

**Minutes of 1287<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 20.1.2023**

**Present**

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

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

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory North)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Stanley C.F. Lau (a.m.)

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang (p.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works),

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong

Transport Department

Mr Horace W. Hong

Director of Lands

Mr. Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District (Acting)

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

**In Attendance**

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (a.m.)

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong (a.m.)

Ms Carmen S.Y. Chan (p.m.)

1. The Board noted that it was the last Town Planning Board meeting attended by Mr L.T. Kwok. On behalf of all Members, the Chairperson extended a vote of thanks for Mr Kwok's contribution to Town Planning Board over the years.

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1286<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 16.12.2022**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1286<sup>th</sup> meeting were circulated to Members on 16.1.2023 and no comment was received. The minutes were confirmed by circulation on 17.1.2023 without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) **Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP)**

3. The Secretary reported that on 10.1.2023, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Chek Lap Kok OZP (renumbered as No. S/I-CLK/16) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The approval of the draft OZP was notified in the Gazette on 20.1.2023.

(ii) **Reference Back of Approved OZP**

4. The Secretary reported that on 10.1.2023, the CE in C referred the approved Ho Chung OZP No. S/SK-HC/11, the approved Kwu Tung South OZP No. S/NE-KTS/18, the

approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/35, and the approved North Point OZP No. S/H8/26 to the Town Planning 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 20.1.2023.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng joined the meeting at this point.]

### **Tsuen Wan & West Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/35  
(TPB Paper No. 10878)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

5. The Secretary reported that the Amendment Items (the Items) on the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/35 (the OZP) were mainly to take forward some of the recommendations of the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS) conducted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), for which AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant, and agreed by the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board). A representation was submitted by the Hong Kong Institute of Planners (HKIP) (R2) and three comments were submitted by URA (C1), Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) (C2) and Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design (HKIUD) (C3).

6. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

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

- Mr Andrew C.W. Lai  
(*as Director of Lands*) - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and a member of its Committee;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, a member of Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee of URA and a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM, and his spouse owning a property in Mong Kok which was covered by Item C to which representations had been made;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund and being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues, and her mother-in-law owning a property in Mong Kong which was covered by Item C to which representations had been made;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former Executive Director of URA;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang  
(*Vice-Chairperson*) - being a former Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, 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 a former director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his former serving organisation had received sponsorship from URA;
- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Professor John C. Y. Ng - being a member of HKIP, HKIA and HKIUD; and
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of HKIA and HKIUD.

7. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai, Timothy K.W. Ma and Ms Lilian S.K. Law were considered direct, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members agreed that the interests of Dr C.H. Hau, Messrs Ben S.S. Lui, Lincoln L.H. Huang, Ricky W.Y. Yu, Wilson Y.W. Fung, Daniel K.S. Lau, K.L. Wong, L.T. Kwok and Vincent K.Y. Ho were indirect and they could stay in the meeting. As Professor John C.Y. Ng and Mr Franklin Yu, who had not yet joined the meeting,

had no involvement in the submission of the concerned representation/comments, they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

8. The Chairperson said that notifications 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.

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

#### **Government Representatives**

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

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Mr Derek P.K. Tse | - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Mr Clement Miu    | - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)       |

#### **Representers and Commenters**

##### **R1 – The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)**

##### **C4 – Li Man Fei**

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Poon Fu Kit Benson | - Representer's/Commenter's Representative |
| Li Man Fei         | - Commenter                                |

##### **R5/C5 – Mary Mulvihill**

- |                |                             |
|----------------|-----------------------------|
| Mary Mulvihill | - Representer and Commenter |
|----------------|-----------------------------|

##### **C1 – URA**

- |                        |                              |
|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mak Chung Kit Lawrence | ] Commenter's Representative |
|------------------------|------------------------------|



Wong Yuen Sheung Ophelia ]  
Hui Ka Lam Carol ]

C3 – HKIUD

Cheung Man Ching Anthony - Commenter's Representative

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

11. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the draft OZP, the grounds/views of the representers and commenters and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10878 (the Paper).

[Mr Franklin Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during the presentation by PlanD's representative.]

12. The Chairperson then invited the representer, commenters, and representer's/commenters' representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments:

R1 –REDA

C4 – Li Man Fei

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Poon Fu Kit Benson made the following main points:

- (a) REDA fully supported the approach taken by URA in resolving the urban decay problem in Yau Mong District (the District) as there had been a lack of incentives for the private sector to participate in the urban renewal process. REDA also supported the major recommendations of the YMDS that were reflected in the OZP amendments;
- (b) REDA had proposed design and planning principles in the representation that were similar to those they made in 2018 in respect of the review of the draft OZP No. S/K3/31, including increasing development intensity and building height (BH) to incentivize the private sector, allowing design flexibility for constructing more sustainable buildings, allowing more public space/visual amenities/wind penetration at ground level, improving urban design of the District, and adopting floor-to-floor height (FTFH) that followed the latest market trend and sustainable design;
- (c) there was a dire need for redevelopment to expedite the urban renewal process. The District was facing a two-fold ageing problem, i.e. a large proportion of existing buildings were in an old and decaying state together with the burden of an increasing ageing resident population;
- (d) the proposals to relax development restrictions and expand land use options would enhance financial viability in speeding up the urban renewal process, encourage amalgamation of sites, increase the redevelopment potential, and improve the environmental quality, urban design and cityscape;
- (e) the relaxation of building height restrictions (BHRs) would provide more flexibility for building form, innovative design and reducing podium bulk,

by which visually interesting skyline could be created and downwash effect facilitated to improve air ventilation on the ground level. It would also allow flexibility to establish landmark buildings on both sides of Nathan Road, which was the key commercial spine of the District. Taller buildings with smaller development footprint could also allow more at-grade public open space;

- (f) the adoption of FTFH that met the market trends for sustainable buildings would allow flexibility in the design of interior space to accommodate supporting facilities, achieve sustainability standards for current high-quality office developments, provide better indoor environment for people to live and work in, enhance ability to capture more natural sunlight and ventilate areas of a building, create a sense of spaciousness for users to reduce psychological stress, and enable flexibility for future changes of use on the commercial floors;
- (g) the removal of plot ratio (PR) restriction of 12 would allow developments to adopt the maximum PR of 15 under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) for “Commercial” (“C”) zones, which would greatly enhance incentives and financial viability for private sector to pursue redevelopment and revitalization, and provide more flexibility for future high-quality commercial developments;
- (h) the enhanced interchangeability between domestic and non-domestic PR for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zones would enable greater flexibility in financial investment for the private sector to respond to market trends and redevelop their properties;
- (i) the amendments to the OZP represented an improvement to PlanD’s assumptions adopted for the previous amendments on the OZP No. S/K3/34. The current amendments had factored in the latest development trends, technical and design flexibility, and reasonable impact of development controls to ensure that the existing private property

development rights could be achieved under B(P)R; and

- (j) the relaxation of BHR would result in negligible to slightly adverse visual impacts that only a small portion of buildings, if built to the maximum of relaxed BH, would encroach into the 20% building free zone when viewed from the strategic viewing point at Central Pier No.7. However, the impact could be well justified by good design and planning merits.

## C1 – URA

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence made the following main points:

- (a) the YMDS completed in 2022 identified that there was a growing urban decay problem in the District. There were over 65% of the buildings with age more than 50 years, 47% in “marginal” or “varied and “poor” conditions and 37% were “three nil” domestic buildings. Given the inadequate incentive for private initiatives, limited redevelopment projects were carried out in the District in the past 20 years. The vision of YMDS was to regenerate the District into a livable, sustainable, diverse and vibrant metropolitan hub while reinforcing it as an area representing the rich local and cultural heritage of Hong Kong;
- (b) YMDS had developed three scenarios of Master Urban Renewal Concept Plans (MRCPs) with varying development intensity, i.e. ‘+’, ‘0’ and ‘-’ scenarios. The YMDS recommended adopting MRCP ‘+’ as the first step to envision growth and livability, focusing on steering economic growth, and to generate an increase in gross floor area (GFA). The MRCP ‘-’ scenario had made reference to the assumptions adopted in Hong Kong 2030+. The adoption of specific development scenario by the Government would depend on resource availability. The current approach, i.e. ‘+’ as a starting point with gradual move to ‘0’ and ‘-’ scenarios as the ultimate goal, was considered pragmatic when land and financial resources were available;

- (c) the MRCP developed an overall framework for the District with comprehensive network of development nodes (DNs), street consolidation areas (SCAs) and other special design/community area with public open space and corridors;
- (d) apart from existing planning tools such as upzoning, rezoning and site amalgamation, new planning tools, namely transfer of PR (TPR), SCAs and interchangeable domestic and non-domestic PR, were introduced under YMDS to facilitate urban redevelopment;
- (e) the increase in overall allowable GFA through better spatial planning and urban design could provide larger living space to residents and improve the living environment;
- (f) 18 technical assessments, amongst which 11 were related to environment, had been carried out to ensure that the OZP amendments were technically feasible and without insurmountable problems;
- (g) the current OZP amendments were the first batch of amendments to be carried out. While the MRCP '+' scenario was the first step, it was hoped that the thinning out vision (i.e. MRCP '-') under the Hong Kong 2030+ would be progressively achieved. Further liaison with the Government on the new planning tools would be carried out with a view to encouraging private sector participation in urban renewal;
- (h) the increase in PR of "C" zone was to strengthen Nathan Road as a key shopping street/commercial spine and to incentivize redevelopment;
- (i) YMDS had recommended 48 ha of open space to serve a total population of 213,000 persons under the MRCP '+' scenario. Such provision was based on a distinctive open space network well connected to and integrated with the proposed DN's and other key amenity features. An ample provision of Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities had

also been recommended under YMDS; and

- (j) URA was glad to see that the Government had taken forward the recommendations of YMDS and the new planning tools such as TPR identified therein. Urban renewal was a multi-faceted task which could not solely be done by URA. Collaboration among different stakeholders including the Government, developers, property owners and professional bodies was crucial. It was hoped that another batch of OZP amendments would be carried out to take forward more of the recommendations of YMDS.

