

**Minutes of 1357th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 18.3.2026 and 19.3.2026**

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 Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung (18.3.2026 a.m. and 19.3.2026 p.m.)

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong (18.3.2026 p.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Bond C.P. Chow (18.3.2026)

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung (19.3.2026 p.m.)

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam (18.3.2026)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South)
Environmental Protection Department
Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho (19.3.2026 p.m.)

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

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katy C.W. Fung (18.3.2026 a.m. and 19.3.2026 p.m.)

Mr K.K. Lee (18.3.2026 p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Carol K.L. Kan (18.3.2026 a.m.)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (18.3.2026 p.m.)

Mr Edward H.C. Leung (19.3.2026 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 18.3.2026:

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	
Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong	
Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu	
Professor Roger C.K. Chan	
Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho	
Mr Timothy K.W. Ma	
Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui	
Mr Daniel K.W. Chung	
Mr Rocky L.K. Poon	
Professor B.S. Tang	
Professor Simon K.L. Wong	
Mr Simon Y.S. Wong	
Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon Transport Department Mr Vico P. Cheung	

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

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

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K7/25

(TPB Paper No. 11051)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese, English and Putonghua.]

2. The Secretary reported that the draft Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/25 (the draft OZP) mainly involved rezoning of a site at Fat Kwong Street (i.e. the site under Item A) (the Site) to facilitate a proposed private residential development, which was supported by a feasibility study conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - he and his spouse owning properties in Ho Man Tin; and

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung - being a former Director of CEDD.

3. Members noted that Mr Daniel K.W. Chung had no involvement in the feasibility study and the properties owned by Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and his spouse had no direct view of the Site, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

5. The following government representatives (including the consultant) (hereinafter referred to as “government representatives”), representers and/or their representatives 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) |
| Mr Jamie H.M. Chan | - | Town Planner/Kowloon (TP/K) |

CEDD

- | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----------------------|
| Mr Stephen C.C. Lo | - | Chief Engineer (CE) |
| Mr Ray L.W. Lau | - | Senior Architect (SA) |

AtkinsRealis Asia Limited

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|------------|
| Mr Louis N.K. Lau | - | Consultant |
|-------------------|---|------------|

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R7 - 陳家強

- | | | |
|------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Mr Chan Ka Keung | - | Representer |
| Mr Wong Chun Man | - | Representer's Representative |

R16 - 張筱青

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Zhang Xiaoqing | - | Representer |
|-------------------|---|-------------|

R17 - 尚夢園

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|-------------|
| Ms Shang Mengyuan | - | Representer |
|-------------------|---|-------------|

R36 – Zhang Feng Fen

Ms Zhang Feng Fen - Representer
Mr Kanjauapas, Suriyan Joshua - Representer's Representative

R63 – 劉勇

Mr Liu Yong - Representer

R78 – 虞鐵軍

Mr Yu Teijun - Representer

R120 – Sarah Tang

Ms Tang Hai Ying Sarah - Representer

R248 – 潘登

Mr Pan Deng - Representer

R311 – 張詠思

Ms Cheung Wing Sze Vince - Representer

R363 – 張明瑋

Mr Zhang Ming Wei - Representer

R451 – Song Ting Feng

Mr Song Ting Feng - Representer

R506 – 麥嘉恩

Ms Mark Ka Yan Bridget - Representer

R628 – 九龍城區議會陳治華議員辦事處

Mr Chan Chi Wah - Representer's Representative

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the hearing would be conducted in 2 days on 18.3.2026 and 19.3.2026

(p.m.). The representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations at this session of the meeting. After the presentation of PlanD, the representers and/or their representatives would 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 2 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 for each morning and afternoon session after the attending representers and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers and/or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After the hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers and/or their representatives, the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

8. 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 item on the draft OZP, the grounds/views of representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in the Paper No. 11051 (the Paper). The amendment item on the draft OZP mainly involved rezoning of the Site in Ho Man Tin from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Residential (Group B) 4" ("R(B)4") for a proposed private residential development, subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 19,300m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 160 metres above Principal Datum (mPD), with provision of social welfare facilities (Item A).

9. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP in relation to the above rezoning and other technical amendments including those to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left this session of the meeting temporarily after PlanD's presentation.]

