

**Minutes of 1353rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 16.1.2026**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Isabel Y. Yiu

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1352nd Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1352nd meeting held on 2.1.2026 were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 8.1.2026, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Sha Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/ST/38, the approved Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/39 and the approved Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP No. S/YL-MP/8 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 16.1.2026.

(ii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations on (a) the draft Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-PS/21; (b) the draft Shek Kong OZP No. S/YL-SK/10; (c) the draft Ngau Tam Mei OZP No. S/YL-NTM/15; and (d) the draft Tung Chung Valley OZP No. S/I-TCV/3.

4. The Secretary briefly introduced that the four draft OZPs were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance, with the first OZP on 26.9.2025, the

second one on 17.10.2025 and the latter two on 31.10.2025. During the 2-month exhibition period, 4, 67, 14 and 9 valid representations were received respectively. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the representations of each of the four OZPs was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the respective hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board for the first draft OZP and the other three draft OZPs was tentatively scheduled for February 2026 and March 2026 respectively.

5. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 4 above.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/29

(TPB Paper No. 11040)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

6. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street in Hung Hom (Item A) for a proposed residential development by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants of the project, and rezoning of two sites near URA's proposed development to reflect the as-built open space and a pigging station. Representations were submitted by URA (R1) and the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas) (R121), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr C.K. Yip]
(as Director of Planning)] being a non-executive director of the URA

Mr Maurice K.W. Loo (as Director of Lands)] Board and a member of its Committee;]
Dr Tony C.M. Ip	- having current business dealings with URA and AECOM;
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	- being a member of the Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and Development Project Objection Consideration Committee of URA, and being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
Professor B.S. Tang	- being a former non-executive director of the URA Board;
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	- having current business dealings with URA, and being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from HLD;
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	- having current business dealings with URA, AECOM and HLD; and
Mr Stanley T.S. Choi	- owing a flat in Hung Hom.

7. Members noted that Professor B.S. Tang and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had not joined the meeting yet. As the interests of Dr Tony C.M. Ip, Messrs C.K. Yip, Maurice K.W. Loo, Timothy K.W. Ma and Vincent K.Y. Ho were considered direct, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Messrs C.K. Yip, Maurice K.W. Loo, Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting temporarily and Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

8. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Mr Ryan M.H. Kwok	- Town Planner/Kowloon

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R1 – URA

Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike]
Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence] Representer's Representatives
Mr Peter Wu]
Ms Li Yee Ting]

R34 – 林博

Mr Lam Pok	- Representer
Mr Lo Chun Shing]
Mr Wong Hon Ming] Representer's Representatives
Ms Lai Wai Shan]
Mr Tam Chun Kit]

R40 – Mak Tsz Lun

Mr Mak Tsz Lun	- Representer
----------------	---------------

R65 – Hui Kwok Chuen

Mr Hui Kwok Chuen	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

R70 – 李沛鏗 Li Pui Hang

Mr Li Pui Han	- Representer
---------------	---------------

R120 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill

- Representer

R121 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

Mr Cheng Wa

] Representer's Representatives

Mr Chow Kwok Keung

]

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

10. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Vicki Y.Y. Au, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Hung Hom OZP (OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11040 (the Paper). The amendment items on the OZP included:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street (Item A Site) from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant” (“OU(STP)”) to “Residential (Group A) 9” (“R(A)9”) subject to a maximum total and domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 68,490 square metres (m²) and 60,880m² respectively

and a maximum building height (BH) of 110 metres above Principal Datum (mPD);

- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site abutting the waterfront at Bailey Street (Item B Site) from “G/IC” and “OU(STP)” to “Open Space” (“O”); and
- (c) Item C – rezoning of a site to the north of Sung Ping Street (Item C Site) from “OU(STP)” to “G/IC” subject to a maximum BH of 1 storey.

11. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to Item A and other technical amendments.

12. The Chairperson then invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – URA

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

- (a) in June 2025, the Government announced that Item A Site would be allocated to URA to bolster its urban renewal initiatives. This land grant not only provided URA with essential resources to enhance the feasibility of its redevelopment projects but also presented an opportunity for optimised land utilisation, thereby delivering planning gains to the To Kwa Wan area; and
- (b) as compared with maintaining Item A Site as an open-air car park, the proposed development would effectively optimise land resources through holistic planning and the ‘Single Site, Multiple Use’ approach, transforming it into a shared public node accessible to the general public. The proposed development would reinforce the role of Hoi Sham Park as a key harbourfront destination and enhance connectivity between the inland areas and the East Kowloon waterfront.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Li Yee Ting made the following main points:

- (a) Item A Site was located at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street, covering an area of about 7,610m². It was rezoned mainly from “G/IC” to “R(A)9” to accommodate the proposed development, which formed a key component of the Victoria Cove Area Study (東維港灣區) aimed at enhancing the area’s vitality and attractiveness through improved waterfront access and provision of community facilities;
- (b) the proposed development sought to balance development needs with planning benefits. By setting back the building blocks, an at-grade communal space was planned at the southern portion of Item A Site to enhance pedestrian connectivity. The public would be able to gain direct access to Hoi Sham Park, either through the at-grade communal space or via the podium-level commercial spaces;
- (c) commercial facilities, including eating places and retail spaces, were proposed at ground level, particularly along the waterfront and near the communal space, to foster a vibrant harbourfront atmosphere. About 3,100m² of GFA was allocated for welfare facilities, initially intended for a residential care home for the elderly (RCHE). The proposed development adopted the ‘Single Site, Multiple Use’ approach, promoting an inclusive and lively harbourfront environment aligned with a “Yes-In-My-Backyard” mindset, with the aim of enhancing liveability and transforming potential community conflicts into support for sustainable development;
- (d) URA acknowledged the opposition to Item A. The current use of Item A Site as a temporary open-air car park limited its long-term land value and community benefit. Even under previous plans for school development, the single use approach would only benefit a specific group, undermining long-term community benefits. In contrast, the proposed development would introduce new housing and additional community and planning gains, improving the living environment, promoting social inclusion and revitalising the area;

