with the selling of food and drinks that were not affordable for most visitors;

- (e) she objected to allowing residential use on application within “Commercial” zones, including the representation site zoned “C(7)”. Otherwise, the public areas might turn into a ‘private’ garden for residents and the residents might also complain about catering facilities at the waterfront;
- (f) the section of the Hung Hom Promenade adjacent to the representation sites was situated in a prime location, and the existing commercial buildings and hotel thereat were not noise-sensitive users. The public should be allowed to have 24-hour access and use those areas for a wide variety of activities, including those that might at times generate some noise nuisances if near residential areas;
- (g) the completed developments were different from what the developers had ‘promised’ at the planning stage. The Board should not become a rubber stamp and approval of the OZP should be put on hold until the developers implemented what they had ‘promised’; and
- (h) appropriate action should be taken to address the lack of facilities for public use in the area. Consideration should be given to using the NBAs at the representation sites for shops/facilities selling/offering affordable items/services to the general public.

25. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative, the representers, commenter and their representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, commenter, their representative and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the

Board or for cross-examination between parties.

26. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

- (a) whether there was any restriction on the OZP and the relevant land leases for alfresco dining within the area designated as NBA within the representation sites, and if there were any controls for uses within the NBA and/or its opening hours;
- (b) whether the relevant Planning Brief (PB) had stipulated alfresco dining as a mandatory provision in the NBA of the "C(7)" site ;
- (c) whether there were justifications to revert the amendments on the OZP on the grounds that the current use in the NBA was different from the illustrations/photomontages presented to the then HEC;
- (d) what the implications were if the Board was to revert the zoning of representation sites to the original zonings; and
- (e) why the representations for the OZP and the DSP were considered separately.

27. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the representation sites were located adjacent to the Hung Hom Promenade which was managed by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. A 10m-wide NBA was designated along the southern boundary of both sites. According to the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP and the PB for the sites, alfresco dining without building structure might be provided within the NBAs. A 24-hour public passageway connecting the inland to the waterfront promenade was provided within the 30m-wide NBA on the eastern boundary of the "C(7)" site. According to the relevant leases, the NBAs were mainly intended for provision of boundary walls, pedestrian

links, landscaping and playground equipment for children. If alfresco dining was to be provided within the NBA, it would require approval by the Director of Lands based on the lease requirement;

- (b) the representation sites were previously zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (“CDA”) on the OZP. The then HEC and Kowloon City District Council had been consulted on the PBs of the sites before the PBs were endorsed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board in 2009. The relevant s.16 planning applications for submission of Master Layout Plans (MLPs) for the two sites, making reference to the endorsed PBs, were approved in 2012 and 2013. Subsequently, the developments at the sites were completed in accordance with the MLPs and Occupation Permits had been issued by the Building Authority. According to the usual practice, sites zoned “CDA” would be rezoned to appropriate zonings to reflect the completed development. During the “Review of Sites Designated “CDA” on Statutory Plans in the Metro Area for the Years 2019/2021”, the Board agreed that the two sites should be rezoned to appropriate zonings. The requirements under the PBs and MLPs had been duly considered by PlanD when proposing the current zonings and development restrictions for the representation sites;
- (c) according to the PB for the previous “CDA” zone of the “C(7)” site and restrictions under the “C” zoning, provision of alfresco dining in the NBA was allowed, but not mandatory. The OZP had already provided the flexibility but whether the property developer would provide such use was mainly a business decision;
- (d) if the Board decided to revert the representation sites to the original “CDA” zoning, all future development/change in uses would need to obtain planning permission from the Board; and
- (e) as the amendments shown on the draft OZP and the DSP both fell within the Hung Hom planning scheme area, they were considered together by the Board in June 2021. Since the representations and comments received from the public on the OZP and DSP had different focuses, the Board



agreed on 17.12 2021 to consider the representations and comments for the OZP and DSP separately.

28. On the issue of land leases for the representation sites, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands, supplemented that while he did not have the two relevant leases in hand, generally speaking, the Lands Department would prepare special conditions in the leases taking into account the comments and requirements of relevant government departments.

