

**Minutes of 1340th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 25.7.2025**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South)
Environmental Protection Department
Miss Queenie Y.C. Ng

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Anny P.K. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Joan S.Y. So

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1339th Meeting held on 11.7.2025

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1339th meeting were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 8.7.2025, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/TW/39) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the OZP was notified in the Gazette on 18.7.2025.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/33

(TPB Paper No. 11012)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that the amendments incorporated in the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/33 (the draft OZP) involved rezoning of two sites at Choi Hing Road (Item A1 Site) and Choi Ha Road (Item B1 Site) for private housing developments. A feasibility study (the Study) was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) for the proposed developments, with AtkinsRealis Asia Limited (AtkinsRealis) as the consultant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho | - | co-owning with spouse a property in Kowloon Bay and his company owning a property in Kowloon Bay; |
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | being an alumni of St. Joseph's Anglo-Chinese School and currently involving in the school affairs; |
| Mr Daniel K.W. Chung | - | being a former director of CEDD; and |
| Professor Simon K.L. Wong | - | being the Chairman of Employees Retraining Board which owned properties in Kowloon Bay. |

4. Members noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Daniel K.W. Chung had no involvement in the Study, the interests of

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Professor Simon K.L. Wong were considered indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to 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, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

6. The following government representatives (including the consultants) and representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Peggy L.Y. Wong	- Town Planner/Kowloon

CEDD

Mr Stephen C.C. Lo	- Chief Engineer
Mr Ray L.W. Lau	- Senior Architect

AtkinsRealis

Mr Louis N.K. Lau]
Mr Kelvin H.F. Chau]
Mr Alex P.Y. Sung] Consultants
Mr Kevin Lee]
Mr W.K. Chiu]

Representer

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Representer

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

[Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Mr Simon Y.S. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

8. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft OZP, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11012 (the Paper). The amendment items included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site at Choi Hing Road from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group A) 4” (“R(A)4”) subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic and a maximum building height (BH) of 175mPD;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of two strips of land at Choi Hing Road from “G/IC” to areas shown as ‘Road’;

- (c) Item B1 – rezoning of a site at Choi Ha Road from “G/IC” to “R(A)4” subject to a maximum PR of 7.5 for a domestic building or 9 for a building that was partly domestic and partly non-domestic and a maximum BH of 140mPD; and
- (d) Item B2 – rezoning of a strip of land at Choi Ha Road from “G/IC” to “G/IC(3)”.

9. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the Plan and to tally with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

10. The Chairperson then invited the presenter to elaborate on her representation.

R3 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A1

- (a) the proposed high-density residential development with a large podium at Item A1 Site was considered incompatible with the surrounding context in terms of building bulk and BH. The proposed development would disrupt the stepped height profile of the area, create a wall effect that would adversely affect the adjacent “Green Belt” zone and contravene urban design principles. The BH should be lowered to better align with the stepped height profile and provide a smoother transition;
- (b) in the current depressed housing market with an oversupply of housing units, developers might not accept the requirement to include a Hostel for Severely Mentally Handicapped Persons (HSMH), which would result in the removal of the HSMH from the tender in order to ensure sale of the site;

- (c) there was an urgent need for mental health and care services. The Government should review the provision standards in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, particularly the standard for Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness, which was one centre per 310,000 persons. Significant deficits were observed in various social welfare facilities (SWFs), particularly for child and community care as well as rehabilitation facilities in the Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Planning Area and across the Kwun Tong District, contrary to the Paper's assertion of adequate service provision in the wider district;
- (d) Item A1 Site was situated in a government, institution and community (GIC) cluster of low-rise educational facilities. Retaining the original planning intention for a social welfare complex could better address service shortfalls and meet community needs. The site should be developed into a centre where the mentally handicapped could reside in a tranquil environment. The "single site, multiple use" (SSMU) model could be realised by providing various types of community services at the site;
- (e) integrating the HSMH into the podium would pose practical constraints and might compromise service quality for the vulnerable community due to limited access to natural elements, such as greenery and sunlight;
- (f) the proposed development would be subject to adverse environmental impacts, including noise and air pollution from New Clear Water Bay Road. Sufficient setback should be considered;
- (g) there was no information on the number of parking spaces to be provided in the proposed development;