### C3 – HKIUD

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Man Ching Anthony made the following main points:

- (a) HKIUD generally had no objection to the OZP amendments. While the ageing problem of buildings in the District was serious, the relaxation of BH and PR restrictions would provide financial incentive for redevelopment and catalyze the urban renewal process in the District. Moreover, the Government should justify whether the infrastructure and community facilities were sufficient to serve the increase in population and traffic;
- (b) there was reservation on the blanket approach in relaxing the BHRs, as it might result in monotonous BH profile in the area. There should be measures to encourage building variations with a view to attaining vibrancy of the cityscape. For instance, BH variation might facilitate the provision of open space on the ground floor of the development. While there was the mechanism of minor relaxation of BHR, developers upon application for such might find it difficult to obtain approval from the Board;
- (c) air ventilation assessment and traffic impact assessment were required to

justify that the relaxation of BH and PR restrictions would not adversely affect local air movement or induce unbearable adverse traffic impact;

- (d) HKIUD supported the “Other Specified Use” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) zone and considered that such zoning should be encouraged in other districts, as it could create vibrancy, and allow people to work and live within the same building by which the need for commuting would be reduced and hence, less burden on street traffic;
- (e) while the relaxation of BH and PR restrictions was aimed to allow comprehensive urban redevelopment in the District, individual owners of some small buildings might take advantage of the relaxation and redevelop their buildings individually. Such individual redevelopments might result in high-rise buildings on small sites and undermine the holistic redevelopment approach and there should be measures to minimise their emergence;
- (f) taking the examples of Champs-Élysées in Paris and an underground space in Malaysia, urban renewal should be done comprehensively with upgrading of streetscape, recreation areas, GIC facilities, pedestrian and transport facilities such as rationalisation of bus lines, instigation of central car parking facilities, multi-level pedestrian network, etc., and all these could only be led and done by Government;
- (g) the Transport Department (TD) should not insist on adopting a high-end car parking ratio for developments in the urban core. It was noted that for some developments, up to seven basement levels were required for provision of car parking spaces in order to meet the high-end ratio which was considered unreasonable. A low-end ratio should be allowed for developments located in proximity to MTR stations and public transport termini/interchanges. Besides, the Government should consider taking the lead to provide satellite centralized car parks so as to reduce traffic flow into the urban core area. Taking the centralised carpark planning in Munich in Germany as an example, selling the rights of using the parking

spaces in such centralized car parks to the developers in the area for fulfilling the car parking requirement could also help enhance the efficient use of land of development sites in the urban core area; and

- (h) TPR and SCAs might exacerbate the “upzoning” magnitude under the current OZP amendments. To allow TPR or SCA, future project proponents should ensure that infrastructure capacities would not be severely compromised and the Board should only approve TPR or agree to SCA where there were good urban design merits and public gains, e.g. enhancement of air ventilation, greening and pedestrian environment.

R5/C5 – Mary Mulvihill

16. With the aid of visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to Items A1, A2, B and C while supported Item D. She fully supported the representation submitted by the HKIP (R4);
- (b) the focus of YMDS was exclusively on optimizing redevelopment potential. The proposals of YMDS had completely neglected the interests of the lower income residents currently living in the District by not providing public or subsidized housing;
- (c) while there were numerous media reports on the presence of vacant commercial units, and the Board had approved many planning applications for rezoning commercial sites for residential use, including a number of which located in the District, it was questionable whether there was shortfall in commercial sites as identified in the Hong Kong 2030+. Besides, there had been a shift of commercial activities to the border areas, and there were new central business districts planned for the Northern Metropolis and Lantau and the recent announcement of development in Tseung Kwan O. The need for additional commercial space in the District was unjustified;



- (d) there was no setback requirement for development along Nathan Road and hence, rows of massive developments along the pavements of which were anticipated. Also, there was no requirement for conducting of daylight assessment under relevant regulations/guidelines;
- (e) there was no assessment on the increase in BHR for individual sites and rows of monotonous blocks and uniform height with similar design and façade might be resulted;
- (f) the increase in PR would have significant impact on traffic, natural light penetration and air ventilation. The current traffic congestion problem in the District had all along been horrendous and the future traffic impact due to increase in PR was overlooked. The amendments by allowing more GFA were merely for the interests of developers, while the well-being and good health of both the residents and general public were ignored;
- (g) there would possibly be adverse impacts on visual openness, permeability and access to sky view in the District, and some buildings upon redevelopment to the relaxed BHR would encroach into the 20% Building Free Zone below the ridgelines;
- (h) the planned population of the OZP Planning Area had been underestimated and the existing and planned GIC facilities were generally inadequate in meeting the demand. In particular, there were deficits in the provision of local and district open space and the situation would be worsened with the increasing working population in the District. The surplus open space provision in West Kowloon and Tsim Sha Tsui could not help resolve the deficit problem as the open spaces were not within walking distance of the District. There were also deficits in the provision of a number of GIC facilities, such as pre-school/day rehabilitation services; and
- (i) Item D2 was supported as the site would be returned to the public realm, preventing further exploitation under the development initiative of “single site, multiple use”.

17. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representer, commenters, and representer's/commenters' representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer, commenters, representer's/commenters' representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties.

*MRCP scenarios and Relaxation of PR restrictions*

18. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the current OZP amendments following the MRCP '+' scenario were technically feasible and sustainable;
- (b) how the MRCP '-' scenario with reduction in population in the District could be achieved;
- (c) whether it was the first time PlanD initiated increase in PR restrictions on OZP in the urban area;
- (d) whether developments on small sites within "C" zone could achieve the maximum PR as regulated under B(P)R; and
- (e) with the increase in PR as per the current amendments, whether there would still be scope for minor relaxation through planning application in future.

19. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the OZP amendments, including relaxation of PR and BHR, were made in accordance to MRCP '+' scenario. A series of technical assessments had already been carried out by URA to demonstrate that the amendments were technically feasible and would not create insurmountable impacts;

- (b) according to population projection of Territorial Population and Employment Data Matrix (TPEDM) of PlanD, there was a trend of declining population in the Yau Tsim Mong District for about 11% (from about 324,900 to about 289,200) during the period of 2021 to 2029. While more land resources were made available in the Lantau Vision, New Development Areas and Northern Metropolis, etc., the population in the existing metro area, including the District, was envisaged to be thinned out as envisioned under HK2030+;
- (c) the PR restriction of 12 as recommended under the Kowloon Density Study had been imposed for “C” zone on the OZP since 1993 after taking into account the traffic and sewerage capacities in the Kowloon area. Since then, it was the first time that PlanD had initiated extensive removal of PR restriction of “C” zone for the Mong Kok OZP in order to take forward the recommendation of YMDS. The maximum PR would be capped by B(P)R (i.e. PR 15 for non-domestic building). Various technical assessments were undertaken by URA to confirm that the increase of PR from 12 to 15 would not cause insurmountable problems, in particular on traffic and sewerage aspects;
- (d) for the sites within “C” zone, BH assessments were carried out by URA to confirm that the maximum PR of 15 under B(P)R could be achievable even for small development sites; and
- (e) the provision for minor relaxation of PR was stipulated under the Notes of the OZP, and such application would be considered on case-by-case basis and should be supported by technical assessments agreed by relevant departments;

*Planning Tools and Comprehensive Redevelopment*

20. Some Members raised the following questions to URA:

- (a) whether URA considered the existing planning tools sufficient in achieving the redevelopment proposals in YMDS; and whether there were any mechanism to avoid piecemeal redevelopment or high-rise buildings on small sites in the District or any incentives to encourage small developers/owners to amalgamate their sites for redevelopment;
- (b) whether the new planning tools could benefit the small to medium-scale developers who might be less competitive in terms of resources; and
- (c) whether URA had any plan to preserve the unique local character of the District, in particular those character streets, during the urban renewal process.