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

R7 – 陳家強

11. Mr Chan Ka Keung made the following main points:

- (a) as the Chairman of the Owners' Committee of Ultima and a holder of Doctor of Philosophy in the discipline of engineering, he had experience in conducting environmental impact assessment, and generally, the results of such assessment depended on what the client sought to achieve. He supplemented his written representation by focusing on human perspective in addition to technical considerations. The Board should take into account the actual situations faced by residents and residents' daily experiences;
- (b) notwithstanding the Transport Department (TD)'s no objection to the zoning amendment under Item A and the improvement measures implemented by the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL), the existing situation at Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station during peak hours was still unsatisfactory. There were only three lifts serving Exit A3, and residents had to queue for more than 10 minutes in a long passage without air-conditioning. Only one of the lifts was arranged to stop at the level of Ultima (i.e. G Level) in limited time slots each day. For the other two lifts, residents of Ultima would be brought from the station concourse direct to the public covered walkway level (i.e. U3/F) and had to walk downstairs equivalent to 6 to 7 storeys to reach home. Alternatively, residents of Ultima had to use Exit A2, walking uphill for over 100m along Fat Kwong Street. The said improvement measures and alternative route appeared acceptable, however, were highly inconvenient in practice, particularly for the elderly and families with young children;
- (c) while the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) had brought journey-time benefits to other districts, residents of the Ho Man Tin District, including those of Ultima, did not have direct access to CKR, but had to bear the pollution daily

due to the nearby Ho Man Tin Ventilation Building (HMTVB) of CKR. During the construction period, works such as blasting and piling had caused severe noise nuisance to nearby residents. At meetings with the relevant government departments and consultants, residents were only advised that emissions from HMTVB depended on the operation of the ventilation fans and were monitored by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD), but no concrete emission data on key pollutants, such as nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide and particulates, had been made available. Noting that Ultima was about 130m from HMTVB whereas the Site directly adjoined HMTVB, he questioned how acceptable air quality could be ensured for future residents;

- (d) with reference to PlanD's presentation, a total of about 200 flats was estimated based on an assumed average flat size of 75m². Nevertheless, the developer might adopt a smaller flat size (for example about 170 or 270 square feet), resulting in a significantly higher number of flats and population than those assumed under the notional scheme. From territory-wide housing supply perspective, the 200 flats would only make a modest contribution, especially when compared with those major development projects in the Northern Metropolis, and he questioned whether it was justified to pursue a highly contentious project with severe long-term impacts on surrounding residents merely for such limited gain;
- (e) it was considered inappropriate to treat the Site as being of lesser value simply because it had been used as a temporary works area, and hence suitable for development. Instead, the Site should be reinstated as far as practicable, or put to an appropriate use having regard to its original planning intention as a "G/IC" zone to address local needs, rather than for high-density residential development;
- (f) as regards concerns on privacy, his residence was about 50m to 60m from the recently completed developments Onmantin and In One, and this separation had already resulted in a noticeable loss of privacy, requiring him to draw the curtains earlier in the evening. The proposed development could be as close as about 25m to 30m from Ultima, which would further aggravate

overlooking between buildings; and

- (g) over the past 2 to 3 decades, it was observed that various “G/IC” sites in the district had been converted to residential use without the provision of additional parks or community facilities, while increasing numbers of students and residents had further strained MTR services and nearby shopping centres. Private residential developments relied entirely on parking spaces provided within developments, and the value of a parking space had risen to about \$4 million to \$5 million, which was considered questionable in terms of fairness to residents living in Ho Man Tin and the wider public interest. There was high demand for public car parks.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong joined this session of the meeting at this point.]

R16 – 張筱青

12. Mr Zhang Xiaoqing made the following main points:

- (a) as an experienced planning professional, he considered that town planning had to balance among relevant factors, taking into account technical assessments and avoiding changes that would undermine long-term public interest. As a resident of Ultima, he considered the rezoning a planning blight. Referring to the draft OZP and aerial photos, the Site was located on the same cut-slope platform as Ho Man Tin West Fresh Water Service Reservoir (FWSR) to its northwest, above which was an open space now used as a temporary baseball training ground, and HMTVB at the slope toe to its north and Ho Man Tin Park and Ho Man Tin Sports Centre located to its south, all falling within the same “G/IC” zone. This land use pattern reflected a well-established planning intention for utility, sports and recreational uses of the Site. Rezoning the Site from “G/IC” to “R(B)4” for residential development would, from planning perspective, brought more disadvantages than benefits to the community;
- (b) introducing a high-rise residential development on such a small site would

neither meaningfully nor effectively address the Government's underlying revenue considerations, but would instead appear abrupt in urban design terms within a mature and densely developed neighbourhood and adversely affect the livelihoods of local residents;