Item B1

- (h) the current oversupply of unsold housing units in the market reduced the need for additional private housing sites. As such, Item B1 Site should be used for subsidised housing, such as Home Ownership Scheme, which was in more

urgent need;

- (i) rezoning Item B1 Site for private housing solely based on an overall public/private housing split of 74:26 in the Kwun Tong District was considered unjustified as the geographical distribution of housing types and the potential sale of subsidised housing units in the open market after a prescribed period should also be taken into account;
- (j) providing new private housing sites would discourage developers from acquiring and redeveloping ageing buildings, thereby hindering urban renewal;

Others

- (k) the Board should evaluate the rezoning of the sites not only based on land revenue, but also on the suitability of the location, while taking heed of the community needs for welfare services and affordable housing;
- (l) Items A2 and B2 were for housekeeping purpose;
- (m) the proposed SWFs could not effectively improve the overall GIC deficit in the district; and
- (n) the reason for the deletion of ‘Educational Institution (ground floor only)’, ‘Place of Entertainment (ground floor only)’, ‘Religious Institution (ground floor only)’ and ‘Training Centre’ from Column 2 of Schedule II of the Notes for the “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”) zone was unclear.

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

invited questions from Members.

Traffic Aspect

13. Considering the projected population growth and the existing heavy traffic on major roads, including New Clear Water Bay Road and Choi Ha Road, two Members enquired about the potential traffic impact and mitigation measures for the proposed residential developments. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been conducted, taking into account the two proposed residential developments and other committed developments in the area. The TIA concluded that the projected traffic would not result in insurmountable impacts on the local road network. The Transport Department (TD) had no objection to the proposed developments and would implement local road improvement works to further enhance the network capacity.

14. Noting that Item A1 Site was in proximity to the proposed Smart and Green Mass Transit System in East Kowloon (SGMTS-EK), a Member sought clarification on the interface between Item A1 Site and the transit system. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that the SGMTS-EK was still at a preliminary stage during the process of the Study, and therefore had not been factored into the assessments. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning (D of Plan), supplemented that the SGMTS-EK alignment was gazetted for public inspection under the Railways Ordinance on 20.6.2025, and a station was proposed at Choi Wan (I) Estate to the north of Item A1 Site. Hence, the proposed development would not be affected by the SGMTS-EK alignment.

Pedestrian Connectivity

15. Noting that Item A1 Site was in a peripheral location, a Member expressed concern about pedestrian connectivity to nearby facilities, such as Choi Hung MTR Station. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that the road and pedestrian networks had been reviewed. Existing public transport, such as minibus routes, could support the needs of future residents. Existing pedestrian facilities, including footbridges and walkways, would facilitate access to the surrounding areas. The impact on the existing transport network was anticipated to be minimal. TD would monitor the situation and adjust transport services to meet future demand, if required.

16. Regarding pedestrian connectivity for Item B1 Site, a Member enquired about its accessibility to the MTR station and local community facilities. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) pedestrian accessibility had been reviewed under the Study. Existing pedestrian infrastructure was available to serve the future residents, including a staircase adjacent to Cheerful Court providing access to Amoy Gardens and onward to the MTR station, as well as a route along Choi Ha Road and Jordan Valley North Road with a footbridge at Kwun Tong Road providing access to the MTR station; and
- (b) options to further enhance pedestrian connectivity had been explored. For example, the feasibility of a direct footbridge to Amoy Gardens from Item B1 Site was examined but found impracticable due to insufficient headroom above the existing car park ramp at Amoy Gardens and the extensive structural modifications required within the privately-owned development.

17. Considering that the staircase adjacent to Cheerful Court was steep and there was significant level difference across Item B1 Site, the Member further enquired whether a horizontal pedestrian connection from the western part of Item B1 Site to the adjoining staircase of Cheerful Court could be explored to avoid the route through the steepest part of the staircase. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD acknowledged the challenges posed by the site's topography and said that an option to provide an opening at the lower portion of the site was considered feasible in the Study to facilitate horizontal connection, though walking through the rest of the staircase to Amoy Gardens would still be required due to inherent topographical constraints.