21. In response, Ms Wong Yuen Sheung Ophelia, representative of C1, made the following main points:

- (a) to take forward the redevelopment proposals under YMDS, apart from the existing planning tools such as upzoning, rezoning and site amalgamation, some new planning tools including, TPR, SCA and interchangeable domestic and non-domestic PR were introduced. TPR allowed transferring of development potential from sending sites to receiving sites within the same district, such that the overall development density would not be intensified at district level. For SCAs, land parcels were grouped and demarcated into larger development sites for holistic redevelopment, and planning briefs/layout plans would be prepared to guide the redevelopment therein and specific urban design requirements, e.g. building separation and setback, could be suitably reflected on the OZP or in land lease. URA would continue liaising with the Development Bureau (DevB) on the details of new planning tools;

a holistic approach had been adopted in YMDS in formulating the redevelopment proposals for the District. It was considered that the new planning tools such as TPR and SCA would incentivize the developers to amalgamate smaller sites for more holistic redevelopment in order to

achieve a higher PR. YMDS also recognized that rationalization of the existing grid-pattern road network might facilitate site amalgamation. Hence, YMDS had identified a number of roads that could be closed for pedestrians and open space use, and adjoining small street blocks could be amalgamated to form larger and more cohesive redevelopment sites. In addition to SCAs, five DNs were proposed at strategic locations for anchor developments. Apart from planning tools, URA considered that land premium concession was also an important incentive;

- (b) the planning tools and initiatives mentioned above would encourage site amalgamation, which could allow the participation of small and medium-scale developers. URA would continue to study other planning tools that could provide more incentives for site amalgamation and private sector's participation in urban renewal; and
- (c) URA valued the local character of Mong Kok area and they had guidelines on minimizing the impact on the existing local shops. The new planning tools recommended under YMDS also helped preserve local character and ambience of the area. The major character streets in Mong Kok, including Flower Market Road, Tung Choi Street and Fa Yuen Street, were identified under YMDS to be rezoned from "R(A)" to "OU(MU)" on the OZP to encourage flexibility in commercial mix, which could enhance street vibrancy. Besides, URA had plans to facilitate restoration of street stores at the character streets if the concerned sites were to be redeveloped.

22. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, supplemented that the current OZP amendments including rezoning of the sites along character streets from "R(A)" to "OU(MU)", deletion of PR restriction of "C" zone along Nathan Road, relaxation of domestic PR from 7.5 to 8.5 for "R(A)" and "R(E)" zones etc., were the first batch of OZP amendments to take forward YMDS's recommendations. It was envisaged that the OZP amendments could provide incentives for private sector to participate in urban renewal in the District. Besides, the relaxed BHRs, which had taken into account the permissible PR and Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, would provide greater flexibility in building design, with a view to enhancing the overall urban design and environment of the area concerned, and could in turn

incentivize urban renewal of the area and its surroundings.

23. The Chairperson supplemented that DevB was currently liaising with URA on the implementation details of the new planning tools including TPR and SCA as recommended in YMDS. DevB was also reviewing the requirements in respect of compulsory sale for redevelopment and other related policies to encourage amalgamation of smaller sites for comprehensive redevelopment.

#### *Mixed-Use Zoning*

24. A Member invited Mr Cheung Man Ching Anthony, representative of C3, to further elaborate their vision and concept regarding mixed-use zoning. In response, Mr Cheung said that land use zoning was itself an old concept which was deployed to separate different land uses. The current trend on mixed-use development, however, as per the example of the Barangaroo of Sydney, was to integrate the living and working spaces together within the same building. Such kind of mixed-use concept would not only benefit the convenience of the residents by reducing the need for commuting, thus creating less burden on street traffic, but also enhance vibrancy within the development and in the surrounding area.

25. A Member noted that the Notes of the “R(A)” and “OU(MU)” zones were rather similar and asked how the mixed-use concept and its flexibility could be achieved via the designation of “OU(MU)” zone. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, said that while some development restrictions previously stipulated under “R(A)” zone, including maximum domestic and total PR restrictions of 7.5 and 9.0 respectively, and permitting commercial uses on the lowest three floors of an existing building, had been maintained, the new “OU(MU)” zone also allowed commercial uses in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of a new or an existing building. This fine difference would provide much greater design flexibility for new or converted buildings, enriching the mix of domestic and commercial uses in a composite development to echo with the highly mixed-use character of the areas. However, domestic and non-domestic portions were still needed to be segregated within a composite development, which was considered appropriate in order to avoid co-location of incompatible uses found in the “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) zone in the past.

*Urban Design*

26. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any mechanisms to ensure that the future redevelopment/development in the District would be of good urban design quality whilst achieving the maximum development potential, and any incentives to encourage more innovative and better urban design;
- (b) how the redevelopment proposals under YMDS would enhance greening in the District; and
- (c) how URA's vision of improving the pedestrian environment for sites involving both private and Government lands would be realized.

27. In response, Ms Wong Yuen Sheung Ophelia, representative of C1, made the following main points:

- (a) planning briefs with stipulation of urban design requirements would be prepared to guide the major future redevelopment within SCAs and DNs. There would be stipulations of open space requirements (i.e. minimum 30% for development area within DN) and minimum greening ratio (i.e. not less than 50% for district park, not less than 30% for other smaller open spaces and not less than 20% for private developments). The current Urban Design Guidelines under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) had also set out relevant guidelines on good urban design. However, specific urban design elements varied from site to site, and would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis;
- (b) to enhance greening in the District, a comprehensive open space network comprising inter-district green features (i.e. urban waterway and green link) and district/local parks was proposed. According to the MRCP proposals, the open space provision within the YMDS's area would increase from 16 ha to 48 ha. For instance, a Central Urban Park of more than 9,000m<sup>2</sup>

was planned in the centre of the District. Moreover, six east-west green corridors of at least 10m wide were planned to enhance air ventilation and connectivity in the area; and

- (c) the road layout of the District was in grid pattern with many roads intersecting development sites, and some of the roads were considered not necessary after the assessment under YMDS. For SCA, URA would take up the design and implementation responsibilities of the closed roads. With the understanding that small developers might have difficulty to take up the management of the closed streets, if any, URA would take the initiatives in suggesting to the Lands Department different proposals on road/street closure.

28. In response to Member's question on the mechanisms to ensure good urban design quality for redevelopment projects, Mr Cheung Man Ching Anthony, representative of C3, said that the various planning tools introduced by YMDS were useful, however, urban design requirement should vary from site to site taking into account the unique characteristics of individual sites. It would be crucial that large-scale developments should be planned with good urban design. The Government could also consider gathering urban design ideas through public participation and design competitions.

29. A Member enquired whether any specific urban design elements of the current Urban Design Guidelines under HKPSG had been laid out as reference for developers to guide future developments and application of minor relaxation of development restrictions. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, responded that application for minor relaxation would be considered on its own merits and assessed by relevant criteria, such as those stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP for relaxation of BHR, including amalgamating smaller sites for achieving better urban design and local area improvements, providing better streetscape/good quality street level public urban space, and providing separation between buildings to enhance air ventilation and visual permeability, etc.

#### *Car Parking Facilities*

30. Some Members raised the following questions:



- (a) noting that some public vehicle parks (PVPs) were proposed at the periphery of the District under YMDS, with a view to reducing traffic and associated urban design problems, whether these carpark could be acquired by the developers/owners of individual developments for meeting the parking requirement and hence, minimizing the need to provide carpark within their developments; and
- (b) whether PlanD had any comments on C3 (HKIUD)'s recommendation of providing centralized carpark at the periphery of the District.

31. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) currently, parking provision ancillary to a development would be determined by TD on a case-by-case basis according to the standards set out in HKPSG and taking into account relevant factors, such as proximity to rail station and public transport services and site conditions. Some developments with small site area might not require the provision of ancillary carpark. PVP would however be determined by TD taking into consideration the district demand, traffic conditions and impact, and whether any suitable location could be identified. For example, PVP would be provided in the planned Sai Yee Street commercial development and a planned URA redevelopment site near Nullah Road; and
- (b) the Government should be very cautious when planning for large-scale carpark in the Mong Kok area, as large-scale carpark might impose adverse cumulative traffic impact on the surroundings. The District was served by three MTR lines and other public transport and 'park and ride' facilities were provided at suitable locations so as to meet the needs for commuting and minimise traffic flow in the District. Besides, the land administration aspect for providing centralised carpark for various individual private developments would need to be carefully examined.

32. In response, Ms Wong Yuen Sheung Ophelia, representative of C1, said that the

parking requirement was also subject to the size of the development site, and not all developments required the provision of parking facilities. Under the YMDS's proposal, every SCA would have its own communal carpark serving the people therein. Also, considering the issue of on-street/illegal parking, large-scale PVPs would be provided in the DNs to serve the needs of the District, and the implementation details of these PVPs would be further studied in future. Taking the redevelopment projects in Hung Hom as an example, URA had planned a communal carpark to serve the area as a whole.

### *GIC Facilities*

33. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the provision of GIC facilities was adequate to cater for the increase in population and whether the deficit of GIC facilities could be addressed; and
- (b) whether there were recycling facilities proposed under YMDS.

34. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the demand from the existing and future population, except for child care centres, community care service facilities and residential care homes for the elderly. The Social Welfare Department had been adopting a multi-pronged approach with short to long term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services to meet the needs in the District. Opportunities would also be taken to provide appropriate social welfare facilities within suitable redevelopment projects; and
- (b) there were no specific recycling facilities planned in the Mong Kok area. Nevertheless, recycling facilities were always permitted under some of the zonings of the OZP and provision of which did not require planning permission from the Board.

### *Job Opportunities*

35. A Member asked whether there was any assessment on the types of jobs to be provided in the Mong Kok area and whether those jobs would suit the skillset of the local residents. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, explained that according to the 2021 Population Census, 49% of the local working population in Mong Kok worked in other districts. Although there was no specific study on the skillset of local residents and the types of jobs to be provided in the Mong Kok area, diversified job opportunities demanding different skillset would likely be provided for the local residents with reference to the various nature of existing businesses in the area, such as office, retail and eating place.

### *Zero Carbon Initiatives*

36. A Member asked if the zero carbon initiatives had been considered under YMDS. In response, Ms Wong Yuen Sheung Ophelia, representative of C1, said that it would be quite an impossible task to achieve carbon neutrality for developments in urban area like Mong Kok. The YMDS had undertaken a preliminary Carbon Appraisal as one of the technical assessments and there were some recommendations on this aspect in the assessment. From land use planning perspective, large-scale carpark were planned in the DNs at the periphery of the District to reduce traffic flow in the central part of the District and the 'park and walk' concept was advocated; provision of open space was planned to be increased from 16 ha to 48 ha; and greater building flexibility would be provided which could facilitate greening provision in the District. Details of the Carbon Appraisal, if required, could be provided to Members after the meeting.

37. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, supplemented that it was anticipated that the OZP amendments would facilitate reduction in carbon emission. Given that about half of the working population in Mong Kok area worked in other districts, with the introduction of mixed-use zoning, more job opportunities could be created for residents to work within the District, and hence reducing the need for commuting. Moreover, the current BHRs on the OZP had allowed greater flexibility in building design to enhance air ventilation and permeability as well as the provision of greenery, particularly at pedestrian level, which would help mitigate the heat island effect. The proposal of widening the pedestrian walkways would also enhance the walking environment and reduce the use of cars, and in return reduce carbon emission. Mr

Cheung Man Ching Anthony, representative of C3, added that while urban design of a city had limited contribution to carbon neutrality, relevant measures should be introduced by utility companies.

38. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked government representatives and the representer, commenters, representer's/commenters' representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations and comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives and the representer, commenters, representer's/commenters' representatives left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

#### Deliberation Session

39. Members generally supported the OZP amendments and agreed that the amendments would provide incentives for private sector participation in the urban renewal process of the District, allow design flexibility to achieve better urban design and improve the overall environment. Members' detailed comments with regard to the implementation aspect of the amendments were as follows:

- (a) there was concern on the blanket increase in PR of "C" zone (allowable under the B(P)R) as the maximum PR of 15 might not be appropriate for the relatively small sites adjoining narrower streets, e.g. Nelson Street and Sai Yeung Choi Street South. A range of PR might be introduced for the "C" zone, which could vary according to the locations and sizes of development sites. A lower PR was considered more appropriate for small development sites while site amalgamation to form a larger site for comprehensive redevelopment was encouraged with a higher PR;
- (b) for application for minor relaxation of development restrictions, the criteria for consideration of such application should be stated clearly in order to provide a better reference for the Members and project proponents;

- (c) the increase in PR restrictions for relevant zones was supported. Consideration could also be given to relaxing PR restrictions in the rural area, which should be justified with improvement in quality of open space and greening in order to improve the overall environment of Hong Kong and hence, achieving zero carbon to help alleviate climate change;
- (d) in view of the vision to minimize traffic flow in the District, there was concern on whether all new developments in the District should follow the current parking requirements under HKPSG, especially for small development sites. The Government could also consider exploring the provision of carpark underneath large open space or within large-scale underground development that might connect different areas in the Yau Tsim Mong District. The car parking spaces so provided could be rented out to the local residents or private developers;
- (e) with regard to the “OU(MU)” zone, there was concern that guidelines might be needed for the implementation of the mixed-use concepts. Noting the change in working style of people and the presence of co-working space and home office in recent years, there might be difficulty in distinguishing the domestic and non-domestic use within the mixed-use development in future; and
- (f) there was concern on whether the local character of the District could be preserved and whether the character streets would be gentrified and turned into tourist attractions, like the case of Lee Tung Street in Wan Chai.

40. Members had some general comments on urban renewal and the new planning tools proposed under the YMDS as follows:

- (a) it was noted from some redevelopment projects in Kowloon City that many small sites were redeveloped on their own after the relaxation of BH control, resulting in the presence of piecemeal redevelopments or high-rise buildings on small sites in the area. Hence, the process of undertaking urban renewal in a comprehensive manner in the District should be accelerated;

- (b) the new planning tools introduced under YMDS could facilitate redevelopment in the District, but there were concerns on how the planning tools could be realized and how the requirements in respect of the planning tools could be clearly and fairly presented to avoid an impression or misconception that the tools were in favour of large developers. Hence, the criteria for adopting the tools should be set out in a coordinated and integrated manner to ensure that they could be implemented efficiently. For DN and SCA, the relevant planning briefs and guidelines should be prepared timely to guide the future development/redevelopments in the District. The TPR would affect the premium issue and should be considered thoroughly. The successful implementation of new planning tools for redevelopment projects in the District would have a guiding effect for urban renewal projects in other districts;
- (c) private developer should not solely be relied on in taking forward urban renewal initiatives with public benefits, and Government's involvement was the key; and
- (d) when carrying out urban renewal projects in future, the urban forestry and biodiversity aspects and recommendations of the Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section of DevB should be taken into consideration.

41. Considering that the current OZP amendments would affect more than 200,000 population in the District, two Members doubted why only few representations/comments were received, and emphasized the importance of public participation in the urban renewal process.

42. In conclusion, the Chairperson remarked that while URA played a crucial role in the urban renewal process, private sector participation was crucial to speeding up and expanding the scope for redevelopment significantly. Therefore, it was critical to provide incentives to encourage private developers to participate in the process such as relaxing the development restrictions and lowering the compulsory sale threshold. While the new planning tools introduced under YMDS were supported by the Government, the implementation details of which, including TPR, were being further studied. DevB and URA would be keeping close

liaison in this regard and the Board would be briefed on the details of these new planning tools once their implementation details were formulated. Regarding Members' concern on the criteria for consideration of applications for minor relaxation of development restrictions, as detailed design requirements/guidelines should be site specific, specifying the requirements in explicit details for general reference might limit the creativity of future developers. While relevant criteria for consideration of minor relaxation had already been laid down in the ES of the OZP, PlanD was invited to consider specifying more details on the relevant principles in the ES when opportunity arose and where appropriate. The Chairperson shared Members' concern on the traffic condition in the District as well as the parking space provision for individual developments, particularly for small sites, and remarked that the concept of centralized carpark as proposed by HKIUD could be explored in URA's district studies in Sham Shui Po and Tsuen Wan in consultation with relevant government departments. With regard to the concern on the few representations and comments received, it was noted that URA had all along in liaison with the stakeholders during the study process of YMDS. For implementation of the mixed use concept under the "OU(Mixed Use)" zone, if necessary, PlanD could be requested to further brief Members on the matter.

43. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R1, R2, R3** and **R5(Part)** and decided not to uphold R4 and R5(Part) and considered that the draft Mong Kok (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) Items A1, A2, B and C are to take forward some recommendations of YMDS under the MRCP ‘+’ scenario as a first step to envision growth and liveability, focusing on steering economic growth, and to generate an increase in GFA within the limits of infrastructure and planning capacity. When more land resources are made available from new land supply in the longer term, progressively thinning out the population in the existing metro areas as envisaged under HK2030+ would be possible (**R4**);
- (b) the removal of PR restriction on the “C” zones will provide more flexibility to the market for adapting to future changes, incentivise redevelopment within these “C” zones, optimise the site potential, provide more commercial GFA to meet the long term demand and create more job opportunities for local population. It will also further strengthen the role of Nathan Road as the

key shopping street and commercial spine in Yau Mong Areas. There is no strong justification to retain the PR restriction 12 on the “C” zone (**R4**);

- (c) various technical assessments on traffic, environmental and infrastructure, as well as visual and air ventilation aspects have been conducted by URA to support the recommendations of YMDS. The findings of these assessments revealed that Items A1, A2, B and C and relevant amendments to the Notes of the OZP are technically feasible without insurmountable problems (**R4 and R5**);
- (d) the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the Mong Kok Planning Area in accordance with HKPSG and the concerned B/D’s assessments, except some social welfare facilities. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long, medium and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services (**R5**); and
- (e) the existing and planned provisions of both local and district open spaces in Yau Tsim Mong District will be in surplus. A number of major public open spaces are located within the walking distance of the Mong Kok Planning Area. The redevelopment projects as proposed under YMDS will also provide opportunity for additional open space in Yau Mong Areas to benefit the local community (**R5**).”