[Post-meeting note: According to the land leases of the two representation sites, no building or structure shall be erected in the NBA except boundary walls / fences, landscaping features and facilities, playground equipment for children as well as the specified Pedestrian Link and the Pedestrian Walkway. There is no requirement on the provision of alfresco dining.]

29. A Member noted that alfresco dining was always permitted in the NBAs of the representation sites under the OZP. In that regard, the Member asked the representative of R1 if he had any opinion on the considerations of the property owners/operators for not providing alfresco dining at the location. In response, Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel, representative of R1, said that it could be due to the costs associated with installation of filtration system to treat the fume generated by restaurant use and/or noise issues often associated with alfresco dining. The complicated licensing procedures might also be one of the reasons.

30. In response to the query from a Member, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R2/C1) said that the 6,200 m<sup>2</sup> of GFA that was planned for eating place and shops and services uses in the “C(7)” site as stipulated under the OZP had not been realised. Affordable shops and convenience stores should be provided along the waterfront to benefit the public. In that regard, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, pointed out that the 6,200m<sup>2</sup> of GFA for eating place and shops and services uses had been provided within One Harbour Gate at the “C(7)” site within the two two-storey blocks fronting the promenade. However, the relevant floor space in one of the blocks was unoccupied at the moment. Another Member asked Ms Mulvilhill whether there was any basis for her statement that the Board would be rubber-stamping in approving the draft OZP, Ms Mulvihill reiterated that the OZP should not be approved until the retail facility at the “C(7)” site was implemented as ‘promised’ by the developer.

31. As Members did not have further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives, the representer/commenter and the representative of representer for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comment in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenter of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives, the representer/commenter and the representative of representer left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

32. The Chairperson remarked that the representation sites were previously zoned "CDA" and the PBs had been endorsed and MLPs were approved by the MPC. The amendments on the draft OZP were mainly to reflect the as-built conditions of the two sites, following the decision of the Board in the latest round of CDA review. Sufficient flexibility had been provided in the current zonings to allow alfresco dining use within the NBAs.

33. Some Members considered that even if there were differences between the photomontages presented by the developers at the design stage (i.e. with alfresco dining within the NBAs) and the actual situation currently at the sites, whether or not to provide such uses was a commercial decision of the relevant property owners. Another Member shared the views of the representers that merely providing landscaping within the NBA could not achieve vibrancy as stated in the ES. Whilst agreeing that the Board should not control design details, specific planning objectives, such as visual permeability and public access could be stated in the ES as appropriate in future projects.

34. A Member pointed out that the ES for the representation sites stated that alfresco dining without building structure might be permitted within the NBAs along the southern boundaries so as to enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront promenade. Another Member said that the Board often considered planning applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions based on merits of the proposals, in particular the proposed planning and social gains. Therefore, it could be a matter of concern if the developer did not implement the proposal as submitted or presented to the Board. In response, the Chairperson said that if the planning gain of a development proposal formed the fundamental basis for the Board's approval, suitable approval conditions could be stipulated to ensure the planning gain could be realised. For planning and design elements that were not major considerations of the Board, it was generally

not necessary to spell out the details in the Notes or the ES.

35. The Chairperson further remarked that the types of businesses and facilities that would be provided at the representation sites depended on market forces and whether the waterfront promenade was frequently visited. In that regard, the Harbour Office of the Development Bureau was working actively on place-making projects on various waterfront promenades along the harbour. If the section of waterfront promenade at Hung Hom became more popular in future, the developers might have a stronger incentive to provide suitable facilities to serve the visitors.

36. Members generally agreed that there was no justification to amend the OZP as sufficient flexibility had been provided to accommodate alfresco dining or shop and services at the representation sites.

37. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R1 and R2 and considered that the draft Hung Hom OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reason:

“the rezoning of the sites from “CDA” zones to “OU(Hotel)” and “C(7)” zones with appropriate development restrictions is to reflect the completed hotel and commercial developments at the sites which were developed in accordance with the endorsed PBs and approved MLPs. The rezoning is considered appropriate.”