- (e) the artist's impressions of the notional scheme illustrated that the podium and the communal space adjacent to Hoi Sham Park would be developed as a retail belt, enhancing the harbourfront ambience. The setback of building blocks at the southern portion of Item A Site would create green communal space with a pedestrian walkway to Hoi Sham Park, maintaining visual openness and improving connections between the inland areas and the waterfront;
- (f) an air ventilation assessment was conducted, which revealed that the notional scheme, featuring adequate building separation and setback from Bailey Street, would significantly enhance ventilation performance compared with the previous school development plan. The earlier plan typically involved more enclosed building forms and boundary walls, which restricted air movement;
- (g) a traffic impact assessment (TIA) was conducted covering 10 nearby junctions, which revealed that the proposed development would not adversely affect the surrounding road and pedestrian networks. Minor improvement works were recommended at junction J8, located at the intersection of Hung Hom Road and Tai Wan Road East. Furthermore, pedestrian walkways in the local area were found to be operating at desirable levels (i.e. with Level of Service C or above);
- (h) a visual impact assessment was conducted in compliance with TPB Guidelines No. 41. Seven viewpoints were identified, encompassing major roads, parks, pavilions and a strategic viewpoint from the Hong Kong Convention & Exhibition Centre. The assessment concluded that those viewpoints would have negligible or slight-to-moderate visual impacts; and
- (i) after the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) meeting of the Board in August 2025, URA engaged with four adjacent schools to discuss the proposed development and related planning procedures. No objections were raised during the consultation.

R34 – 林博

15. Mr Lo Chun Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of the Incorporated Owners of Bailey Garden. Residents of Bailey Garden objected to the proposed development, mainly due to its excessive BH. The heights of the proposed residential towers would exceed Bailey Garden by about 30 metres (m) (around 10 storeys) and Wing Fai Mansion by about 50m. The significant increase in BH would obstruct sea views and daylight for numerous units in both developments. Sunlight would only reach certain flats between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m., resulting in prolonged shadowing effects. The residents advocated a reduction in either BH or plot ratio (PR) to ensure adequate daylight;
- (b) regarding the building layout, while there was no objection to the two tower blocks outlined in the notional scheme, it was suggested that the number of towers could be increased to three. The adjustments, coupled with wider ventilation corridors and reduced BH, could mitigate both visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding environment; and
- (c) the nearest libraries were located at the To Kwa Wan and Kowloon City Government Offices, approximately 10 to 13 minutes' walking distance away. To address the community's needs, the proposed development should incorporate a public library, thereby enhancing local community facilities for the residents in the area.

16. Mr Lam Pok made the following main points:

- (a) he was a District Council (DC) member for the Kowloon City District;
- (b) a survey was conducted to gauge public opinion on the proposed development. A total of 446 responses were collected (i.e. 180 (40.4%) from the Upper East, 95 (21.3%) from Bailey Garden, 86 (19.3%) from Wing Fai Mansion/Sung on Street area, and 85 (19%) from other locations), demonstrating substantial community involvement. The survey revealed that majority of respondents, 399 (89.5%), opposed the proposed development, while 37 (8.3%) expressed support, with their primary rationale being the need for increased housing supply, and 10 (2.2 %) raised no comment on the issue;

- (c) 38% of respondents suggested that Item A Site should be developed into a park or waterfront open space. Their feedback highlighted the inadequacy of the current To Kwa Wan promenade to accommodate the growing population in the area. With numerous redevelopment projects already underway in the vicinity, the lack of sufficient open space could lead to a deterioration in residents' quality of life;
- (d) about one-quarter of the respondents indicated a preference to reserve Item A Site for community, cultural and recreational facilities, such as a sports centre, library or swimming pool. It was noted that the planned swimming pool in Kai Tak would not proceed. With a population of about 420,000, Kowloon City District had only three public swimming pools, including Ho Man Tin Swimming Pool, Kowloon Tsai Park Swimming Pool and Tai Wan Shan Swimming Pool. In particular, not all of them provided heated pools, thereby limiting year-round usage;
- (e) 12% of the respondents proposed that Item A Site be developed into public parking facilities. They suggested a multi-purpose, layered design akin to that implemented under the Central Kowloon Route Project near the Grand Waterfront. The design comprised a public vehicle park or public transport interchange beneath a landscaped podium incorporating parks and playgrounds. The 'Single Site, Multiple Use' approach could help alleviate parking and traffic issues in the area;
- (f) the incorporation of residents' suggestions, including the provision of a RCHE and other community facilities in the proposed development, was highly appreciated. It was essential for Members and relevant government departments to take public views into account so as to bring tangible benefits to the area, rather than focusing solely on high-rise, wall-like buildings. Moreover, many local residents had been suffering from odour issues in the area. It was considered crucial to address those environmental concerns at Item A Site by installing sewage treatment or deodorisation facilities, thereby improving the overall living conditions for the community;

- (g) while URA indicated that four nearby schools had been consulted regarding the proposed development, doubts were raised about whether the consultation process had covered the wider Kowloon City District. Po Leung Kuk Lam Man Chan English Primary School was cited as an example, as it operated on two separate campuses at Sheung Heung Road and Farm Road. Parents and teachers had expressed a wish to consolidate the campuses to save travelling time and enhance management efficiency. Given that Item A Site had historically been designated for school development, it was considered a potential opportunity for campus consolidation; and
- (h) in addition to the primary development site, alternative locations in the vicinity were also proposed. For instance, areas within the same district, such as the “5 Streets” or “13 Streets” in Ma Tau Kok, could provide larger and more suitable sites for housing projects. Those alternatives would allow housing provision without adversely affecting existing communities.

