

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 23.8.2024)**

**Minutes of 1323<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 26.7.2024**

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 4**

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K3/URA5/A prepared under Section 25 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance

(TPB Paper No. 10978)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Deliberation Session**

1. The Chairperson invited Members to consider whether the draft Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was acceptable and could be deemed suitable for publication under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Members generally supported the proposal of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and had no objection to the draft DSP, and some Members had the following views and suggestions:

*Waterway Park*

- (a) the design of the Waterway Park, be it in the form of either a thin water body over the decked nullah or a sunken channel by uncovering the nullah, would not affect the zonings on the DSP. URA's proposal was considered satisfactory in ameliorating the built environment and enhancing the long-established Flower Market characters;

- (b) while the draft DSP was considered acceptable, the Waterway Park should be a genuine “Urban Waterway” by removing the deck and revealing the original nullah. While it was uncertain when the water quality of the nullah could be improved, the long-term goal of opening up the nullah should be properly recorded for URA and the Government to work towards such goal;
- (c) in recent years, the Government revitalised nullahs as “blue-green features” for public leisure and recreation. Nature-friendly designs were applied to redress some existing nullahs in the rural and urban areas, e.g. Kai Tak, Yuen Long and Tsui Ping. The impressive outcomes were due to the dedicated efforts of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and the Drainage Services Department (DSD) in improving the water quality by remediating the sewer misconnection upstream, among others. Subject to resource availability, the Government should keep up the efforts in revitalising the nullahs in the territory;
- (d) taking into account the safety concerns especially for children, the current design of the Waterway Park was preferred as it would be easier to control the water level and ensure the presence of water in the park. It would be difficult to promote water-friendly culture in an exposed nullah as it required construction of stairway to reach the water level and a certain width and depth of space to restore the natural elements. It might not be worth spending lots of resources and time to uncover the subject nullah;
- (e) the nullah was just a run-of-the-mill drainage channel. In the District Study for Yau Ma Tai and Mong Kok (YMDS), the concept of “Urban Waterway” would extend to the centre of Mong Kok reaching Nathan Road. Implementation of such an idea might sound quixotic and impractical. URA should not put too much emphasis on the term “Waterway”, which might lead to public misconception. Instead, URA should manage public expectations by presenting what could be done at this stage and what might be achieved in the long run;

- (f) URA might pursue the concept of “Flower Park” at the location next to the Flower Market and the Yuen Po Street Bird Garden in lieu of the Waterway Park. As stated in URA’s proposal, the Waterway Park would become a flower appreciation hotspot for public enjoyment by promoting a colourful landscape design theme with various kinds of planting areas, flowering trees and shrubs, appropriate soft and hard landscape and place-making opportunities, to create an attractive environment facilitating seasonal/occasional flower viewing activities;
  
- (g) as illustrated in the drawings of URA’s proposal, there was a vast area of bare ground in the Waterway Park. It could function as a connector to various facilities at the proposed multi-purpose GIC complex, the adjoining Mong Kok Stadium and the Flower Market, and serve as a space for gathering and recreation. Subject to detailed design and public preference, more trees should be planted to provide shades for the public and to alleviate heat island effect;

*Revitalisation of Back Lanes*

- (h) the proposed revitalisation of back lanes would enhance the economic value of the properties in the area as exemplified by the revitalisation initiatives undertaken for the areas of Pak Sha Road and Yun Ping Road in Causeway Bay and Elgin Street and Staunton Street in Central. Despite the fact that some portions of the back lanes were privately owned, it was believed that URA’s efforts in initiating the revitalisation of the back lanes in the Flower Market could give impetus to the stakeholders to join in enhancing the amenities of the neighbourhood;

*Others*

- (i) in the air ventilation assessment, the permitted building height (BH) on the OZP was adopted as the baseline scenario for the DSP area. In reality, the actual BHs might be much lower, hence the assessment results might not fully

reflect the performance of the actual situation;

- (j) URA should further consider enhancing the accessibility from the Flower Market to the MTR Prince Edward Station. Such a pedestrian linkage would be beneficial to not only the Flower Market but the area as a whole; and
- (k) URA's proposal would help restructure the land uses, resolve the district problems such as segregated spaces, traffic congestion and pedestrian-vehicle conflicts, upgrade and provide recreational, leisure and public facilities as well as improve hardware support and spatial planning so as to facilitate the long-term sustainable development of the Flower Market.