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

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority To Kwa Wan Road/Wing Kwong Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA3/1

(TPB Paper No. 10797)

---

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

39. The Secretary reported that the draft Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was located in Hung Hom and submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). Representations/comments had been submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill (R13/C23), URA (C1) and Designing Hong Kong Ltd (DHK) (C22). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the representers/commenters or owning properties in the Hung Hom area:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung<br><i>(as Director of Planning)</i> | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee;  |
| Mr Andrew C.W. Lai<br><i>(as Director of Lands)</i>    | - | being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee;  |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang<br><i>(Vice-Chairperson)</i>     | - | 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                                      | ] |   |
|  | ] | having current business dealings with   |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong                                    | ] | URA;  |
|  | ] |   |

- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA and DHK and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with URA and DHK and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund (URF), 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;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung ]  
] being former directors of the Board of the  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] URF;  
]
- 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 URF;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues;

- Mr L.T. Kwok - the institution he was serving had received sponsorship from URA;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governor of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received funding from the URF before; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - owning a flat in Hung Hom.

40. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai, Stanley T.S. Choi and L.T. Kwok had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang had already left the meeting. Members also agreed that the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai, Y.S. Wong and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong were direct and they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item; and as the interests of Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu, Wilson Y.W. Fung, Daniel K.S. Lau and Peter Yuen, Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were indirect, and Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the representations/comments, they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung and Andrew C.W. Lai left the meeting temporarily, and Mr Y.S. Wong, Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

41. Members noted that a set of replacement pages (Annex III) which was an extract of the Board's minutes of meeting held on 18.6.2021, was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

42. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters 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 and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

43. The following government representatives and representers/commenters or the representatives of the representers/commenters were invited to the meeting at this point:

***Planning Department (PlanD)***

Ms Katy C.W. Fung - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Mr C.H. Mak - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

***Representers, Commenters and their Representatives***

R4 - Lai Sik Kau

Mr Lai Sik Kau - Representer

R5 - Bright Success Holdings Limited

Mr Yeung Wai Hong Tommy - Representer's Representative

R6 - Cheng Cheung Ming

Mr Cheng Cheung Ming - Representer

R13/C23 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

C1 - URA

Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan ]

Ms M.P. Kwan ] Commenter's Representatives

Mr T.W. Law ]

C8 - Chiu Shing Hung

Ms Chiu Ching Hung ] Commenter

Mr Cheng Man Chu ] Commenter's Representative

C13 - Hon Shing Yuen

Mr Hon Shing Yuen ] Commenter

Ms Cheng Oi Lan ] Commenter's Representative

C22 - DHK

Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel - Commenter's Representative

44. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submissions. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters and their 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 all attending representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers, commenters or their representatives and PlanD's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

45. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

46. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr C.H. Mak, STP/K, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background and key parameters of the DSP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses to the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10797 (the Paper).

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting at this point.]

47. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.



R4 – Lai Sik Kau

48. Mr Lai Sik Kau said that he was the owner of a shop on the ground floor of Wong Teck Building. He did not support the DSP as Wong Teck Building was relatively new and in acceptable conditions and demolishing it for redevelopment would involve substantial cost and create a large amount of waste that was not environmentally friendly. Furthermore, the additional gross floor area (GFA) that could be achieved upon redevelopment was very limited.

R6 – Cheng Cheung Ming

49. Mr Cheng Cheung Ming said that he was also an owner of a shop on the ground floor of Wong Teck Building and he agreed with the viewpoint of R4. Wong Teck Building was in better condition than many surrounding buildings and it did not suffer from any structural problems. Moreover, Wong Teck Building had undergone major rehabilitation only about 10 years ago. As such, it should be excluded from the redevelopment project.