R40 – Mak Tsz Lun

17. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Mak Tsz Lun made the following main points:

- (a) the traffic conditions in the vicinity were already severely overloaded, and URA’s TIA lacked comprehensiveness. It was observed that by around 7 p.m., traffic congestion routinely extended from Hung Hom Road to Chi Kiang Street and Bailey Street. Nevertheless, URA’s report failed to reflect those daily traffic issues. The area was already heavily congested as Hung Hom Road served as a short-cut route to Tsim Sha Tsui, taking only about five to seven minutes’ driving time to reach the Avenue of Stars;
- (b) the area also became a vibrant tourism spot, attracting substantial traffic. Notably, Hung Hom Road was known for its array of jewellery shops, while Bailey Street had two pharmacies. The Upper East featured a chocolate shop, and Sung On Street was lined with various restaurants. Chi Kiang Street offered a selection of souvenir shops, and both Hung Hom Square and Chatham Gate were surrounded by pharmacies and jewellery stores. The bustling

commercial activities in those locations often resulted in illegal parking, primarily arising from shopping and tourist coaches. URA had not effectively addressed this persistent problem;

- (c) the proposed development lacked designated pick-up and drop-off areas for tourist coaches, which contradicted URA's planning concept of enhancing waterfront connectivity and encouraging public activity. The absence of loading/unloading facilities would exacerbate the existing issue of double parking in the area. The vehicular access plan for the proposed car park at Chi Kiang Street, which included 15 coach parking spaces and over 100 car parking spaces, was considered infeasible;
- (d) furthermore, the proposal failed to meet the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) (paragraph 7.2.14 of Chapter 8), which required appropriate pick-up/set-down bays for major tourism attractions. At present, tourist coaches were frequently parked illegally along Chi Kiang Street and Sung On Street while waiting for passengers who were shopping at souvenir shops, necessitating police intervention to maintain order. It was considered unacceptable for public resources to be deployed to address issues arising from inadequate planning. As a quasi-governmental body, URA had a responsibility to mitigate traffic impacts and should address those issues;
- (e) the existing private car parks in the area were already operating at full capacity, resulting in a significant illegal parking problem, particularly in the vicinity of the Guardforce Centre on Bailey Street. With the removal of the open-air car park at Item A Site and the absence of any alternative parking solutions, the situation was expected to worsen, leading to increased illegal parking and heightened traffic congestion in the area;
- (f) the visual impact assessment included a viewpoint (Drawing H-8 of the Paper) in which a large rock obstructed the view of the proposed development, potentially understating its visual impact. URA claimed that the proposed development would maintain a compatible BH profile with the surrounding buildings. Nevertheless, the surrounding buildings generally

ranged from 50mPD to 80mPD, whereas the proposed development would reach 110mPD, significantly exceeding the height of the neighbouring context. It was recommended that maximum PR and BH restrictions be imposed to ensure that the building mass remained moderate;

- (g) under Modular Integrated Construction (MIC), there could be further increase in BH. This gave rise to concerns that the actual BH might exceed what had been presented to the public;
- (h) the claim of community support by URA was questionable. While URA stated that 33 representations supported Item A, 18 of them were submitted within a short timeframe (i.e. between 12:30 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. on 31.10.2025). Moreover, a significant number of supporters were residents from the “13 Streets”, which fell outside the subject OZP. In contrast, residents living merely one street away from the project site were neither informed nor consulted. There were no briefing sessions, notices or direct engagement arranged for the affected neighbours, giving rise to a perception that URA’s consultation process was superficial, selective and lacked genuine public involvement;
- (i) the proposed development was considered likely to exacerbate existing issues relating to transport, parking and urban design, rendering the scheme imprudent; and
- (j) the rationale behind granting Item A Site to URA appeared to be driven primarily by the need to alleviate its financial pressure and maintain cash flow. However, considerations of URA’s financial situation should not override the public interest. The Government could allocate other land parcels that were more suitable for intensive development.

R65 – Hui Kwok Chuen

18. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Hui Kwok Chuen made the following main points:

- (a) as a local resident, he objected to the proposed development of Item A Site. The proposed development with a PR of 9 and a BH of 110mPD contradicted the common practice of low to medium density development along Hong Kong's coastline. For instance, (i) the Hoi Yu Street waterfront in Quarry Bay was developed at a PR of about 4.6, preserving sea views for the second row of buildings; (ii) the West Kowloon Cultural District maintained an overall PR of about 2.08, with BHs not exceeding half the height of the rear buildings; and (iii) the new Central harbourfront development, with a PR of about 3.13, had minimal impact on the surrounding taller structures. Those examples demonstrated that Item A Site should adhere to the stepped BH approach rather than reaching the proposed development intensity and BH;
- (b) the 15m-wide wind corridor between the two towers in the notional scheme was considered inadequate. From the perspective of rear residents, the two "T-shaped" towers overlapped visually, creating the illusion of two overlapping residential towers rather than a genuine open corridor;
- (c) the financial justification for granting Item A Site at a nominal land premium to support URA's finances was questionable, especially when it came at the expense of the local residents' living environment. The sudden change from a low-rise school development to a high-density residential project brought adverse impacts on the surrounding community; and
- (d) while the Under Secretary for Development previously assured that the design would minimise impacts on the community, the current proposal appeared to prioritise maximising development value rather than addressing concerns. This approach deviated from the Government's stated intention to return the harbourfront to the public and the prevailing trend of developing new promenades along Victoria Harbour with lower density and open waterfront designs. The Board was urged to critically review the proposal with reference to other waterfront planning precedents and reconsider the necessity of permitting a PR of 9 for this waterfront site.

R70 – 李沛鏗 Li Pui Hang

19. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Li Pui Hang made the following main points:
- (a) as the Chairman of the Upper East Owners' Committee, he objected to Item A. He proposed adopting a maximum BH of 80mPD, with a 30m-wide wind corridor and a 20m setback along the northern edge adjoining Hoi Sham Park, with a view to improving air flow and providing public open space;
 - (b) one of the photomontages in the visual impact assessment was misleading as it was taken from a north-eastern waterfront angle rather than directly from the east, thereby failing to reflect the actual visual impact;
 - (c) according to TPB's statutory planning portal, the BH profile in the area descended from the inland area towards the waterfront and from north to south. BHs ranged from 130mPD to 140mPD near Ko Shan Theatre and Kwun Shan Court, 120mPD near Chat Ma Mansion and Co-tack Building, and 100mPD for Upper East and a URA's redevelopment site at Bailey Street. For developments to the south of Bailey Street, such as The Vantage and Sung Chi Building, BHs were 120mPD, whereas those to the north, including Upper East and Bailey Garden, were 100mPD. It was unreasonable for Item A Site, being a waterfront site north of Bailey Street, to exceed 100mPD. A more appropriate control should be a maximum BH of no more than 80mPD, which would align with the local context;
 - (d) he questioned the necessity of introducing another high-density residential development when the surrounding infrastructure was already under considerable strain. Item A Site was previously reserved for school use. From both planning and community perspectives, the land should be used for tourism-related purposes, aligning with the overall vision for the East Kowloon Harbourfront. URA failed to make reference to international precedents, such as Darling Harbour in Sydney, in adopting a stepped waterfront planning approach;

- (e) there was a vacant “G/IC” site between Tsing Chau Street and Hok Yuen Street, formerly used as a school, which could serve as an alternative location for the proposed development; and
- (f) residents of Upper East expressed particular concern over the rezoning, which involved a change from an 8-storey school development to residential towers exceeding the heights of nearby developments, including Bailey Garden, Upper East and Wing Fai Mansion. The Board was urged to adhere to the established planning principles for the Kowloon City District and reconsider the approval of a scheme that deviated markedly from the prevailing BH profiles in the area.