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Questions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-LFS/443



Proposed Temporary Open Storage of Building Materials for a Period of 3 Years in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 2842 RP in D.D.129, Sha Kong Wai, Lau Fau Shan, Yuen Long  
(TPB Paper No. 10877)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

45. In view of the overrun in the meeting schedule and that the applicant was not available to attend the meeting in the afternoon, the applicant requested and Members agreed the consideration of the item be deferred to a later date.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:00 p.m.]

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan, Dr C.H. Hau, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung, Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Stanley T.S. Choi and L.T. Kwok left the meeting at this point.]

46. The meeting was resumed at 2:10 p.m.

47. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

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

Chairperson

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

Mr. Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong  
Transport Department  
Mr Horace W. Hong

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

**Hong Kong District**

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/30  
(TPB Paper No. 10876)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

48. The Secretary reported that amendment items B, C, D1 to D4, E1, E2 and F on the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H5/30 (draft OZP) involved the incorporation of completed developments of the Land Development Corporation (LDC)/Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Development Scheme Plans into the draft OZP, and amendment item A1 involved a s.12A application No. Y/H5/5 (the s.12A application) and AECOM Asia Co.

Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 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 a former Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA;  |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong                                      | - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;  |
| Mr Ben S.S. Lui  | - being a former Executive Director of URA;   |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu   | - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, 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 a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;   |
| Ms Lilian S.K. Law                                       | - being a former director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund and a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues, and her spouse serving an honorary post at Ruttonjee Hospital in Wan Chai; |

- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee of URA, a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund and a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his former serving organisation had received sponsorship from URA;
- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM; and
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - her company owning an office in Wan Chai.

49. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Wilson Y.W. Fung and L.T. Kwok, Dr C.H. Hau and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had already left the meeting. Members agreed that as the amendments to the OZP to reflect the completed LDC/URA development were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), those Members who had declared interests in relation to URA could stay in the meeting. Members also agreed that as the interest of Ms Lilian S.K. Law was indirect and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had no involvement in the s.12A application, they could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

50. 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.

51. The following Government's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

### ***Government Representatives***

#### *PlanD*

Mr Mann M.H. Chow - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK)

Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK)

#### *Commissioner for Heritage's Office (CHO), Development Bureau (DEVB)*

Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang - Commissioner for Heritage (C for H)

Ms Clarissa Y.T. Wan - Assistant Secretary (Heritage Conservation)

Miss Jane W.Y. Yip - Engineer (Heritage Conservation)

#### *Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO), DEVB*

Ms. Fione S. L. Lo - Executive Secretary (Antiquities & Monuments)

Miss Fiona Y.C. Tsang - Curator (Historical Buildings)

### **Representers/Commenters and their Representatives**

#### R1 – Kennedy Road Protection Group

Mr John Fraser Bowden - Representer's representative

#### R2/C2 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/Commenter

C1 – Yuba Company Limited

Mr Albert K.Y. Yeung ]  
Mr Frank K.C. To ]  
Ms Gloria H.C. Lau ]  
Ms Delius H.K. Wong ] Commenter’s representatives  
Mr Y.C. Chan ]  
Mr M.F. Tam ]  
Mr Y.S. Li ]

C3 – Melanie Moore

Ms Yip Mee Yung - Commenter’s representative

52. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that government 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 efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or his/her representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or 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 the representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board’s decision in due course.

53. The Chairperson invited PlanD’s representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Floria Y.T. Tsang, STP/HK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the OZP amendments, the grounds/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD’s views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10876

(the Paper).

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

R1 – Kennedy Road Protection Group

56. Mr John Fraser Bowden, on behalf of Mr Roger Emmerton who was the representative of R1, made the following main points:

- (a) the grounds in R1's written representations were still valid;
- (b) the applicant of the s.12A application had admitted that the accessibility to the Nam Koo Terrace (NKT) site (Item A1) was a problem and had provided no solution to address the issue. The Item A1 site could only be accessible by pedestrian walkway which was convoluted and inconvenient. According to the building layout submitted under the s.12A application, the proposed building looked like a hotel which would require access for pick-up/drop off, goods delivery and garbage disposal. The Item A1 site abutted a steep slope which would have a high risk of landslide. Without vehicular access, fire engines or ambulance could not reach the site for emergency rescue. It was questioned why the s.12A application was agreed even without vehicular access to the site and the pedestrian access from Hopewell Centre II development (HC II) had yet to be implemented. It was also unclear how construction of the site would proceed without a vehicular access; and
- (c) the foundation platform (plinth) of NKT should form part of the site for historical preservation. According to the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance (Cap. 53), "No person should excavate, carry on building or other works, plant or fell trees or deposit earth or refuse on or in a proposed monument or monument.". The works covering up the plinth of NKT was against the above principle.

R2/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

*Items A1*

- (a) she strongly objected to Item A1 as it was wrong for the Committee to approve the s.12A application as a number of issues had not been resolved, including hazardous pedestrian access due to the steep gradient from St. Francis Street; no barrier-free access; the garbage disposal arrangement; adverse impact on traffic of Queen’s Road East (QRE) without drop off/pick up facilities, the building height restriction (BHR) of Sau Wa Fong had been ignored; the proposed open space was not genuine; and the sunlight and ventilation to the site would be blocked by the nearby mega hotel development. Concerns raised by Members when considering the s.12A application including provision of some social welfare facilities, the need to improve air ventilation and provision of more open space, etc. had not been addressed. The Board should review the Committee’s previous decision of agreeing to the s.12A application and rezone the NKT site back to their original zonings;
- (b) according to the scheme for the s.16 planning application (submitted under the current “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone and had been deferred by the Committee), the development was more bulky than the s.12A indicative scheme, it had no balconies and looked like a hotel development, and the development indicated that the units would not be sold and hence it would not help meet housing demand;
- (c) NKT had played an important role during the Japanese occupation of Hong Kong during World War II. The building with strong cultural and historical connections to Hong Kong’s history and its construction on a unique solid granite masonry plinth were worthy of preservation, but the retaining walls thereat were being gradually dismantled;
- (d) the developer had not helped to improve pedestrian accessibility nor



provided open space for the public in the area. There was a large deficit of open space in the area and the district open space in the larger Wan Chai district was located close to the waterfront which was far from the site. As there was a large transient population in the district, additional open space was required for shared use with non-residents and the provision of open space should be up to the standard recommended in the Hong Kong 2030+ Study;

*Item A2*

- (e) it covered an existing slope which would not be for development, and the previous “Open Space” (“O”) zoning was more appropriate;

*Item D1*

- (f) the redevelopment projects, i.e. the Zenith and One Wanchai, were completed and the damage to the Old Wan Chai Market was irreversible;

*Item D3*

- (g) it was doubtful why the BHR for Yan Yee Court was lower than the BHR stipulated under Item D2 for the Zenith;

*Item E1*

- (h) the open space at The Avenue was not genuine, not visible and not easy to access. More stringent restrictions on open space provision should be added to govern any future redevelopment;

*Item E2*

- (i) supported rezoning the Amoy Street Sitting-out Area to “O” to reflect the public open space (POS);

*Item F*

- (j) strongly objected to rezoning the Item F site covering Grade 2 historic buildings and the J Residence to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), as under that zoning, the historic buildings could be redeveloped to a building with building height of 160mPD. The site should be rezoned to “Other

Specified Uses” annotated for preservation of the historic building; and

*Others*

- (k) the Wesley (i.e. 22 Hennessey Road) site which was currently zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) should be rezoned to “Commercial” as only 20% of its gross floor area was for Government, institution and community (GIC) use and the site was already being surrounded by commercial towers. Otherwise, enforcement action should be taken as the site was for a hostel use. Besides, GIC facilities in shortage, such as residential care homes for the elderly, day rehabilitation services and residential care services should be provided in the Wesley site if it was retained under “G/IC” zone.

C3 – Melanie Moore

58. With the aid of some photos, Ms Yip Mee Yung made the following main points:
- (a) she was a Wan Chai resident who had been living in the district for more than 60 years. She was also a culture docent (文化導賞員) for Wan Chai district;
  - (b) the roof level of the old Wan Chai Market was an open space in the old days with a children’s playground. For the redevelopment at the old Wan Chai Market site (i.e. One Wanchai), the developer had promised to re-provide a POS for public enjoyment but that POS was being locked up and not accessible by the general public. The POS in The Avenue was also gated and not accessible. The public was unable to use and enjoy the two POS in those redevelopments. The government should ensure that the public open space in private developments (POSPD) were easily accessible by the public;
  - (c) some photos showed that the plinth of NKT was fenced off and construction works were in progress. It was doubted whether the Grade 1 historic building could maintain its heritage value should the plinth of

the NKT be covered up. The plinth of NKT should be kept in open view for public appreciation and study. The historic structure as a whole was important for academic research on heritage preservation as well as a landmark for local history. It was doubtful whether the public would be allowed to access NKT in future; and

- (d) the promises made by the s.12A applicant for preserving the historic value of NKT would be changed as the development plan was being constantly amended. For example, the originally planned POS was now proposed as a meeting venue, the compensatory trees were to be provided as potted plants, and the width of Ship Street would become narrower.