2. Noting Members' views and concerns, the Chairperson made the following main points:

- (a) the land uses and the development parameters of the proposed development sites (Site A1 to A5 and Site B) would be governed by the respective zonings on the draft DSP. Changes in the design of the Waterway Park would not affect the zonings on the DSP. Should the nullah be opened up as part of the Waterway Park in the future, subsequent amendments to the DSP would not be necessary;
- (b) the Waterway Park was mainly described in paragraph 7.15 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP. In view of Members' views, the Chairperson proposed and the Members agreed that the long-term vision of opening up the nullah and revitalising it as part of the Waterway Park subject to improvement in water quality should be clearly reflected in the ES. Moreover, necessary flexibility and provision should be built into the current design of the Waterway Park to cater for the possibility of uncovering and opening up the nullah in future. The reason of adopting the current design of water features in the Waterway Park instead of opening up the decked nullah as advocated in YMDS should also be provided in the ES for public information and managing public expectation; and
- (c) Members were well aware of the constraints encountered by the Government in dealing with the water quality problem of the nullahs in the territory and priority

had to be given to those exposed nullahs with more imminent environmental concerns over the decked nullahs.

3. In view of the above, the Chairperson asked the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) to write to EPD and DSD to invite them to consider, subject to resource availability and technical feasibility, improving the water quality of the nullah within the Waterway Park in the long run so that the vision of removing the deck and opening up the nullah could eventually be achieved. As for the views and suggestions relating to the management of back lanes and the pedestrian linkage to the MTR Prince Edward Station, URA would be advised to take them into account at the detailed design stage.

4. Members agreed that paragraph 7.15 of the ES of the draft DSP at Annex G-3 of the Paper should be revised, with three new paragraphs added after paragraph 7.15 of the ES to reflect Members' views and concerns, as follows:

~~“7.15 ... .. Water features will be introduced at appropriate locations above and/or along the decked nullah alignment as far as practicable to recall the memory and local characters of the nullah. Ownership, management and maintenance of the Waterway Park will be handed over to relevant Government departments upon completion. Provision of facilities and opening hours of the Waterway Park is subject to detailed design and agreement by relevant Government departments.~~

***7.16 Ownership, management and maintenance of the Waterway Park will be handed over to relevant Government departments upon completion. Provision of facilities and opening hours of the Waterway Park is subject to detailed design and agreement by relevant Government departments.***

***7.17 URA has explored the possibilities of opening up the existing nullah between Boundary Street and Flower Market Road which was covered in 2010 to eliminate odour and improve hygiene condition. In collaboration with various Government departments including the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and DSD, URA has conducted various tests which reveal that the water in the decked nullah contains large amounts of pollutants, microbes as well as strong odour-causing chemicals. As a prudent and practical solution to safeguard public hygiene and***

*address environmental safety concerns while taking forward the distinctive waterway landscape concept advocated under Yau Mong District Study, the proposed Waterway Park will provide appropriate water features above and/or along the decked nullah alignment as far as practicable to recall the memory and local characters of the nullah.*

*7.18 The design of the proposed Waterway Park should not preclude the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah, which remains a long-term vision of the Plan. In the long term, the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah could be further explored subject to improvement of the water quality and proper integration with the wider drainage network to control water flow and prevent flooding risks.”*

5. After deliberation, Members agreed that the draft DSP was suitable for publication under the Ordinance and decided to:

- (a) deem the draft URA Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road DSP No. S/K3/URA5/A (to be renumbered to S/K3/URA5/1 upon exhibition for public inspection) and its Notes (Annexes G-1 and G-2 of TPB Paper No. 10978 (the Paper), as being suitable for publication as provided for under section 25(6) of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance, so that the draft DSP shall be exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) endorse the revised ES of the draft DSP (Annex G-3 of the Paper subject to the revision in paragraph 4 above) and adopt it as an expression of the Town Planning Board’s planning intention and objectives of the DSP, and agree that the revised ES as being suitable for public inspection together with the draft DSP.

6. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft DSP including its Notes and ES, if appropriate, before its publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board’s consideration.

7. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29C, the Board's decision on the draft DSP would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting and would be released when the draft DSP was exhibited for public inspection. Members should exercise due care so as to avoid inadvertent divulgence of their views on the boundaries of the draft DSP to the public before its publication.

[Mr Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting during deliberation.]