Provision of SWFs

18. Noting that Item A1 Site was originally reserved for a social welfare complex but without implementation programme, and considering the shortfall of SWFs in the district, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the prolonged delay in implementing the social welfare complex was due to practical challenges, such as the need to reach a threshold level of service demand to justify initiating the programme;
- (b) whether the SWFs originally planned for the complex would not be fully materialised at Item A1 Site, and whether those facilities would be reallocated to other sites in the district; and
- (c) when and where the outstanding SWFs, particularly mental health-related services, would be provided to address the shortfall in the district.

19. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) implementation of SWFs was subject to various factors, including funding, manpower and changing community needs, etc. The construction of a standalone complex presented significant challenges due to its complexity and resource-intensive nature;
- (b) the original plan for a social welfare complex at Item A1 Site was a premises-based allocation, meaning it was intended to provide floor space for various SWFs rather than dedicating the entire site to a single use. No specific types of SWFs had been earmarked for the complex. The provision of SWFs evolved with population changes, demographics and emerging needs, allowing for flexibility and responsiveness. Approximately 2,850m², accounting for 10% of the domestic gross floor area (GFA), was reserved for SWFs under the proposed development at Item A1 Site. Such allocation was notably higher than the typical 5% provision in public housing or other private developments, and represented a proper balance between housing development and community needs. The provision included the HSMH, paired with a Day Activity Centre and a Supported Hostel for Mentally Handicapped Persons (SHOS). These facilities offered integrated and complementary rehabilitation services to address community needs and optimise operations. The facilities were selected on request of the Social Welfare Department (SWD), based on relevant considerations, including locational suitability, service priorities, cost-

effectiveness and staff deployment, etc.; and

- (c) to address the deficit in the district, the premises-based SWFs could be provided at multiple locations in consultation with SWD, including within new public and private housing developments. When redevelopment and new land supply became available, such as urban renewal initiatives in collaboration with the Urban Renewal Authority, Government-led projects and public housing projects (e.g. Choi Hung Estate redevelopment), opportunities would be seized to incorporate appropriate SWFs progressively to address shortfalls and meet community needs. In addition to infill sites, dedicated GIC sites had been reserved under large-scale developments, such as Anderson Road Quarry Development project, for constructing GIC complexes serving both new population and adjacent communities.

20. Noting the arrangement of decentralising SWFs from a complex building into multiple locations to integrate with residential developments, the two Members further raised the following questions:

- (a) whether decentralising the provision into multiple locations reflected a change in policy aimed at addressing urgent needs more flexibly and expeditiously, without waiting for a large-scale complex to materialise;
- (b) whether such arrangement could foster more effective integration with the local community, provide greater flexibility in implementation, expedite the provision of facilities and better align with community needs; and
- (c) whether the TPB Paper could be supplemented with information on the deletion and reallocation of SWFs across dispersed sites, as well as details of other planned facilities, to improve transparency and facilitate better monitoring. A tracking mechanism was necessary to ensure that long-term provision targets could be met and accountability could be upheld over time.

21. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the provision arrangement varied depending on context. In new development areas, such as Anderson Road Quarry Development project, dedicated GIC sites were reserved as part of a comprehensive development strategy, under which the implementation of GIC complexes was carried out progressively. In built-up areas, where land resources were constrained, decentralisation was considered more practical;
- (b) decentralising SWFs into multiple locations enhanced integration with the local community and provided greater flexibility in implementation. Such arrangement allowed facilities to be prioritised based on real-time needs, making the provision more responsive to demand, expediting implementation and ensuring accessibility for the catchment population; and
- (c) regarding tracking, the suggestion to supplement the TPB Paper with additional information was acknowledged. SWF provision was reflected in the GIC Table in the Paper, which was a live dataset serving as a dynamic reference for relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) to consider facility provision in response to evolving needs.

22. Mr C.K. Yip, D of Plan, supplemented that the GIC Table in TPB Paper served as a reference for relevant B/Ds to coordinate facility provision at appropriate developments. As a recent example, on 18.7.2025, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) considered the proposal for a development project associated with the SGMETS-EK in the east of Po Tat Estate, in which a 100-place child care centre was designated to meet the identified shortfall in the district. PlanD and SWD would continue the collaborative approach in identifying gaps in the GIC Table, ensuring that appropriate facilities would be incorporated in future developments.