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

#### *Accessibility to NKT site*

60. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the reasons for not providing vehicular access to the NKT site and the access arrangement proposed by the s.12A applicant;
- (b) with no vehicular access to the NKT site, what method would be used for construction material delivery or garbage collection;
- (c) whether the nil provision of emergency vehicular access (EVA) to the NKT site was acceptable from fire safety perspective;
- (d) noting that both R1 and R2 were concerned on the traffic impact arising from the development of the NKT site, whether a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)

had been conducted;

- (e) how the public could access the NKT site using lift to be provided in HC II; and
- (f) whether Item A1 would affect the width of Ship Street.

61. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the applicant in the s.12A application, it would be difficult to provide any vehicular access including EVA to the NKT site due to the substantial level difference between the site and QRE and Kennedy Road. While the NKT site was not served by any vehicular access, future residents or visitors could gain access through the existing pedestrian networks from QRE via Sik On Street and St. Francis Street and through the POS on Ship Street. In addition, the applicant of the s.12A application had proposed public lifts for pedestrian connection and barrier-free access from Kennedy Road to QRE under the NKT development and HC II development, and an elevated walkway over Ship Street connecting one of the public lifts to the public park of the HC II development. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) had no in-principle objection to the nil provision of internal transport facilities in the s.12A application due to the site constraints. C for T also agreed that the additional car parking and loading/unloading demands arising from the development could be served by the existing transport facilities nearby, including Hopewell Centre, Wu Chung Building, Lee Tung Street as well as the HC II which was under construction;
- (b) there was no information provided in the s.12A submission regarding the method for delivery of the construction material to the NKT site. According to the s.12A application, the caretakers of the proposed development would collect garbage from the flats and shops, and dispose the garbage to the refuse collection point in Star Street in late evening/early morning by trolleys. Similar practice had been used by the residential developments in Sau Wa

Fong;

- (c) the Director of Fire Services had no in-principle objection to the s.12A application (with no EVA in the indicative scheme) subject to fire service installations and water supplies for firefighting being provided to the satisfaction of his department. Detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans;
- (d) a TIA (conducted in 2019) was submitted to support the s.12A application and no new TIA had been conducted for the amendment to the OZP. As the NKT site was zoned “CDA”, a Master Layout Plan (MLP) shall be submitted for the approval of the Board. The project proponent would further review the issues related to car parking, loading/unloading and EVA, and demonstrate that the proposed pedestrian and traffic arrangement were acceptable with the support of a TIA;
- (e) according to the approved planning application (No. A/H5/408) for HC II, lifts would be provided with pedestrian connections at Kennedy Road, and QRE and Ship Street. Hence, visitors could reach the NKT site via HC II. The relevant approval condition for the planning application could ensure the proper design and provision of the pedestrian connections at Kennedy Road, QRE and Ship Street including measures to be implemented during lift failure/maintenance to the satisfaction of the C for T and the Director of Highways; and
- (f) the width of Ship Street would not be affected by Item A1 and the Ship Street Park (under construction by the developer of HC II) would be handed back to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for maintenance and management in future.

*Preservation of NKT*

62. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the plinth of NKT was one of the features contributing to the historic value of NKT;
- (b) whether shielding of the plinth would affect the historic value of NKT; and
- (c) whether the responsibility to preserve NKT including the maintenance and management works for the historic building would be transferred to the future flat owner if the residential portion of the development was to be under multiple ownership.

63. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Ivanhoe C.H. Chang, C for H, made the following main points:

- (a) the main building of NKT was a Grade 1 historic building, but the granite masonry plinth/the retaining walls underneath was neither within the grading boundary of NKT nor an item pending assessment by the Antiquities Advisory Board. Besides, the front garden of NKT was not part of the Grade 1 building, but the developer's proposal to preserve the garden as well as the annex building, pavilion, fountain and the planter areas as a whole was appreciated. Despite that NKT was privately owned, the developer was willing to provide guided tour for the public to appreciate the historic building. The indicative proposal in the s.12A application would be commensurate with the heritage value of NKT and was therefore supported. Should the subsequent s.16 application under the "CDA" zone be approved, the applicant would be required to submit a Conservation Management Plan (CMP), including the arrangement for public appreciation of the NKT and the proposal for minimizing the construction disturbance to the Grade 1 historic building for AMO's approval prior to commencement of works;
- (b) according to the s.12A application, the garden facing QRE in front of the main building of NKT would be preserved and would be connected with the proposed open space at the previous site of Miu Keng Terrace and the public could conveniently access and appreciate NKT. The proposal was generally acceptable. Besides, a CMP setting out the ways to properly

manage the change in NKT during the conversion works, both physically and visually, had to be submitted to the satisfaction of AMO; and

- (c) the responsibility to preserve, maintain and manage the historic building should rest with the owner.

64. The Chairperson said that the NKT site was still under the planning stage, and the developer would submit a MLP and other information as requested by the Board (including the responsible party to preserve NKT) for the consideration of the Board and relevant government departments. Upon approval of the MLP, the applicant also needed to apply for lease modification. Details on whether the residential portion would be sold to individual owners or under single ownership would be a commercial decision of the developer. If there was heritage building to be preserved by the developer under the land lease, the subsequent maintenance and management responsibility should normally rest with the developer, instead of being transferred to individual flat owners. Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, Director of Lands (D of Lands), supplemented that the Lands Department (LandsD) would consult relevant government departments during lease modification stage. The responsibility for preserving NKT would be subject to further discussion and agreement between the developer and the government, and the corresponding land-related arrangement would be specified in the lease conditions as appropriate. In general, for composite developments comprising residential and commercial portions, if the owner of the commercial portion was required by the government to preserve and maintain the historic building, a restriction on alienation of the commercial portion (except as a whole) would usually be imposed in the relevant land lease.

#### *Building height of the NKT site*

65. A Member asked how the BHR of the NKT site was determined. Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, responded that the BHR of 91mPD was based on rounding up the building height of the indicative scheme (90.25mPD) of the s12A application.

#### *Others*

66. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how the government would monitor the proper provision and management of the POS proposed in NKT; and
- (b) the reason why the Wesley site was zoned “G/IC” even though the building was not mainly for GIC use.

67. In response, Mr Mann M.H. Chow, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) the government would follow the “POSPD Design and Management Guidelines” promulgated by DEVB to guide the design and management for the future POS in NKT; and
- (b) the occupation permit for hostel use was granted to the Wesley site in 1991. According to the Notes for the “G/IC” zone at that time, hostel which was a ‘residential institution’ was a Column 1 use that was always permitted. There was no need to rezone the Wesley site as suggested by R2/C2.

68. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board’s decision in due course. The government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

69. The Chairperson recapitulated that the Item A1 was mainly to take forward the Committee’s decision of an agreed s.12A application for the residential-cum-preservation project at the NKT site which was rezoned to “CDA”, under which submission of a MLP in the form of s.16 application for approval of the Board was required. As such, details in relation to the heritage preservation proposal and road/pedestrian access to the site would be further addressed in the MLP submission stage. Item A2 was a consequential amendment to Item A1 to rectify the boundary of the private lot. Other amendment Items B to F involved completed LDC/URA projects and the zonings and development restrictions were to reflect their as-built



conditions. She then invited views from Members.

70. Members generally supported or had no objection to Item A1. Two Members raised concern on the accessibility to the public passageway and POS of the NKT site and the way to ensure that the public pedestrian access points to the NKT site from HC II would be opened for public use in the future. A Member shared C4's concern on the blocked public access to the POS in One Wanchai and The Avenue and said that relevant government departments should follow up on the issue. A Member said that design measures might be deployed by some developer to hinder visitors from accessing and using the POS. In response to Members' concern on the use of public passageway and access to POSPD, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai, D of Lands, said that developers would sometimes be required to provide public passageway or POS in their developments. From experience, if the public passageway was located within the commercial portion of the development, developers and property owners of the commercial portion would generally be prepared to provide and maintain the public passageway when it might bring more patronage. For the POSPD, it could be more challenging to ensure public access. In the past few years, more complaints were received regarding denial of public access to the POSPD while the relevant developers or property owners explained that the POSPD had been closed temporarily as an anti-epidemic measure. The Chairperson said that different from the past approach with POSPD, POS projects in private developments nowadays would mostly be designed and constructed by the developer to the satisfaction of relevant government department, such as LCSD. Upon completion and requested by relevant government departments, the POS would be handed back to the government for maintenance and management as appropriate.