R13/C23 – Mary Mulvihill

50. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) The DSP incorporated the public roads into the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone to increase the plot ratio (PR) and GFA in the redevelopment project. No information on the rezoned road area was provided. URA claimed that they were going to provide more pedestrian walkways and open space within the street areas. However, by expunging the streets, there was no gain for the community. The pedestrianised streets would become ‘managed’ and the public would not have the opportunity to freely use the streets for activities. Furthermore, whether a street should be pedestrianised was for the Transport Department, rather than the URA, to decide;
  - (b) URA proposed an all-weathered communal space (AWCS) in the redevelopment to create a focal point for community gathering. There was no information on tree planting. No active recreation facilities nor children’s play area was proposed in the project. URA should strive to provide these

much-needed recreational facilities whenever possible;

- (c) URA's primary intention was to privatise the public space that belonged to the community as reflected in the Shantung Street/Thistle Street project where public open space (POS) and facilities such as public toilets, which were supposed to be accessible by the public around the clock, were closed. It was feared that the POS in DSP would eventually become 'private gardens' for the residents living in the towers above and be closed off early to avoid causing nuisance to the residents;
- (d) as observed from the redevelopment projects by URA at Fa Yuen Street/Sai Yee Street/Nelson Street and at Lee Tung Street, the open spaces provided were unsatisfactory, lacked seating areas and often with planters blocking the passageway. There were similar problems in many other projects of the URA;
- (e) the old area of To Kwa Wan was pleasant to walk around as the pavements were relatively wide and sheltered. There were also many interesting small shops in the area. However, the proposed footbridge would take pedestrians away from the street level and ruin the ambience;
- (f) the proposed development would intrude into the building-free zone for protection of the ridgeline. PlanD's response that visual impact would not be significant because the Chatham Gate development in the foreground of the URA project had already penetrated into the zone was unacceptable. The panoramic view of the ridgeline as viewed from the Victoria Harbour might eventually be destroyed if there were more similar projects in the future;
- (g) the information on the deficit of community facilities in the area against the requirements in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was not provided in the Paper. The URA should strive to provide a residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) and other community facilities with higher capacity;

- (h) the communal space underneath the Low Block was undesirable. That design concept was similar to the sunken plaza proposed in URA's project at Kai Tak Road/Sho Po Road which served no purpose except as an entrance to a pedestrian subway that connected Kowloon City and Kai Tak Development; and
- (i) the URA projects only gentrified the old areas and pushed out existing residents and businesses.

### C1 of – URA

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms M.P. Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) the subject redevelopment project (i.e. KC-016) was part of a holistic plan for redevelopment projects in the surrounding street blocks which they named Kowloon City Action Area 1 (KCAA1). URA had commenced seven other redevelopment projects in the vicinity of KC-016;
- (b) in the KCAA1, URA had adopted a planning-led, district-based approach with an objective to re-structure/re-plan the pedestrian network and street layout of the area to enhance walkability and the pedestrian environment;
- (c) to minimise disturbance to local residents, redevelopment and restructuring of roads and pedestrian walkways, rehousing and business relocation would all be carried out in phases;
- (d) upon proposed pedestrianisation of Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street and re-routing the vehicular traffic under other redevelopment projects, the overall ratio of pedestrian area to carriageways in KCAA1 would be 70:30 and its central area could become a car-free zone. The AWCS would be located in the central area, and together with the pedestrianised area, a focal point for community gathering could be created;

- (e) the Occupation Permit of Wong Teck Building was issued in 1974. Based on URA's assessment, the condition of Wong Teck Building was considered acceptable. The most recent building rehabilitation works were completed in 2012. Wong Teck Building would be more than 50 years of age by the time the DSP was implemented. Exclusion of Wong Teck Building, which was located in the centre within KCAA1, from the project would jeopardise the holistic planning for the area. Wong Teck Building would become isolated and surrounded by new developments. Based on the Social Impact Assessment conducted, more than half of the respondents of Wong Teck Building supported the redevelopment project and only 10% had objections;
- (f) a responsive design with a staggered building height profile with residential towers at 110mPD and 140mPD as well as a low block would be adopted to ensure adequate air ventilation and minimise visual impact on the surrounding areas;
- (g) government, institution and community (GIC) facilities with GFA equivalent to a PR of 1 were proposed within the development;
- (h) the proposed podium of the residential towers was mainly to mitigate the traffic noise and air quality impacts generated by the nearby major roads. By adopting such design, the residential floors could be located at higher levels and further away from the abutting main roads. Two urban windows at To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road would be provided to enhance air ventilation into the inner area of KCAA1, create points of visual interest as well as reduce the visual bulk of the podium;
- (i) building setbacks would be provided along To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road to further enhance walkability and the pedestrian environment; and
- (j) as an initiative under URA's revitalisation strategy, a footbridge linking up the development with the MTR To Kwa Wan Station would be explored in order to provide a safe and more direct access route across To Kwa Wan Road in addition to the existing at-grade crossings.

52. Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan said that the proposed residential tower at 140mPD would not breach the ridgeline and the Chatham Gate development in the foreground would completely block the view of the residential tower when viewed from the Strategic Viewing Point at the Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre.

C8 – Chiu Shing Hung

53. Ms Chiu Shing Hung said that she had been living in Wong Teck Building for a long time. The unit she was living in had minor problems such as water leaks and building materials were peeling off from the walls. She supported the redevelopment of Wong Teck Building. It was hoped that the compensation from the URA could be sufficient for the residents in Wong Teck Building to relocate to decent sized flats or they be rehoused by the government so that their living environment could be improved.

C8 – DHK

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel made the following main points:

- (a) it was unclear whether sufficient POS would be provided in the proposed redevelopment. He was worried that the problems regarding the POS in URA's redevelopment at Lee Tung Street, Wan Chai, namely The Avenue, would be repeated in the current project in To Kwa Wan;
- (b) a POS at The Avenue was located on the 5/F of the podium and the entrance was obscured with insufficient signage for visitors, resulting in under-utilisation of the POS. The URA should learn from experience gained from their previous projects to ensure such problems would not be repeated in the subject redevelopment;
- (c) POS in URA redevelopment projects often lacked facilities that matched the needs of the community, such as children's play facilities; and

- (d) according to the HKPSG, pedestrianised streets should not be counted towards open space provision. Currently, the streets within the DSP had very little traffic and they were utilised by residents for impromptu social and recreational activities. If the streets were privatised and managed, they would become dominated by brand name shops and restricted for activities. Redevelopment projects would often completely change the social fabric of the area and displace existing residents and businesses, like in the Lee Tung Street project.

55. As the presentations of government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, commenters, their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

56. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

- (a) the size of the proposed AWCS and whether the requirement for its provision was stipulated in the Notes of the DSP;
- (b) whether there was a deficit in the provision of GIC facilities in the area; and
- (c) whether the proposed RCHE with 200 beds could help address the shortage in the Hung Hom area.

57. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the Notes of the DSP had stipulated that an AWCS would be provided in the "R(A)" zone but a minimum size had not been stipulated. There was no information provided in URA's submission in this regard;

- (b) a table showing the GIC facility provision for the Hung Hom planning scheme area was included in TPB Paper No. 10743 considered by the Board on 18.6.2021. The types of facilities in deficit included district open space, secondary school classrooms, hospital beds, child care centre, day care centre/units for the elderly, home-based community care services and RCHE beds; and
- (c) the proposed RCHE with 200 beds in the project could help alleviate the shortage, reducing the deficit from about 600 to 400 beds. If there were other major public housing developments or redevelopments in the area in the future, there would be scope to provide more suitable GIC facilities to serve the district.

58. The Chairperson and some Members raised questions on the following aspects to the URA (C1):

*The Redevelopment Scheme*

- (a) the number of residential units to be provided upon redevelopment and their average sizes as compared to the existing conditions;
- (b) what the measures were to improve the pedestrian environment, and what the planning and design merits of the proposed footbridge and the urban windows were;
- (c) which party would be responsible for the management and maintenance (M&M) of the proposed AWCS;
- (d) whether the access road to the carpark near the urban window at Kai Ming Street would be in conflict with the pedestrianised streets;
- (e) whether the proposed buildings would intrude into the 20% building-free zone below the ridgeline;

- (f) whether the subject site had any special character like Lee Tung Street mentioned by the representer/commenter;
- (g) whether any POS was at podium level and how the POS figure was calculated;

*Synergy with the surrounding URA Projects*

- (h) how the redevelopment could create synergy with the other URA projects in its vicinity and bring planning gain for the wider area;
- (i) what the justifications were for including Wong Teck Building in the redevelopment;

*Compensation and Relocating*

- (j) what the compensation and rehousing arrangements for the affected residents and shop owners were;

*Other Issues*

- (k) whether there was suitable monitoring mechanism to ensure the holistic planning concept of the KCAA1 would be realised; and
- (l) whether the area was served by sufficient recreation facilities.

59. Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan and Ms M.P. Kwan, representatives of C1, made the following responses:

*The Redevelopment Scheme*

- (a) there were currently 410 residential units (according to the general building plans) within various buildings on the DSP. Based on their notional scheme, about 900 units, with an average size of about 46m<sup>2</sup>, would be provided in the redevelopment. It was assumed that each unit would accommodate an



average of 2.3 to 2.5 persons. Residential flats in URA's redevelopment projects had a minimum size of about 28m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to about 300 ft<sup>2</sup>). The actual range of flat size would depend on the eventual design adopted by the developer;

- (b) two urban windows with a minimum width and height both of 15m were proposed as part of 'good design measures' to enhance the local environment. Not only would they serve to enhance the breezeways at pedestrian level, they could also allow visual permeability and reduce the visual bulk of the podium by breaking it into smaller sections. The widening of footpaths and provision of canopies along the streets would be further explored in the detailed design stage. The proposed footbridge connecting the development to the MTR To Kwa Wan Station was not part of the redevelopment project but a separate revitalisation initiative that was welcomed by the Kowloon City District Council to improve accessibility and connectivity for the area. The footbridge would also facilitate easy and barrier-free access to the GIC facilities located in the podium of the development by members of the public coming from the MTR Station. The ownership and M&M arrangement for the footbridge was subject to further discussion with relevant government departments. In the interim, an alternative crossing along To Kwa Wan Road was under discussion with relevant government departments;
- (c) the AWCS below the Low Block was covered and not enclosed. A sunken design was proposed with wide stairs and space for performance or other activities. The M&M arrangement of the AWCS was yet to be confirmed but URA would ensure the associated responsibility and cost would not be passed onto future owners of the domestic units;
- (d) the two proposed urban windows were aligned with Kai Ming Street and Hung Fook Street. The current proposal with entrance to the car park on Kai Ming Street had taken into account the technical constraints as well as the comment from the Transport Department. The exact location of the ingress/egress would be finalised at the detailed design stage. As the

redevelopment would provide only about 114 car park spaces and some loading/unloading bays, the traffic generated was expected to be quite low and unlikely to affect the pedestrian environment;

- (e) the building height of the tallest building was 140mPD. The five-storey podium would accommodate commercial and GIC facilities. The podium was required to elevate the residential floors for mitigation of noise and air quality impacts generated by nearby major roads. Based on the visual impact assessment conducted, the proposed building with a building height of 140mPD at the representation site (the Site) would marginally intrude into the 20% building-free zone below the ridgeline as viewed from the Strategic Viewing Point at Hong Kong Convention and Exhibition Centre. The buildings in the proposed development would not be visible from viewpoints along the harbour as they would be blocked by other existing developments in the foreground;
- (f) the ground floor shops in the Site were mainly occupied by car repair workshops and there was no special character along these streets;
- (g) no POS on podium level was proposed by URA for the subject project;

*Synergy with the surrounding URA Projects*

- (h) based on the District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) study, URA had undertaken a district-based planning study for KCAA1. The URA aimed to improve the living environment of the district through holistic master planning and large-scale public consultation was conducted as part of the study. The redevelopment at the Site would create a synergy with other nearby URA projects, all of which had either commenced or were being tendered. The proposed AWCS at the Site could create a focal point for social gatherings and would also serve other residents living in the area. Some 5,000m<sup>2</sup> of GFA in the redevelopment would be designated for the provision of elderly care facilities and social welfare facilities would also be proposed in the DL-8:KC project within KCAA1. It should be noted that

the Site was previously zoned “R(A)” on the Hung Hom OZP before the DSP was gazetted. If the Site was to be redeveloped by private developers, they would not be required to provide POS, GIC facilities or adopt various design measures for the benefit of the wider district;