23. The Chairperson said that while the incorporation of SWFs in private residential developments, such as the proposal for Item A1 Site and the forthcoming east of Po Tat Estate development, might appear incremental, it contributed practically to meeting local needs. Moreover, the Government had systematically implemented a policy requiring equivalent to 5% of the domestic GFA to be allocated for SWFs in new public housing developments, which was a proactive approach to aligning service provision with community needs. The public housing development projects, such as the Choi Hung Estate redevelopment and the Ngau Chi Wan Village

redevelopment, located just beyond the district boundary but in close proximity, would also incorporate the 5% requirement.

24. In response to a Member's concern on whether the required facilities in the GIC Table would be fully incorporated into the Choi Hung Estate redevelopment, the Chairperson said that the concern would be conveyed to the Housing Bureau (HB) for consideration.

25. Ms Mary Mulvihill, R3, said that the rezoning of GIC sites for private housing developments through land sale appeared to prioritise revenue over community needs, and shifted the Government's responsibility for providing SWFs to private developers. Members should ensure the availability of adequate services for the community. In response, the Chairperson clarified that the Government had no intention of transferring its responsibility for providing SWFs to private developers. The Government had been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increasing the provision of SWFs. In public housing projects, apart from allocating equivalent to not less than 5% of domestic GFA for SWFs, the Government funded both the construction and operation of such facilities. In private housing projects, SWFs required by Government were exempted from GFA calculation, and construction cost was factored into the land premium offer. Upon completion, the operation of the SWFs would be handed over to the Government, which would allocate the space to welfare bodies to provide government-funded services. The provision of SWFs had always been the Government's responsibility. The integration of SWFs with residential developments fostered better interaction between service users and the community, thereby enhancing community integration and improving convenience for service users.

Proposed HSMH at Item A1 Site

26. Considering that Item A1 Site was adjacent to New Clear Water Bay Road and that the HSMH was proposed within a private residential development, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the accommodation capacity of the HSMH;
- (b) the layout and design of the HSMH, particularly the mitigation measures (e.g. window orientation), to address potential environmental impacts, including traffic noise and air quality;

- (c) whether the HSMH could be separated from the residential development, or whether separate accesses would be provided to enhance the privacy of service users and residents; and
- (d) whether the provision of supporting and ancillary facilities, such as lay-by or parking for ambulance, and barrier-free circulation (e.g. lifts), had been considered.

27. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed HSMH would accommodate approximately 50 beds, while an additional SHOS would provide 30 beds. The Kwun Tong District Council had no objection to the proposal;
- (b) to mitigate potential environmental impacts, the schematic design incorporated a 20m buffer from New Clear Water Bay Road and 5m buffer from Choi Hing Road. In addition, sensitive uses would be positioned further from New Clear Water Bay Road and shielded by non-sensitive uses, such as kitchens and storage areas;
- (c) the design incorporated separate accesses to enhance convenience and privacy for both service users and residents. An alternative option for a standalone low-rise GIC block had been studied and found feasible to be accommodated under the proposed BH restriction and meet the requirements of the Buildings Ordinance. The future developer would have the flexibility to consider a standalone low-rise GIC block as part of the development; and
- (d) the schematic layout presented in the Paper was illustrative. Detailed arrangements for ancillary facilities, including access and vehicular routing, would be subject to further review to ensure compliance with service standards.

Provision of GIC Facilities at Item B1 Site

28. In response to a Member's enquiry on the provision of GIC facilities at Item B1 Site, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) further to the MPC meeting on 28.2.2025, the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB) conducted a review on the provision of SWFs in the Kwun Tong District. It was confirmed that GIC facilities were not required at Item B1 Site, as the originally planned facilities had either been accommodated at other sites within the district or in rented premises; and
- (b) the scheme design, incorporating the maximum PR and BH, with due assessments of the infrastructural capacity including drainage and transport networks, provided flexibility to accommodate GIC facilities if required in the future. The actual provision would be determined by relevant B/Ds prior to finalising the land sale conditions, based on prevailing circumstances.