- (c) residents had already endured years of construction noise and disturbance arising from various works in the vicinity, to the extent that children could hardly study at home in the afternoon, even with windows closed and curtains drawn during piling and other noisy activities, which also affected air ventilation. Soon after the completion of such works, they had to face further construction works for the proposed residential development at the Site. The proposed residential development with a BH of 160mPD at the Site, which was considered the only remaining 'breathing space' for residents in the vicinity, would further enclose Ultima. Many families had committed most of their savings to purchase flats in Ultima, which was promoted as a high-end development, only to find themselves increasingly hemmed in by buildings and experiencing a decline in their living and environmental quality over the years;

- (d) drawing on his experience as a planner in the Mainland, it was understood that planning authorities often faced strong public reactions when rezonings or redevelopment proposals were perceived to sacrifice local interests for marginal gains. Every planning decision could have long-term implications for residents' daily lives and the Government's credibility. The additional housing yield from the Site would be relatively minor, but the adverse impacts on building mass, visual openness, air ventilation and community acceptance could be substantial. It was therefore urged that due weight should be given to long-term public interest, including the livelihood of residents in the vicinity, in making planning decisions, rather than focusing solely on housing supply or revenue. Otherwise, the rezoning would send an undesirable message that sites with long-established planning intention for community/recreational uses could be rezoned for development purpose because of minor financial gains; and

- (e) the Site should be developed for low-rise sports or leisure facilities, which would be compatible with the surrounding open spaces and recreation grounds, so that the existing skyline would not be dominated by a cluster of tall buildings. It was therefore strongly requested that the zoning amendment under Item A be rejected and that the original planning intention of a “G/IC” zone be maintained.

R36 – Zhang Feng Fen

13. Ms Zhang Feng Fen made the following main points:

- (a) she moved from Mid-Levels to Ho Man Tin as a resident of Ultima because of its relatively spacious environment and the choice of schools in this area, noting that the district had traditionally been characterised by residential developments with educational and community facilities rather than concentration of commercial activities. In recent years, a number of large-scale residential developments, including those above Ho Man Tin MTR Station such as Onmantin and In One, had added several thousand new flats to the area, on top of existing housing estates such as Oi Man Estate and Ho Man Tin Estate;
- (b) based on her daily experience, students in the district had very limited public spaces to go to after school or at lunchtime, with only a small shopping centre at Oi Man Estate providing basic necessities, and some students had to have their lunch in a rush. Those working in the Housing Authority Headquarters nearby took long time to commute by MTR or other public transport modes and were difficult to find seats for lunch. Notwithstanding the provision of multiple exits at Ho Man Tin MTR Station, the Station and surrounding pedestrian network were already very crowded at peak hours and close to capacity even without further development. It was considered that the responses in the Paper were largely theoretical and failed to address the difficulties faced by residents, wheelchair users, the elderly and students during peak hours;

- (c) although Ho Man Tin Sports Centre and its tennis courts were located close to Ultima, the tennis courts could rarely be successfully booked despite repeated attempts, requiring travel to other districts such as Kwai Tsing and Tsing Yi. There was inadequate provision of sports and recreational facilities in the Kowloon City District and the Ho Man Tin area to meet local demand. One of the characteristics of Ho Man Tin was the provision of schools, and it was considered that without the educational and leisure facilities, the attractiveness of the district would be greatly diminished; and
- (d) there were concerns about the impact of emissions from HMTVB as information on the monitoring system and emission data was not available. The relevant government departments, such as EPD and TD, had indicated “no comment” on the rezoning, and it was questionable whether such views were based on facts and reality. From the perspective of a Ho Man Tin resident, the Board and the relevant government departments should consider the rezoning of the Site not only on the basis of technical assessments but also the needs and livelihood of local residents.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi joined this session of the meeting during R36’s presentation.]

R78 – 虞鐵軍

14. Mr Yu Teijun made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Tower 8 of Ultima and strongly objected to the rezoning of the Site for residential use. The Government’s intention to increase housing supply was noted, and his views were provided from three perspectives, including the obstruction of natural lighting and blocking of views, wall effect and the associated environmental impact, and whether the planning decision was made in a scientific and prudent manner;
- (b) his flat was located at a direct distance of about 20m from the Site. When he decided to purchase a flat there, it was based on reasonable expectations under the then prevailing development context. The proposed high-rise

development at the Site would create substantial wall effect not only on his flat, but also on those at lower and middle floors of Ultima. There would be significant reduction in natural lighting, with little or even no sunlight after 3 p.m. The proposed development at the Site would adversely affect the living environment of existing residents, given the already congested development context;