- (i) Wong Teck Building had undergone major building rehabilitation works in 2012 and the current situation of the building was acceptable. Normally, rehabilitation works would be carried out every ten years. In considering whether a building should be included in the redevelopment, building condition was only one of the many factors. From a holistic planning perspective, Wong Teck Building was located in the central area of the KCAA1 project and it was undesirable to exclude it from redevelopment area. If the building was to be excluded, it would not be possible to close Yuk Shing Street and properly restructure the surrounding pedestrian and road network nor provide the AWCS. It would significantly undermine URA’s effort to redevelop and revitalise the area in a holistic manner. More than half of the respondents from Wong Teck Building supported redevelopment of the building;

#### *Compensation and Rehousing*

- (j) URA would offer compensation in accordance with the prevailing policies taken into account the market value of the relevant properties and whether the person affected was the owner or occupier of the properties. The actual compensation would be calculated based on the method approved by the Legislative Council in 2001. In accordance with the Urban Renewal Strategy promulgated in 2011, the URA would provide assistance to shop owners to relocate their businesses as far as practical and there were also social worker teams to facilitate communication between the URA and the affected locals;

#### *Other Issues*

- (k) there were seven URA redevelopment projects around the Site. Six projects

were entirely within and in line with the development controls of the “R(A)” zone and planning permission from the Board or amendment to the OZP was not required. The project KC-010 at Hung Fook Street was the subject of another DSP that was agreed by the Board a few years ago. Besides URA’s own monitoring, Lands Department could also monitor the implementation of the projects through conditions of the land lease of the individual projects. Furthermore, the road works, including modification and closure of existing streets, were/would be gazetted under Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370) and any objections from the public would be processed according to the established mechanism. All of the above would contribute to an effective mechanism to ensure proper implementation of the redevelopment plan; and

- (l) Hoi Sham Park was located in the vicinity of the Site and was easily accessible. There were also other pocket parks and playgrounds in the area. Within KCAA1, the proposed AWCS at the Site and the POS adjacent to project KC-012/013 abutting the pedestrianised section of Kai Ming Street would serve all members of the public in the future.

60. The Chairperson noted that the provision of an AWCS had been stated in the planning intention of the “R(A)” zone in the Notes of the DSP and details were further elaborated in the relevant Explanatory Statement (ES). She asked the representatives of PlanD and URA whether indicating the minimum size of the AWCS in the ES, for the sake of enhancing transparency and stating expectation, would be suitable. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, said that the URA’s proposal for AWCS was preliminary in nature and its size and the detailed design would need to be worked out in the subsequent stages. The current construction of the Notes was aimed to provide some flexibility for the URA. Notwithstanding that, if there was information available from the URA on the minimum size of the AWCS, it could be incorporated into the ES of the DSP as appropriate. In that regard, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, representative of C1, said that the AWCS with the surrounding uncovered landscaped area in the notional scheme was about 500m<sup>2</sup> in area. Since the design of the AWCS was still preliminary in nature and subject to change, if a minimum GFA for the AWSC was to be stipulated, it might restrict the future design of the AWCS and cause dispute on whether the uncovered landscaped area could be counted towards the provision. It was more desirable to retain sufficient

flexibility in that regard.

61. 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 and comments in closed meeting and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer and commenters and their representatives and PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 20-minute break.]

62. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung and Andrew C.W. Lai rejoined the meeting at this point.]

## **Sai Kung and Islands District**

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 158 S.C RP in D.D. 238, Pan Long Wan, Clear Water Bay, Sai Kung (TPB paper No. 10798)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

63. The Secretary reported that on 7.12.2021, the applicant requested deferment of consideration of the review application for three months to allow time to consult relevant government departments and for preparation of further information (FI) to address their comments. It was the first time that the applicant requested deferment of the review application.

64. Members noted that the justifications for deferment met the criteria as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33A) in that the applicant needed more time to consult relevant government departments and prepare FI to respond to their comments, the deferment period was not indefinite, and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties. Notwithstanding the above, it was set out in TPB PG-No. 33A that normally the applicant would be given two months for preparation of submission of FI.

65. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer a decision on the review application for two months, instead of three months sought by the applicant, pending the submission of FI from the applicant. The Board agreed that the review application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of FI from the applicant. If the FI submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the review application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board’s consideration. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of the FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

66.           There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:05 pm.