71. A Member pointed out that except for the public passageway that would be surrendered to the government upon completion of the development, it would be difficult to ensure the public was allowed to use the access even though the requirement was imposed into the lease. The Member suggested that the government could consider the use of other mechanisms to be agreed between the developer and the government for providing right-of-way for the public accessing the NKT site from HC II or requiring dedication of the public passageway which might be more readily enforceable in case of non-compliance. The Chairperson said that access arrangement to the NKT site should be further explored by the developer during the MLP submission stage and Members' views would be conveyed to the developer. A Member said that the garbage collection arrangement should also be further

explored in the MLP submission stage.

72. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported the OZP amendments and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

73. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive view and the views provided in **R2 (part)** and decided not to uphold R1 and R2 (part) and considered that the draft Wan Chai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

*“Item A1*

- (a) relevant technical assessments in the agreed s.12A application confirmed that there is no insurmountable impacts in respect of development intensity, traffic, open space provision and heritage conservation, arising from the development. Rezoning the site from “Open Space” (“O”), “Residential (Group C)” and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) to facilitate appropriate planning control is considered appropriate (**R1 and R2 (part)**);
- (b) a Master Layout Plan together with technical assessments covering visual, landscape, noise, air and traffic impacts etc. shall be prepared by the applicant for permission for development on land designated “CDA” and will be scrutinised by all concerned government departments and the Board (**R1 and R2 (part)**);

*Item A2*

- (c) the rezoning of the strip of slope from “O” to “G/IC” is to reflect the existing use of the private lot covering St. Francis’ Canossian School/College, which is not intended for open space use (**R2 (part)**); and

*Item F*

- (d) the zoning of the site as “Residential (Group A)” is to reflect the existing residential development cum commercial use. Appropriate control has been imposed through lease to ensure that the graded buildings at the site will be properly maintained and repaired in good condition (**R2(part)**).

74. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, 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.

## **General**

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open meeting]

Study on the Artificial Islands in the Central Waters

(TPB Paper No. 10879)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

75. The Secretary reported that the Study on the Artificial Islands in the Central Waters (the Study) was jointly commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) and Planning Department (PlanD) with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) as the consultant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr C.H. Hau - being a member of the Urban Forestry and Biodiversity Focus Group for the Study and conducting contract research projects with CEDD; and

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP.

76. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau had already left the meeting, and agreed that since the item was a briefing on the preliminary proposals of the Study, Mr Franklin Yu could stay in the meeting.

77. The following government representatives and the consultants (the Study team) were invited to the meeting:

#### **PlanD**

Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang - Deputy Director of Planning/Territorial (DD/T)  
Ms April K.Y. Kun - Assistant Director of Planning/Territorial  
Mr K.W. Ng - Chief Town Planner/Studies and Research 2 (CTP/SR2)

#### **CEDD**

Mr Jacky K.Y. Wu - Head of Sustainable Lantau Office (H(SLO))

Mr Raymond W.M. Ip - Deputy Head of Sustainable Lantau Office (Works)  
(DH(W))  
Ms Ellen N.S. Cheng - Chief Engineer/Lantau 4 (CE/L4)

**Consultants**

ARUP

Mr Wilfred Lau ]  
Mr James Sze ]  
Ms Carmen Chu ] Consultant  
Dr K.S. Leung ]

ERM Hong Kong Ltd

Mr Terence Fong ]

78. The Secretary reported that two letters in relation to the Study were received before the meeting. The letter submitted by 坪洲填海關注組 received on 18.1.2023 had been circulated for Members' reference before the meeting and the letter submitted by Save Lantau Alliance received in the evening of 19.1.2023 was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

[Post meeting note: A letter submitted by the CIMTPNHK - Committee of International Million Trees/Forest Project – Hong Kong Region, with the “Billion Trees Campaign” and the “Plant for the planet” Program under the framework of United Nations Environment Program in relation to the Study received on 20.1.2023 was also circulated for Members' reference after the meeting.]

79. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the Study team to brief Members on the Paper.

80. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DD/T, PlanD, gave an introduction and said that the briefing would cover the preliminary proposals of the Study in four aspects, i.e. reclamation extent, broad land use, strategic transport infrastructure and possible financing options. The Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands (KYCAI) could provide about 1,000 hectares (ha) of land to meet part of the medium to long-term land requirement of Hong Kong. About 300 ha out of the 1,000 ha reclaimed land was one of the supply sources of the 3,280 ha of developable land in the entire Territory in the coming 10 years. Majority of the 300 ha of land would be for

residential use, utility infrastructure and a new third Central Business District (CBD3) to further enhance Hong Kong's economic competitiveness. In order to enhance liveability, both open space and Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities would be increased to 3.5m<sup>2</sup> per person in line with the recommendations of HK2030+ to support the planned living communities. The strategic infrastructure would improve Hong Kong's overall transportation network. The KYCAI could also offer decanting spaces to support the redevelopment of old urban districts of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon.

81. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ellen N.S. Cheng, CE/L4, CEDD, and Mr K.W. Ng, CTP/SR2, PlanD, then briefed Members on the background of planning objectives, six highlights, and the four aspects of the preliminary proposals of the KYCAI as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10879 (the Paper).

82. As the presentation by CEDD and PlanD was completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

83. Members showed appreciation of the efforts of the Study team and generally supported the directions and principles adopted in the planning of the KYCAI.

84. Some Members raised the following questions:

*Reclamation Extent*

- (a) the justifications to support the reclamation extent of 1,000 ha;
- (b) whether the remaining 700 ha of reclamation would be developed, and whether the reclaimed area would be connected to the nearby islands, for example, linking Island B with the Peng Chau or Sunshine Island;

*Land Use/ Design Concept*

- (c) the design concept of the blue-green corridors;
- (d) the design concept of 15-minute neighbourhood;

- (e) how the planning objective of ‘forward-looking and innovative’ could be achieved;

*Housing*

- (f) how the development quantum for a population of 500,000 to 550,000 was determined;
- (g) noting that the public to private housing ratio of 70:30 was adopted in the Study, whether the ratio could be more flexible to facilitate the CBD3 development which might provide higher-end job opportunities and attract more people living in private housing;

*CBD3*

- (h) whether 10% of the reclaimed land (i.e about 100 ha) for economic development was sufficient for the CBD3 development;
- (i) the reasons for planning a CBD3 in the KYCAI, and what the key factors and attractiveness to encourage businesses to establish in CBD3 would be;

*Sustainability/ Carbon Neutrality Issues*

- (j) how the KYCAI could achieve carbon neutrality and how to evaluate its effectiveness in that regard;
- (k) as the three islands would be formed by reclamation, whether the underground facilities could be planned ahead and implemented during the reclamation stage to minimize the excavation effort and save up fill materials;
- (l) details of the waste management and recycling plan;

*Traffic and Transport*

- (m) the reasons why the section of the proposed Hong Kong Island West – Hung Shui Kiu Rail Link connecting Islands A and C was in curvilinear shape;

- (n) whether the road network and basic living facilities could be provided to meet the first population intake in 2033;
- (o) other than the railway and road links, whether there was other transportation mode to connect the KYCAI;

*Others*

- (p) noting that the ballpark construction cost was about \$500 billion in 2018 price, whether the construction cost had been updated and whether the development was financially viable in view of the recent downturn of the property market and land value; and
- (q) whether the Study team had made reference to other similar reclamation projects and how a livable community from a worldwide perspective could be created.

85. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DD/T, PlanD, Mr Jacky K.Y. Wu, H(DLO), CEDD, Mr Raymond W.M. Ip, DH(W), CEDD, and Mr James Sze, Consultant, made the following main points:

*Reclamation Extent*

- (a) the KYCAI was at a strategic location within the expanded Harbour Metropolis to provide about 1,000 ha of land to meet part of the medium to long-term land requirement of Hong Kong as recommended in the Conceptual Spatial Framework of 'Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030' (Hong Kong 2030+) promulgated in 2021. The project was also one of the land supply options recommended by the Task Force on Land Supply in 2018 after a large-scale public engagement exercise. Apart from housing land, the reclaimed land would meet other needs of the society, such as for economic uses, transport infrastructure as well as community facilities (including those for the aging population). The KYCAI would also expand the scope and capacity of Hong Kong's development in capitalizing the increasing opportunities arising from the National 14<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan and the Greater Bay Area development



and greatly enhance Hong Kong's competitiveness as a financial, commercial and trade centre;

- (b) the current proposal was to reclaim 1,000 ha of land for the KYCAI. There was no plan to commence the planning and engineering study for the remaining 700 ha near Hei Ling Chau under the current term of Government. Further, there was no proposal to connect Island B with Kau Yi Island, Siu Kau Yi Chau and Sunshine Island given the environmental consideration. Public views were welcome on whether land transport connection to Peng Chau should be provided and the Study would consider its provision when planning the local road network on the KYCAI at next stage having regard to factors including traffic demand, environmental impact and cost effectively;

