

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 14.10.2022)**

**Minutes of 1281<sup>st</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 16.9.2022**

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K5/URA3/1

(TPB Paper No. 10865)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Deliberation Session**

1. The Chairperson remarked that the hearing was to consider the representations and comments in respect of Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme Plan (the DSP). The DSP comprised Site A and Site B. Site A was proposed to be rezoned for residential development to provide about 830 flats while Site B was proposed to be rezoned for Government, institution and community (GIC) and open space uses. The majority of the representers/commenters supported the DSP whilst some opposed. Technical assessments had been conducted by URA and no insurmountable problems were anticipated. The Chairperson reminded Members that the Kim Shin Lane (KSL) redevelopment was another development project (SSP-017) being implemented by URA separately. The KSL Site fell within the “Residential (Group A)” zone and rezoning was not required.

2. The Chairperson further said that Cheung Sha Wan Catholic Secondary School (CSWCSS)’s swapping/relocating proposals appeared to be only put forward by C18’s representative at the hearing on the day and not much information was provided to support the

proposals. Planning Department (PlanD)'s representative and C1's representative had provided their preliminary views/assessments on the swapping/relocating proposals that might involve the following major issues/problems: (i) Site A was not large enough to accommodate a standard school for reprovisioning CSWCSS and a higher building height on Site A for school development was not in compliance with the requirements and was subject to Education Bureau (EDB)'s approval; (ii) the CSWCSS site was owned by CSWCSS under a special land lease which might increase complexity in the land matter; and (iii) re-planning works would be required and the consideration of seamless reprovisioning would lead to delay in the implementation programme of the DSP.

3. The Chairperson invited views from the Members. The Members generally supported the DSP having regard to its comprehensiveness with supporting leisure and community facilities. Members raised the following main comments/concerns:

#### *Supporting Views*

4. A Member noted the supporting views of the representers/commenters and expressed empathy with the KSL residents about their poor living condition and the desire for early redevelopment.

#### *Opposing Views – R269/C30's Representative's Views*

5. Two Members opined that the views of R269/C30's representative on carrying out property acquisition and redevelopment only when the property price was in an upward trend and the alleged URA's administration issue of not announcing the two projects properly were irrelevant considerations.

#### *Opposing Views – C18's Representative's Swapping/Relocating Proposals*

6. Some Members considered that there was no basis for the Board to agree to the swapping/relocating proposals as the proposals were only put forward by C18's representative at the hearing on the day and not much detail was provided. Besides, there seemed to be a lot of uncertainties/problems and all planning works would need to be redone which would lead to a long delay in the implementation of the DSP. Two Members said that identifying another

site for accommodating a standard school would be a better option for the long-term development of CSWCSS.

7. The Vice-chairperson opined that having considered that the DSP and the SSP-017 project were two separate projects and the DSP was comparatively not as urgent as the SSP-017 project for redevelopment, there might be scope for URA to further explore the swapping/relocating proposals with the school. If a win-win situation could finally be established, amendment(s) to the DSP could be made. A Member shared the Vice-chairperson's view and supplemented that the Government should pro-actively facilitate URA and CSWCSS to further discuss CSWCSS's concerns/proposals.

*Interface with CSWCSS/ Development Scheme at Site A*

8. With regard to CSWCSS's concerns over the potential impacts in respect of air ventilation, visual, sunlight penetration and noise on the school, some Members said that URA should be advised to establish a collaborative relationship with CSWCSS and liaise with CSWCSS to further minimise the potential impacts on the school at the design and construction stages. In particular, two Members suggested that wider building separation between the two residential towers and lower podium should be considered. Moreover, the exhaust outlets should not face CSWCSS.

*Development Scheme at Site B*

9. A Member opined that although there were some existing public car parking spaces at the Sham Shui Po Sports Ground, it was expected that some people would use private cars to get to the proposed public open space and GIC complex at Site B. Consideration could be given to providing some public car parking spaces at Site B or to providing more public car parking spaces at the Sham Shui Po Sports Ground for shared use.

*Others*

10. Two Members opined that CSWCSS seemed not familiar with the planning process and did not know how/when they should submit their views to the Board. It was suggested that suitable publicity such as outreach programme should be carried out for schools/general

public to let them know more about town planning and how they could participate in the planning process. A Member commented that the Government should consider assisting URA to carry out needy urban renewal projects that might not be financially viable on its own.

### *Conclusion*

11. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the DSP and agreed that the DSP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations, and that all grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10865 and the presentation and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. The Chairperson said that Members' views and suggestions, including those on close liaison between URA and CSWCSS to further enhance the design layout at Site A to address CSWCSS's concerns on air ventilation, visual, sunlight penetration and noise aspects and the possible provision of public car parking spaces at Site B, would be conveyed to URA for consideration. As for the suggestion to further explore CSWCSS's swapping/relocating proposals, the Chairperson remarked that it depended on CSWCSS's final decision of whether relocation was really required and EDB's views on the need for relocation. If required, under the prevailing mechanism, with the policy support from EDB, CSWCSS could submit a site search request to PlanD to identify a suitable site for accommodating a standard secondary school.

12. After deliberation, the Board noted the supporting views of Representations No. **R1 to R268** and decided not to uphold Representations No. **R269 and R270**, and agreed that the DSP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) is in line with the comprehensive and holistic urban renewal approach, the goal of improving quality of life of residents and the urban renewal objective of restructuring and replanning of concerned urban areas as stated in the Urban Renewal Strategy. With the planning-led approach and land use restructuring through the DSP, additional Government, institution and community facilities and integrated public open space within and surrounding the DSP will be provided to meet the needs of the community; and

- (b) there is no insurmountable technical problem arising from the DSP on traffic, environmental and air ventilation aspects as indicated in the technical assessments. The Urban Renewal Authority will engage the local stakeholders including Cheung Sha Wan Catholic Secondary School on the redevelopment and will liaise with the concerned government departments during implementation.”

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

14. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B, the Board’s decision on the draft DSP upon hearing of representations and comments would be kept confidential for 3 to 4 weeks after the meeting.