R121 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

20. Mr Chow Kwok Keung made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development was situated in close proximity to the Intermediate Pressure B pipelines and To Kwa Wan Piggling Station (TKWPS). In light of this, URA was advised to undertake a quantitative risk assessment (QRA) to thoroughly evaluate the potential risks associated with the vicinity of those facilities. The QRA should aim to identify and implement effective mitigation and safety measures to ensure the safety and integrity of the development and the surrounding area; and
- (b) URA should provide Towngas with a copy of the QRA report for record purpose. Maintaining open and continuous communication with Towngas throughout both the design and construction stages was considered crucial to safeguard the safe operation of the gas pipelines.

R120 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A

- (a) she was glad to note that a DC member and a number of local residents attended the hearing meeting to express their objection to Item A;
- (b) she referenced the Chief Executive's 2023 Policy Address, which outlined that the Government's plan to provide suitable land to URA at a nominal land premium to enhance the viability of the relevant redevelopment projects and increase the usable resources available to URA;
- (c) while private developers had consistently secured healthy profits from their projects, URA had recorded loss in its development projects. Item A Site, originally designated for community use, was granted to URA at a nominal premium. Instead of investigating the reasons behind URA's underperformance compared with private developers, the Government had opted to repurpose public parks, recreational facilities and other community-use sites. A recent example cited was Sai Yee Street, where public sports facilities and park areas were reallocated for URA-related developments;

Land Use

- (d) Item A Site was initially designated for school development during a period when Hong Kong's universities were seeking land for campus expansion and the Government was promoting Hong Kong as an education hub. The site should be utilised to address the shortage of suitable land for higher or community education purposes. As Item A Site was located near the waterfront and surrounded by a cluster of "G/IC" zones and an "OU (STP)" zone with BH restrictions ranging from 3 to 10 storeys, the proposed BH of 110mPD was incompatible with its surrounding context;
- (e) the new Kin Wan Street Garden at the Hung Hom waterfront was frequently overcrowded with children and families, indicating that local residents had long been deprived of adequate recreational facilities. Waterfront open space could be improved without URA's intervention or extensive development. Similarly, a new playground near To Kwa Wan Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Station was

consistently crowded, underscoring the insufficiency of such facilities to meet both current and future demand. The policy direction encouraging families to have more children, while failing to provide sufficient play spaces, was considered a matter of concern;

- (f) the existing indoor sports venues were sufficient to serve the densely populated To Kwa Wan and Hung Hom areas. Competition among sports enthusiasts and school teams rendered bookings extremely difficult. One of the representations mentioned that the To Kwa Wan Sports Centre might be converted into a fencing venue. Any reduction in the number of sports venues would further exacerbate booking difficulties. With seven indoor sports venues in Wong Tai Sin and nine in Kwun Tong, constructing another large indoor sports complex at Item A Site was considered not excessive. It would benefit the wider community if a complex, including a fencing hall, was provided at Item A Site, and To Kwa Wan Sports Centre reverted to an ordinary stadium;
- (g) a survey conducted by another representor, which collected over 400 responses, revealed that about 94.5% opposed changes to the existing community, primarily due to concerns about deteriorating living conditions and increased traffic congestion. Some respondents expressed the view that Item A Site should be used for public facilities, such as parks and sports fields. Besides, a low-rise educational development would comply with the original planning intention for Item A Site and optimise the interests of the community. It would also be in line with URA's objective of "delivering tangible social benefits, including enhanced liveability, strengthened local cohesion, social interaction, and community bonding";
- (h) bicycle parking was not proposed, despite the community's aspiration to cycle along the waterfront. Members should duly consider residents' views, particularly as a DC member had also expressed strong objection. The land use zoning should not be based on URA's financial situation;

Visual Impact, Air Ventilation and Environmental Concerns

- (i) a representer stated that the proposed residential towers would create a significant wall effect along the waterfront, severely affecting the visual quality from various viewing points. URA failed to provide an image illustrating the development's appearance when viewed directly from Bailey Street. Members were invited to visualise the impact of a 110mPD development by referring to Plan 4A of the Paper;
- (j) the wall effect would obstruct natural light and air ventilation to schools and recreational facilities located behind the proposed development. There were concerns that government-led projects consistently applied for higher BHs. This "do as I say, not as I do" approach contradicted the intentions of the OZP and the planning process;
- (k) the Paper stated that although some changes to the visual experience at the street level, along the waterfront and in the hinterland were anticipated, the proposed at-grade communal space and podium landscape treatments would provide visual permeability along Bailey Street and create visual interest to the area (point (12) of paragraph 5.2 of the Paper). This statement implicitly acknowledged that significant visual impacts were unavoidable;

Views on Representations

- (l) she raised concerns regarding some of the supporting representations, noting that they might be influenced by URA and its consultants. Unlike the opposing representations, those supporting comments generally did not indicate whether the respondents were residents of nearby developments. Moreover, their submissions were typically brief and similarly worded, in contrast to the detailed submissions from local residents. Members were urged to question the validity of those submissions;
- (m) she echoed the views of one representer who stated that with the redevelopment of To Kwa Wan, the population of residents of all ages would inevitably

increase, while the area was currently lacking recreational and sports facilities. There were only two recreational facilities near Wing Kwong Street, i.e. Ma Tau Wai/To Kwa Wan Road Garden Playground and Hoi Sham Park. During after-school hours, playgrounds were overcrowded, primarily with young children, and elderly residents often found it difficult to find seating. Given the anticipated increase in population, a severe shortage of facilities was expected. As Item A Site was close to the waterfront promenade, it was considered suitable for expanding the promenade and Hoi Sham Park to enhance recreational facilities and children's play areas, as well as for creating a seaside promenade to improve the living environment for the local residents;