Retail Uses at Item A1 Site

29. Noting that two storeys were allocated for retail uses at Item A1 Site, a Member raised concern about the relatively large quantum of retail GFA, taking into account the peripheral location of the site, surrounding GIC uses and the modest provision of only 570 residential units. The Member enquired whether a market sounding exercise had been conducted to assess the commercial viability of the proposed retail provision, and whether there was flexibility to convert retail GFA into GIC or other uses in the future, should there be insufficient demand for retail uses.

30. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the retail GFA under the scheme was indicative and based on the PR adopted for residential developments in the district, which generally comprised a PR of 7.5 for domestic use and a PR of 1.5 for non-domestic use. Technical assessments had confirmed that Item A1 Site could accommodate the permissible GFA. The actual utilisation of the non-domestic GFA would be

subject to the decision of the future developer;

- (b) the OZP provisions offered flexibility to accommodate a range of non-domestic uses under Column I, such as places of entertainment and training centres, allowing the development to respond to changing market conditions; and
- (c) according to the OZP provisions of the site, any floor space that was constructed or intended for use solely as GIC facilities, as required by the Government, might be disregarded in determining the relevant maximum PR. Similar facilities operated by the private sector, such as elderly homes and kindergartens, while accountable for non-domestic GFA, could also be accommodated within the site.

31. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. She thanked the representer and the government representatives (including the consultants) for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representer and the government representatives (including the consultants) left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

32. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

Private Housing Developments at Items A1 and B1 Sites

33. Members generally supported the proposed private housing developments at Items A1 and B1 Sites and expressed the following views:

- (a) East Kowloon was currently skewed towards public housing, with a public-private housing mix of 74:26. The rezoning of the two sites for private housing developments would help achieve a more balanced housing mix, diversify housing options and enhance the housing ladder;

- (b) the originally reserved GIC sites had remained idle for years due to the absence of implementation programme, resulting in prolonged underutilisation of land resources. Rezoning the sites for residential developments aligned with Government's multi-pronged approach to increase land supply, accelerate housing delivery and contribute to government revenue;
- (c) the proposed private housing and major development parameters of the two sites were considered appropriate. Nevertheless, noting the significant level difference across Item B1 Site, pedestrian connectivity between the site and adjacent supporting facilities (e.g. retail) and the MTR station should be enhanced through the adjoining Cheerful Court site; and
- (d) regarding the potential traffic impact, relevant technical assessment had been conducted and TD had confirmed no adverse comment in that regard.

Provision of SWFs at Item A1 Site

34. A few Members raised concerns about the integration of the HSMH with the residential development at Item A1 Site, considering that it might deter potential homebuyers due to perceived stigma effect, potentially discouraging developers' interest and affecting the land premium. On the other hand, other Members generally supported the incorporation of SWFs into the residential development at the site, and expressed the following views:

- (a) the small living space in public housing units often made it challenging for families to care for severely mentally handicapped members at home, sometimes leading to family tragedies. The proposed HSMH could help address such critical need;
- (b) the peripheral location of Item A1 Site, coupled with its limited connectivity to surrounding communities, rendered it unsuitable for the development of a standalone GIC block on the entire site. Instead, integrating the HSMH with private residential development was considered more appropriate, as such facilities did not require a high level of accessibility while the proposed development would provide parking facilities, thereby enhancing the overall

functionality of the site; and

- (c) integrating SWFs with the proposed private residential development could expedite provision of SWFs, with completion anticipated by 2030-31.

Provision of SWFs

35. A Member noted that the Government had previously adopted a 10-year welfare planning strategy, but its discontinuation in recent years had resulted in uncertainty, leading to a reactive and piecemeal approach on SWF provision. The Member emphasised the importance of a comprehensive strategy to ensure systematic provision, and proposed the co-location of complementary facilities in the same building, such as youth centres and elderly centres, so as to optimise resource allocation and maximise operational efficiency.

36. Referring to the originally reserved social welfare complex at Item A1 Site, which had remained unimplemented for over a decade, a Member said that while the delay and slow progress might have stemmed from policy changes, it was the Government's responsibility to ensure SWF provision, and considered that enhanced coordination and comprehensive planning could more effectively manage social costs and improve service delivery. Drawing comparisons with the rapid development pace in the Mainland, the Member urged the Government to expedite implementation to address pressing community needs. There was also a need for greater transparency and accountability in GIC provision, suggesting improved documentation in the TPB Paper to enhance clarity and progress monitoring. Another Member suggested that consideration should be given to providing more data in the GIC Table, e.g. explicitly including the provision of SWFs at Item A1 Site and the 5% domestic GFA requirement for SWFs in public housing developments, to demonstrate the Government's commitment to meeting community needs.