*Land Use/ Design concept*

- (c) a comprehensive blue-green network including blue-green corridors between the living communities and open spaces of varying sizes would provide a variety of leisure, recreational and sports opportunities for people living and working on the artificial islands. The network also included a Y-shaped water channel of about 200m-wide (i.e. similar to the width of Shing Mun River) separating the three islands. The channel could effectively cope with the impact of reclamation on water quality and ecology by maintaining sufficient water flow velocity. Aligning with the prevailing wind directions, the channel would help reduce the urban heat island effect. Waterfront promenade would be provided along the channel for public enjoyment. Eco-shorelines would be designed to promote biodiversity;
- (d) there were two design elements for the planning of living communities under the concept of 15-minute neighbourhood. The first element was the provision of a green mass transit station at the centre where residents could commute to and from their homes places within 15 minutes. The second element was the residents could reach their daily necessities, from their home places within 15 minutes by walking or cycling;

- (e) the planning objective of “forward-looking and innovative” could be categorised into three areas: (i) sustainable planning and urban design including the building orientations in line with prevailing wind directions, promoting urban forestry, etc; (ii) an integrated smart, green and resilient (SGR) infrastructure system, such as a sustainable urban drainage system to improve drainage management and enhance resilience to sea level rise and extreme weather, advanced food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion facilities for turning waste into energy source, etc; and (iii) smart mobility including supporting facilities for electric and other new energy vehicles (e.g. hydrogen vehicles), use of autonomous vehicles and vehicle-to-everything technology. The Study team would also explore an innovative means of lowering the usage of filling materials by undertaking the reclamation works in tandem with the construction of underground space;

#### *Housing*

- (f) a number of factors including liveability, SGR city strategy and traffic capacity had been considered to determine the planned population of 500,000 to 550,000. It should be noted that the provision of SGR infrastructure including sustainable urban drainage system, district cooling system, and food waste/sewage sludge anaerobic co-digestion facilities would also require land. To enhance liveability, reference had been made to the recommendations of Hong Kong 2030+ for increasing the average flat size by a range of 10% to 20%, and both the ratio of land for open space and land for community facilities to no less than 3.5m<sup>2</sup> per person. Generally a maximum domestic plot ratio of 6.5 was proposed for the living communities. Based on the developable land of 1,000 ha, the planned population density would be 50,000 to 55,000 per km<sup>2</sup>, which was generally comparable to that of Shatin/Ma On Shan New Town and Tseung Kwan O New Town;
- (g) the public to private housing ratio of 70:30 was based on the current housing supply target under the Long Term Housing Strategy. Since the development would span over some 20 years, the housing mix might be reviewed subject to changing society need over time;

*CBD3*

- (h) the CBD3 of 100 ha could accommodate about of 4 million m<sup>2</sup> commercial gross floor area (GFA) (equivalent to about 80% of the commercial GFA in Central). The development progress would be closely monitored and reviewed. Apart from the CBD3, about 1 million m<sup>2</sup> of commercial GFA would be distributed within the seven living communities;
  
- (i) the KYCAI would be strategically located, which would only be around 4 km from Hong Kong Island West and around 10 km away from Central. The CBD3 would be well served by transportation network. The planned major trunk roads would be connected to Sunny Bay and link to Route 11 and Tsing Yi – Lantau Link under planning. The railway would be connected to Sunny Bay and Tuen Mun East and further extended to Hung Shui Kiu to link up the Hong Kong – Shenzhen Western Rail Link (Hung Shui Kiu - Qianhai) under planning. The future economic development of Hong Kong had duly considered the National 14<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan, Greater Bay Area development and Belt and Road Initiative to support the development of eight centres such as international financial centre, international innovation and technology centre, East-meets-West centre for international cultural exchange, international trade centre, and centre for international legal and dispute resolution services in the Asia-Pacific region. The CBD3 would be attractive to the investors worldwide, particularly helping enhance Hong Kong's status as international financial and trade centre, and centre for international legal services.

*Sustainability/ Carbon Neutrality Issue*

- (j) Hong Kong's Climate Action Plan 2030+ outlined four major de-carbonisation strategies, namely net-zero electricity generation, energy saving and green buildings, green transport and waste reduction. Following the above four strategies, the Study team formulated corresponding carbon de-carbonisation measures on three aspects in order to achieve carbon neutrality for the KYCAI, i.e. planning and urban design, infrastructure system and smart mobility (e.g. to orientate buildings

according to prevailing wind directions, to develop green buildings and urban forestry, to adopt the concept of 15-minute neighbourhood to encourage residents to travel by healthy modes such as walking or cycling, to provide supporting facilities for electric vehicles and other new energy vehicles, to use Building Information Modelling (BIM) and modular integrated construction (MIC) to reduce construction waste, etc. During the planning stage of the KYCAI, carbon appraisal under different land use/planning scenarios would be conducted. With the implementation of the territory-wide de-carbonisation strategies as well as the corresponding measures on the KYCAI, the Study team was confident that carbon neutrality would be achieved when the KYCAI was fully developed. The Study team would closely monitor the carbon emission figure and review the proposed de-carbonisation measures throughout the Study;

- (k) the Study team would further explore the opportunities to construct underground facilities during the reclamation stage, including making reference to the methods and technologies applied to reclamation projects of the Three-runway System at the Hong Kong International Airport and the Tung Chung East reclamation in order to reduce fill materials and construction waste;
- (l) measures including promoting a circular economy through provision of recycling facilities to support the recycling industry, strengthening the recycling network by re-processing the recyclables into useable products, enhancing waste management process such as source separation, as well as reserving land for handling and processing the waste products so as to achieve the long term goal of 'Zero Landfill' as advocated by the Waste Blueprint for Hong Kong 2035;

#### *Traffic and Transport*

- (m) taking into consideration the technical requirements of the railway link as well as the ecological condition of Kau Yi Chau, a curvilinear alignment for the Hong Kong Island West-Hung Shui Kiu Rail Link connecting the railway stations on Island A and Island C respectively was proposed;

- (n) the Government had adopted the “infrastructure-led” approach in planning for new development area including the KYCAI. The road network, essential supporting infrastructures and other community facilities would be in place for the first population intake in 2033. The railway link was targeted for commissioning in phases a few years after the first population intake;
- (o) apart from road and railway links, ferry services to connect the KYCAI with other islands/places in Hong Kong would also be planned;

*Others*

- (p) the construction cost of \$500 billion previously calculated was based on September 2018 price. A rough estimate of the total construction cost in the second quarter of 2022 would be about \$580 billion. Among the total cost, 30% was for reclamation works, 20% for infrastructure on the artificial islands and 50% for strategic transport infrastructure. The Study team would apply for funding for the detailed design and ground investigation for the project in early 2024 and targeted to seek funding for the reclamation works in 2025. Since the entire development was a long-term investment with economic benefits, it was not necessary to rely solely on public expenditure to take forward the project. Apart from funding using Capital Works Reserve Fund, other financing options such as bond issuance, public-private partnership on build-operate-transfer model to construct major road, and railway-plus-property model to construct railway could be explored. Upon full development of the KYCAI, the associated economic activities would generate around \$200 billion of value-added each year (in 2021 price) which amounted to about 7% of the Gross Domestic Product. In addition, the public housing and strategic transport infrastructure would bring social and economic value; and
- (q) the KYCAI development had made references to overseas and mainland reclamation projects including Marina Bay in Singapore, Odaiba of Tokyo

in Japan, Port of Copenhagen in Denmark, and Qianhai of Shenzhen in China.

86. Some Members expressed the following views on the Study:

- (a) the Government should take a proactive approach including providing better design to attract the targeted residents/enterprises to live and establish businesses on the KYCAI;
- (b) to facilitate the CBD3 development, flexibility should be allowed to adjust the public and private housing mix. Besides, new types of public housing other than public rental housing and subsidised sale flats should be explored;
- (c) the planning and design for the KYCAI could be more creative to allow flexibility in sub-dividing land parcels to cater for phased development; and
- (d) the Study team was encouraged to further explore the incorporation of sparkling innovative elements/design to make the KYCAI a showcase for the world.

[Mr Ben S.S. Lui left the meeting during the Q&A session and Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left the meeting at this point.]

87. The Chairperson concluded the discussion and supplemented on the importance of the KYCAI. In October 2022, the Development Bureau announced that in the next 10 years, the supply of developable land would be about 3,300 ha. About 1,300 ha of which would be from the new development areas in the Northern Metropolis and 300 ha would be from the KYCAI. Besides, according to the final recommendations of Hong Kong 2030+, the KYCAI would be one of the solution spaces for meeting the estimated land shortfall of about 3,000 ha by 2048, while at the same time creating capacities beyond the territorial population previously projected by Census and Statistics Department. To cater for the unforeseen circumstances, it was important to build a land reserve. To develop a land reserve could also provide opportunities to enhance the living space and meet the unexpected social and economic needs. She then thanked Members for their views and comments and said that the Study team would

further develop the preliminary proposals based on the views gathered during the public engagement exercise. She also thanked the Study team for attending the meeting to brief Members on the Study and to answer Members' questions. They left the meeting at this point.

**Agenda Item 7**

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting]

88. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 5:25 p.m.