Car Parking and Podium Bulk

- (n) the Paper indicated that URA would evaluate the Land Development Practice Note concerning GFA exemption arrangement for aboveground parking spaces in private development. This measure was to be reviewed during the subsequent detailed design stage, as outlined in point (7) of paragraph 5.2 of the Paper. Concerns were raised regarding the introduction of this measure without public consultation. Furthermore, underground parking had previously been encouraged to optimise land use and conceal unattractive structures. Nevertheless, developers were now incentivised to locate parking facilities within the podium, leading to taller and bulkier podium structures;
- (o) the proposed development's podium already exceeded the standard height of 15m, equivalent to four storeys instead of the typical three. To accommodate additional parking spaces, podium floors would likely be increased in height, inevitably deteriorating the development's appearance, particularly given its waterfront location. It was considered that parking facilities should be located underground rather than aboveground to maintain aesthetic integrity and efficient land use;

GIC Provision

- (p) while HKPSG were referenced in the GIC table, the data presented pertained to

the Kowloon City DC area, which covered a large area with a population exceeding half a million and was considered too broad for assessment purposes. The figures should instead be based on the Hung Hom OZP area. Given the distinct characteristics of different areas, GIC facilities should be provided within a reasonable walking distance for residents;

- (q) there were deficiencies in some GIC facilities, including about 40% for child care centre, 35% for community care services facilities and 100% for community rehabilitation day centres, etc. Given the uncertainty in the implementation programme of the planned facilities, concerns were raised as to whether those facilities would be realised in practice;
- (r) although the Paper stated that the land grant to URA could optimise land use and enhance planning gains by addressing the district's shortfall in GIC facilities (paragraph 2 of the Paper), the proposed two GIC facilities accounted for less than 5% of the total domestic GFA, which was even lower than the standard level of GIC provision typically required in public housing developments;

URA's Mandate

- (s) URA was not mandated to develop the harbourfront. The responsibility for developing harbourfront areas rested with relevant government departments, not URA. Nevertheless, it was noted that URA had been required to undertake services beyond its core mandate, such as the Smart Tender Platform. Those additional functions should be funded separately by the Government;
- (t) the Paper stated that the proposed development at Item A Site could improve URA's financial situation, enabling it to expedite other development projects, such as the '13 Streets' initiative (point (14) of paragraph 5.2 of the Paper). URA was originally established to redevelop old and dilapidated buildings, and its mandate did not include the allocation of development sites as financial resources. Such allocation could be perceived as an abuse of process and might potentially increase the risk of judicial review;

Item B

- (u) she expressed support for Item B; and

Item C

- (v) the explanation provided in the Paper was insufficient to justify why Item C Site could not adopt the same zoning as the sewage treatment plant, given that both facilities fell within the same category.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

22. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representers and/or their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, their representatives and/or PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Development Intensity and BH

23. Noting that some representers raised concerns on the BH of the proposed development at Item A Site, two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any supplementary or more detailed explanations addressing the representers' concerns about the BH of the proposed development; and
- (b) whether Item A Site, located to the north of Bailey Street, should be stipulated with a lower BH than those developments located to the south of Bailey Street as suggested by some representers.

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

- (a) the statutory BH restriction within the same street block as Bailey Garden was set at 100mPD. Bailey Garden's current BH remained below this limit, but

redevelopment could increase the BH up to the stipulated 100mPD in accordance with the OZP. The OZP's BH restrictions of 100mPD to 120mPD for areas north and south of Bailey Street served as planning controls rather than reflecting the actual heights of the existing buildings; and

- (b) development at a total PR of 9 would give rise to buildings of about 30 storeys, which would correspond to the BH restriction of 110mPD for Item A Site, taking into account a site level of about 5mPD. Besides, the 110mPD was formulated to accommodate site-specific conditions, including the integration of a drainage reserve and the provision of GIC and parking facilities. The BH restriction was considered reasonable within the broader height context of the district and was compatible with the surrounding developments. The district's height transition exhibited a gradual descent from the inland areas to the waterfront, contributing to a varied skyline rather than a uniform BH profile.

25. Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R1's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the northern and southern sections of Bailey Street were characterised by buildings ranging from 100mPD to 120mPD; and
- (b) a maximum BH of 110mPD was proposed to accommodate the planned residential development with a PR of 9, having regard to two primary site constraints. Firstly, a portion of Item A Site was designated as a stormwater drainage reserve, which prohibited any building construction. Secondly, the proposed development included a RCHE, which necessitated compliance with specific design and technical requirements. The proposed BH was consistent with the surrounding built environment. Any development exceeding 110mPD would still require planning permission from the Board.

Continuity to the Eastern Kowloon Waterfront Promenade

26. Noting that some representers were concerned about the continuity of the waterfront promenade, a Member enquired whether the existing sewage treatment works located to the south

of Item B would hinder the future development of a continuous promenade. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that most sections of the promenade near Bailey Street were accessible, with the exception of two locations, i.e. one near the former Green Island Cement site to the south and the other near Grand Waterfront to the north.

27. The Chairperson supplemented that the section adjacent to the Drainage Services Department (DSD)'s facility (i.e. To Kwa Wan Preliminary Treatment Works), located to the south of Item B Site, was now accessible to the public. However, the segment near the former Green Island Cement site remained unconnected. The Government would continue to negotiate with the landowner with a view to achieving full connectivity of the promenade.

Parking and Retail Provision in the Proposed Development

28. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any mitigation measures for the existing traffic congestion problem;
- (b) whether any alternative parking arrangements would be provided following the removal of the temporary car park at Item A Site; and
- (c) the rationale(s) for incorporating retail and GIC uses in the proposed development.

29. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R1's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the traffic consultant conducted a study of 10 nearby junctions and identified congestion mainly at junction J8 (Hung Hom Road). Road improvement works were recommended at that junction, and the Transport Department had agreed in principle. It was anticipated that the improvement works would help alleviate traffic congestion in the area, particularly for the sections along Chi Kiang Street and Hung Hom Road; and

- (b) Item A Site would provide 100 public parking spaces, together with dedicated loading/unloading facilities. A utilisation survey conducted by URA revealed that the existing coach bays were underutilised, typically accommodating between 13 and 18 coaches. In contrast to the current compact arrangement, the new design emphasised independent access for each coach bay, enhancing daily accessibility and turnover efficiency. Moreover, the forthcoming district redevelopment project was expected to augment parking facilities near the MTR station, further supporting the area's needs.

30. Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R1's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, supplemented that the project would enhance connectivity between Hoi Sham Park and inland areas, including Ma Tau Wai Road and To Kwa Wan MTR Station. The improvement was intended to strengthen urban connectivity and vibrancy in the region. Moreover, the proposed development would provide a public open space of about 760m², along with retail and dining establishments near Hoi Sham Park. Those facilities were designed to encourage public activities and foster a distinctive local character, enriching the community's social life.

TKWPS

31. A Member sought clarification on the function of the TKWPS and enquired why a QRA was not considered necessary. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that according to the Environmental Assessment Report, the TKWPS facility was primarily used for the deployment and retrieval of inspection tools for underground gas pipeline maintenance, an activity that occurred about once every decade. Moreover, the station was utilised for monitoring the internal pressure within the pipelines and did not serve as a gas storage unit. It solely housed equipment necessary for inspection purposes. Given those functions and the minimal operational frequency, the risk level associated with the TKWPS was assessed to be very low, and the conduct of a QRA was considered unnecessary according to relevant government department's advice.

32. Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R1's representative, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) a hazard-to-life assessment for a similar facility conducted by Towngas in relation to a previous planning application (No. A/K9/240) in 2010, indicating that the risk level for such facility was low. The findings were consistent with

the assessments carried out for other cases, such as the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun OZP; and

- (b) the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department had advised that a QRA was not necessary, given the absence of gas storage and the infrequent operation of inspection tools.

Odour

33. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding odour assessment near the sewage treatment facility, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R1's representative said that joint field inspections with DSD and the Environmental Protection Department in 2024 identified the primary source of odour as a nearby stormwater outfall, not the treatment plant itself. DSD attributed the issue to illegal or incorrect connections. Mitigation measures, including dry-season interception and rectifications of connections, had been initiated. A reduction in odour was anticipated during the winter season.

Public Consultation and URA's Mandate

34. In response to a Member's enquiry regarding the adequacy of the public consultation process and the alignment of the proposed development with URA's original mandate, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD said that all statutory and administrative consultation requirements had been complied with, which included presentations to the Harbourfront Commission and the Kowloon City DC, as well as further outreach conducted by URA to engage with various stakeholders, ensuring a broad consultation process.

35. Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R1's representative, supplemented by highlighting the broader mission of URA as outlined in paragraph 7 of the Urban Renewal Strategy (2011). He emphasised that URA's mandate extended beyond mere redevelopment and encompassed sustainable urban development, land use planning, urban design, greening, local culture, heritage preservation and harbour beautification. The proposed development was in line with these policy objectives, particularly through its emphasis on urban design and waterfront improvement.

36. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing

procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Chairperson thanked the representers, their representatives and PlanD's representatives 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 representers, their representatives and PlanD's representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

37. Members generally considered that the rezoning of Item A Site for residential development should be supported. Some Members had the following views, observations and suggestions:

Land Use and Urban Design

- (a) the rezoning aimed to transform an underutilised temporary car park into productive residential land, thereby enhancing the overall functionality and attractiveness of the area. The introduction of a retail belt was expected to invigorate the waterfront, adding vibrancy and value to the Eastern Kowloon Waterfront Promenade. A waterfront equipped solely with jogging paths might lack attractiveness, whereas the inclusion of eating places would significantly enhance public enjoyment and had garnered support from key stakeholders;
- (b) the proposed scale and layout of the retail facilities were considered appropriate for fostering gradual revitalisation of the waterfront. URA was encouraged to further enhance the detailed planning by integrating suggestions such as small-scale recreational facilities or children's play areas. The proposed development had the potential to become a key destination, contributing to the regeneration of the broader East Kowloon harbourfront;
- (c) from urban design perspective, retaining the original GIC use of Item A Site would lead to a waterfront that was active during school hours but largely inactive at night. Transforming the site for residential use, together with the provision of open space and enhanced connectivity with Hoi Sham Park, would

serve as a catalyst for urban revitalisation. This development would enhance the area's overall value, improve residents' quality of life and strengthen community vibrancy, ultimately creating a more dynamic and appealing environment for both residents and visitors;

BH

- (d) the proposed BH of 110mPD, while approaching the upper limit of acceptability, was justified by site constraints, particularly the stormwater drainage reserve along the southern site boundary, which reduced the buildable area. The justifications, convincingly presented by PlanD and URA, were further reinforced by the proposed building setbacks, which were intended to create additional open space for the benefit of the community;
- (e) from policy perspective, the proposed development would integrate well with the adjacent open spaces and the harbourfront, contributing to URA's overall urban renewal objectives;

URA's Preparations and Works

- (f) the proposed development was regarded as a "win-win-win" initiative as it would effectively address multiple objectives, including enhancing housing supply, strengthening URA's financial position and fostering synergy with the waterfront park. It also complemented adjacent developments, such as Kai Tak and other URA redevelopment projects, thereby contributing to the renewal and rejuvenation of the wider area. URA's thorough preparation for the hearing meeting was acknowledged; and
- (g) URA was advised to coordinate construction operations with the adjacent schools, with particular emphasis on noise mitigation during examination periods. It was stressed that the committed mitigation measures should be fully implemented and maintained throughout the construction phase.

38. The Chairperson concluded Members' consensus on supporting the OZP

amendments and not revising the OZP to meet the adverse representations. For Item A, the proposed development was regarded as well-balanced, representing a “win-win-win” initiative, and was expected to enhance URA’s financial capacity. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by PlanD’s representatives at the meeting.

39. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R33, R117 (part), R118 (part) and R120 (part)** and views provided by **R117 (part), R120 (part) and R121**, and decided not to uphold **R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part)** and agreed that the draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Item A

- (a) in taking forward the pledge to enhance the Urban Renewal Authority (URA)’s financial capability in the Policy Address 2023, the Government approved the grant of Item A site to URA as financial support to enable it to carry out redevelopment and fulfil its other statutory missions in a self-financing manner. Taking into account factors including site context, the character of the area and infrastructure capacity, rezoning the site for high-density residential development meets the policy objective of optimising land use and enhancing planning gains for the area. The maximum total and domestic plot ratio of 9 and 8 respectively and a maximum building height of 110 metres above Principal Datum for Item A site is compatible with the surrounding land uses. The proposed development with new open space, government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, retail uses, public vehicle park and enhanced accessibility to the harbourfront could benefit the local community and the public and bring vibrancy to the harbourfront; **(R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part))**;
- (b) relevant technical assessments on traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation, hazard-to-life, drainage, sewerage and water supply aspects confirmed that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures, there would be no insurmountable technical impacts arising from the proposed development. The development details and other technical aspects of the

proposed development would be subject to the scrutiny of concerned government departments at the subsequent development stage in accordance with relevant guidelines, requirements and ordinances (**R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part)**);

- (c) a quantitative risk assessment is not required as both the To Kwa Wan Piggery Station (TKWPS) and the Intermediate Pressure B pipeline are neither classified as a Potential Hazardous Installation nor a Notifiable Gas Installation under the Gas Safety Ordinance (Cap. 51). Nonetheless, a hazard-to-life assessment carried out by URA has confirmed that the proposed development would not lead to any unacceptable risk due to the TKWPS, and mitigation measures have been proposed in the assessment to further reduce the potential risk (**R40 and R121**);
- (d) the overall provision of open space and GIC facilities is generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in Kowloon City District Council area in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for elderly, child care and rehabilitation services/facilities. These services/facilities will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant government bureaux/departments, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise. The proposed residential development with welfare facility would expedite the provision of the needed services and the at-grade communal space would enhance accessibility to and create synergy with the adjacent Hoi Sham Park (**R34, R35, R37, R38, R39, R43, R44, R47, R49, R50, R51, R63, R67, R69, R70, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part)**); and
- (e) the consultation procedures for the rezoning exercise have been duly followed. URA will further liaise with relevant parties at the subsequent detailed design stage (**R38 and R63**)."

40. 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.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma rejoined the meeting at this point.]

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-NSW/11

(TPB Paper No. 11041)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

41. The Secretary reported that the amendment items were to take forward the decisions of two partially agreed section 12A (s.12A) applications No. Y/YL-NSW/8 and Y/YL-NSW/9 submitted by King Garden Limited and Bright Strong Limited respectively, which were subsidiaries of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants of the applicants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip] having current business dealings with SHK and
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho] AECOM; and
Mr Ryan M.K. Ip	- being the vice-president and executive director of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from SHK.

42. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had already left the meeting, and Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had not joined the meeting yet. As Mr Ryan M.K. Ip had no involvement in the project(s) under the sponsorship of SHK, Members agreed that he could join the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

43. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representer and representer's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo	- District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE)
Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak	- Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)
Mr Ajyum D. Chan	- Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East

Representer and Representer's Representatives

R1 – Bright Strong Limited/King Garden Limited

Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie] Representer's Representatives
Mr Man Ho]

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

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

45. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alexander W.Y. Mak, STP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Nam Sang Wai Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the grounds/views of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 11041 (the Paper). The amendments items included:

- (a) Item A1 – rezoning of a site to the west of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area” (“OU(CDWRA)”), “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”), “Open Storage” (“OS”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “OU(CDWRA)(2)” subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 392,300 square meters (m²) (of which the domestic GFA should not exceed 371,650m² and a GFA of not less than 6,400m² should be dedicated for the provision of a public transport terminus (PTT)), a maximum building height (BH) of 115 metres above Principal Datum (mPD), provision of a wetland restoration area (WRA) of not less than 28,000m² at the northern part of Area (a) and provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities as required by the Government;
- (b) Item A2 – rezoning of a strip of land to the north of the “OU(CDWRA)(2)” zone from “OU(CDWRA)” to “Conservation Area”;
- (c) Item A3 – rezoning of a site to the southwest of “OU(CDWRA)(2)” from “I(D)” and “OS” to “Open Space” (“O”);
- (d) Item B1 – rezoning of a site near the junction of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Pok Wai South Road from “OS” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Soy Sauce Factory” (“OU(SSF)”) subject to a maximum non-domestic GFA of 13,700m² and a maximum BH of 15mPD; and
- (e) Item B2 – rezoning of a strip of land near the junction of Castle Peak Road – Tam Mi and Pok Wai South Road from “OS” to “O”.

46. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above

rezoning and other technical amendments.

[Messrs C.K. Yip and Maurice K.W. Loo rejoined and Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

47. The Chairperson then invited the representer and representer's representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Bright Strong Limited/King Garden Limited

48. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie, made the following main points:

- (a) she supported the proposed amendments to the OZP, which adequately reflected the two s.12A applications partially agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board in February 2025;
- (b) RNTPC's comments had been incorporated into the OZP, including imposing proper statutory planning controls on the "OU(CDWRA)(2)" and "OU(SSF)" zones. The proposal should cohesively combine the residential area with the relocation of the existing soy sauce factory in a comprehensive and coordinated manner;
- (c) the Notes stated that subsequent section 16 application for both developments would be required, and the relocation proposal of the soy sauce factory would first need to be approved by the Board to ensure environmental and technical compatibility. Requirements on the submission of relevant technical assessments in support of the application were also clearly stipulated in the Notes; and
- (d) the OZP also included the maximum development parameters previously agreed under the s.12A applications, as well as other requirements such as the provision of a WRA, GIC facilities and PTT.