37. Members generally supported decentralising SWFs into multiple locations to integrate with residential developments, and made the following main points:

- (a) implementing a standalone social welfare complex faced greater challenges and had certain drawbacks, including the risk of stigmatisation, as some members of the public might incline to avoid such areas;

- (b) while recognising the Government's considerable increase in social welfare budgets, decentralising SWFs to integrate with residential developments could offer a more sustainable provision approach. It would also expedite the delivery of SWFs, promote social integration and enhance public acceptance. Prosperous Garden in Yau Ma Tei was a successful case, where various community facilities, including mental health facilities, coexisted with residences for over 20 years without major issues; and
- (c) pursuing an inclusive culture required proactive effort and persistence. The continued integration of SWFs into private residential developments, thus establishing it as a prevailing custom, would contribute to the cultivation of social inclusion and gradually change public attitudes over time.

38. A Member highlighted the importance for the Government to allocate more resources to public education campaigns to combat stigma against SWF users and promote social inclusion. It was suggested that an impactful and innovative approach, such as design competitions engaging renowned architects and showcasing successful integrated models from other districts or countries, could be adopted to foster greater acceptance and change public perceptions.

Conclusion

39. Noting Members' comments and suggestions, the Chairperson said that relevant B/Ds, in collaboration with SWD, would strike a proper balance among relevant factors, including market conditions, community needs and prevailing circumstances, etc., to determine the most appropriate types of SWFs for inclusion at Item A1 Site prior to finalising the land sale conditions. The following views/suggestions would be conveyed to relevant B/Ds for follow-up where appropriate:

- (a) LWB and HB: to explore opportunities to address shortfalls of SWFs in the area and the wider district by providing more such facilities at suitable public housing developments, including the Choi Hung Estate redevelopment;
- (b) LWB: to continue conducting public education campaigns to improve community acceptance of SWFs and promote an inclusive culture in society;

and

- (c) CEDD: in consultation with TD, to explore the feasibility of improving pedestrian connectivity at Item B1 Site, particularly by integrating walkways with adjacent developments to enhance accessibility for residents.

40. As far as the GIC Table was concerned, the Chairperson said that PlanD might consider whether the presentation should be refined to include more information on planned and potential facilities, as appropriate.

41. The Chairperson concluded that Members supported the amendments on the draft OZP, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation. All grounds of the representations had been addressed through the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper, as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

42. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1** on Items A1 and A2 and **R2** on all amendment items, and **R4** with no view expressed on the amendment items. The Board decided not to uphold R3 and considered that the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the draft OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“Item A1

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to make available sufficient supply of housing land progressively to meet the acute demand for housing, including carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis. The site is located at the fringe of government, institution and community (GIC) cluster and adjoining various high-density residential developments in the area. It is considered appropriate to rezone the site for residential use with a view to increase housing land supply and optimise the usage of vacant government land. Technical assessments covering various aspects such as traffic, environmental, landscape and visual also confirm that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the site for private residential use;

- (b) the provision of GIC facilities is generally adequate to meet the demand of the planned population in the OZP in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for primary school, hospital, community care services for elderly, child care centres, residential care home for elderly and rehabilitation services. The design of the proposed GIC facilities will be closely monitored by relevant government bureaux/departments and should comply with relevant regulations, guidelines and operational requirements. Rezoning of the site for residential with GIC development would expedite the provision of the much needed social welfare services under the “single site, multiple use” model;

Item B1

- (c) at present, the public/private housing split in Kwun Tong District is about 74:26. The designation of Item B1 Site for private housing would help achieve a more balanced housing supply in the area; and

Amendment to Notes of the OZP

- (d) the deletion of ‘Educational Institution (ground floor only)’, ‘Place of Entertainment (ground floor only)’, ‘Religious Institution (ground floor only)’ and ‘Training Centre’ from Column 2 of Schedule II of the Notes for “Other Specified Use” annotated “Business” zone is to follow the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.”

43. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

44. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:10 a.m.