R2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Item A1

- (a) she opposed Item A;

Development Scheme

- (b) the proposed development comprised 35 blocks, offering about 10,000 housing units to accommodate about 26,000 residents. Given that SHK, the developer, had a history of seeking further increases in development intensity following approval from the Board, it was crucial for Members to consider that the final development might surpass the current development density and BH parameters;
- (c) the residential development portions under the two s.12A applications were combined into a single comprehensive residential development. This amalgamation led to an increase in paved surfaces, a reduction in the number of trees and a reduction in wetland area;

Visual Aspect

- (d) the proposed increase in plot ratio (PR) and BH would further obstruct mountain views from various vantage points. The visual impact assessment was considered insufficient, as it did not sufficiently reflect views from diverse directions. Some visual materials previously included in the s.12A applications were excluded from the consultation materials. The OZP consultation materials should be as comprehensive as those under the s.12A application stage;

GIC Provision

- (e) the residential portion had significantly deviated from the original planning

intention of the proposed zone, which primarily aimed at establishing a GIC node with the provision of essential facilities, such as dormitories for disabled children, ensuring their convenient access to educational resources. This vision was feasible at the time, given that all lots were under the control of a single developer;

- (f) the incorporation of about 40,000m² of government land into the development boundary did not translate into a substantial expansion of GIC facilities. Instead, only a small residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) and a neighbourhood elderly centre would be provided;
- (g) the benefits of the planned WRA, PTT, and GIC facilities to the neighbourhood were questionable. The PTT, which was privately operated, primarily served the residents of the proposed development. Only about 1,000 parking spaces were planned, which was insufficient for the expected population, leaving most residents reliant on bus services. The WRA, covering not less than 28,000m², was primarily intended for flood control and resilience purposes, which could not be regarded as a public amenity that enhanced the daily lives of the community members. Furthermore, the WRA was largely enclosed and privately managed, resulting in a substantial reduction in its recreational value;
- (h) the inadequacy of key GIC provision was a significant concern and considered unacceptable. According to the “Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Yuen Long District Council Area”, several GIC facilities were found to be deficient. In particular, there were shortfalls of about 60% for sports ground/complex, about 70% for clinic/health centre, about 55% for child care centre and about 64% for community care services facilities. Moreover, deficiencies were observed in RCHE at 37%, pre-school rehabilitation services at 38%, day rehabilitation services at 43%, residential care services at 29%, community rehabilitation day centres at 33%, district support centres for persons with disabilities at 40% and integrated community centres for mental wellness at 40%;
- (i) while the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines was considered by

PlanD as long-term objectives, it was crucial to ensure that GIC facilities were delivered in a timely manner. This approach was essential to prevent the recurrence of deficiencies observed in new towns, such as those experienced in Tin Shui Wai;

- (j) the Paper acknowledged the potential for integrating social welfare facilities within public housing developments (footnote 15 of the Paper (p.15)). However, it was important to recognise that many of those services were provided by private operators in the market. To ensure comprehensive community support, the Government should actively encourage developers to incorporate those essential facilities into their development projects;
- (k) the proposed school was not effectively integrated with the overall development. SHK, the developer, consistently provided minimal GIC facilities in proportion to the scale of its projects;

Stakeholder Participation

- (l) it was disappointing that the Yuen Long District Council (DC), Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee and San Tin Rural Committee did not submit any representations. It was the responsibility of the local stakeholders/representatives to monitor developments affecting their areas of concern; and

Items A2, A3, B1 and B2

- (m) she supported Item A2, A3, B1 and B2.

50. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, representer and representer's representative had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer, representer's representatives and/or PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

History of the Soy Sauce Factory

51. In response to a Member's enquiries regarding the age of the existing soy sauce factory and its eligibility as an intangible cultural heritage, Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that the soy sauce factory, which was of a considerable scale, had a history of about 90 years.

52. Ms Wu Wan Yin Winnie, R1's representative, elaborated on the distinguished heritage of the Koon Chun Hing Kee Soy and Sauce Factory (冠珍醬園), which had a history of nearly a century. Originally established in the Kowloon Walled City, the factory was relocated to its current site 60 years ago. The factory was distinguished by its unique characteristics compared to other soy sauce manufacturers. It continued to produce soy sauce using the traditional natural sun-drying method in the fermentation process, which had been preserved over the decades. Over the years, its products garnered international acclaim and were exported worldwide. The Koon Chun brand stood as a testament to a Hong Kong success story.

53. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Chairperson thanked the representer, representer's representatives and PlanD's representatives 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, representer's representatives and PlanD's representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

54. Members generally supported the OZP amendments. Some Members expressed the following views and observations:

- (a) the two s.12A applications, previously partially agreed upon, were further detailed by the OZP, outlining how developers would optimise land use. The use of the traditional natural sun-drying method in the fermentation process presented an opportunity to explore its recognition as intangible cultural heritage. The proposed development, which included preserving the factory

due to its historical significance and unique Hong Kong characteristics, was supported; and

- (b) the two s.12A applications were thoroughly discussed at RNTPC. The integration of the sites into a single development was favourably considered, facilitating enhanced collaboration between the developer and the soy sauce factory. The objective was to prevent a fragmented approach and to promote a more cohesive and comprehensive residential development in the northern portion.

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

56. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1 to R3 and R4 (part)**, and decided not to uphold the remaining part of **R4** and agreed that the draft Nam Sang Wai Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“Item A1

- (a) Item A1 is to take forward the two section 12A (s.12A) applications which were partially agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board) mainly on the considerations that the proposed developments under the two s.12A applications could strike a balance between conservation and development and were not incompatible with the surrounding environment; the proposed development parameters were considered acceptable and relevant technical assessments conducted demonstrated no insurmountable impacts on the surroundings are anticipated; and the concerned government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) had no objection to or no adverse comment on the proposed developments at the respective sites and the subsequent amendments

under Item A1. In view of the above, the amendments are considered appropriate;

- (b) according to the Notes for the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Comprehensive Development to include Wetland Restoration Area (2)” (“OU(CDWRA)(2)”) zone, section 16 application for the proposed comprehensive residential development would be required and should be in the form of a comprehensive development scheme to include a layout plan with supporting documents as set out in the Remarks of the Notes of the OZP for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)”) zone. Relevant B/Ds and the Board would scrutinise the detailed design and technical assessments, such as the design, management and maintenance proposal of the wetland restoration area, the landscape proposals, the development layout and height of the buildings within the comprehensive residential development; and

Provision of Government, Institution and Community (GIC) Facilities

- (c) requirement for provision of GIC facilities in the proposed comprehensive residential developments at Item A1 site has been specified in the Notes and Explanatory Statement of the OZP for the “OU(CDWRA)(2)”) zone. Furthermore, the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities is generally sufficient to meet the planned population in Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) area in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, except for hospital beds, clinic/health centres, some social welfare facilities, sports facilities, divisional police station and magistracy. These services/facilities will be carefully monitored and planned/reviewed by relevant government B/Ds while the Planning Department will also work closely with relevant B/Ds with a view that such premises based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment proposals from both public and private sectors in YLDC area when opportunities arise.”

57. 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 5

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

58. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:35 p.m.