- (c) in other rezoning cases in Tuen Mun and Tsuen Wan, air ventilation assessments had been conducted. There was no information on whether an air ventilation assessment had been conducted for the subject case. Given the existing high-density building cluster around Ultima, the proposed high-rise building block immediately adjoining Ultima would create a wall effect, obstruct the prevailing summer wind and exacerbate the heat island effect, thereby leading to accumulation of air pollutants in the area. This was not merely a visual issue, but a public health concern;
- (d) rezoning the Site to residential use would inevitably generate more traffic and pedestrian flow. Members should be well aware that Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was already busy, and the lifts, platforms and passageways were heavily congested during peak hours. Any additional residents in the area would further aggravate the inconvenience already experienced by existing residents in waiting for lifts to access the MTR Station. It was urged that due consideration should be given to the living quality of residents in the area; and
- (e) the core value of town planning was not merely about identifying more land for development, but also about preserving the harmony and liveability of existing communities. Residents of Ho Man Tin were not opposing development, but called for a fair, scientific and transparent decision-making process. If the existing residents' rights to natural lighting, ventilation and a reasonable view could be so readily compromised, it was questioned how Hong Kong could continue to enjoy its reputation as a liveable city. It was therefore respectfully urged that the zoning amendment under Item A be rejected, or at least deferred, and the relevant government departments be

required to conduct more in-depth assessments on environmental and traffic aspects, while taking heed of the views of residents living in the area.

R120 – Sarah Tang

15. Ms Tang Hai Ying Sarah made the following main points:

- (a) the rezoning proposal was only brought to her attention upon the posting of the notice in her housing estate, and she was surprised that a high-rise development was proposed on such a small site. The Site was adjacent to a sports ground rather than a main street, and it was questioned whether the Government had selected it simply because it was in a less conspicuous location and was unlikely to attract objections;
- (b) while PlanD had explained the proposal was technically feasible, technical feasibility alone should not be the sole justification for the rezoning. Otherwise, many sites in Hong Kong, such as those in Mid-Levels and Central, could also be identified for high-rise development. The Government was considered to have adopted a predetermined stance, benefiting some at the expense of others, and was criticised for such an approach without due regard to the needs of local residents;
- (c) the proposed development was considered incompatible with the surrounding developments, including Ultima, Oi Man Estate and Ho Man Tin Estate. The proposed high-rise building on such a small site would be visually unattractive and represent poor planning, thereby undermining Hong Kong's reputation as a liveable international city. It was also stressed that the Government should act as a gatekeeper and should not approve the proposal merely because it was technically feasible with limited objections;
- (d) the baseball field, which was a temporary use, had remained in place for more than 10 years, and it was questioned whether supporting facilities such as changing rooms and toilets were sufficiently provided. Public sports facilities in Hong Kong were already in limited supply and there was a serious

shortage of recreational facilities for public use, as evidenced by the difficulty in booking tennis courts located near Ultima. The fee was about \$700 per hour with the assistance of coaches for the booking. This reflected the shortage problem. Residents of private housing estates were entitled to enjoy public space such as parks and children's playgrounds. In addition, there was a shortage of parking facilities and parking fees were about \$60 per hour. The Site should be reserved for recreational use rather than housing development; and

- (e) consultation should not be a mere formality and the voices of local residents should be properly heard. The zoning amendment under Item A was opposed, and the Site should be retained for community purposes such as baseball field, tennis courts or other recreational uses.

R628 – 九龍城區議會陳治華議員辦事處

16. Mr Chan Chi Wah, as a Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) member, made the following main points:

- (a) a briefing had previously been arranged with the participation of relevant government departments to explain the proposal to local residents. Many residents in the district had expressed views on the proposed development;
- (b) he mainly consolidated residents' views and presented them for Members' consideration. Residents were concerned about the wall effect, a sense of confinement and privacy. As the proposed BH would be similar to that of the surrounding developments, the high-rise development on the small site would create wall effect, obstruct prevailing air movement and adversely affect ventilation. As more buildings in the vicinity were completed, the area was likely to become increasingly compact, creating a sense of enclosure and further affecting residents' daily lives and mental well-being. The close proximity of the proposed development to existing residential blocks would compromise privacy and create a sense of overlooking, thereby adversely affecting quality of life;

- (c) community facilities in the Ho Man Tin area were already inadequate. The area was predominantly residential, with a lack of supporting facilities, particularly shops, clinics and restaurants, causing inconvenience to residents. The number of flats completed in Ho Man Tin in recent years was about 4,949, including Onmantin (990 units), In One (844 units), Ultima (572 units), Mantin Heights (1,429 units), One Homantin (561 units) and Kwun Tak Court (603 units). Assuming two persons per household, the population arising from these developments had increased by more than 10,000, yet the corresponding supporting facilities had not been improved accordingly. The restaurants and commercial facilities in Ho Man Tin Plaza and Oi Man Plaza or nearby might not be sufficient to cope with the increasing demand from schools, government offices and tertiary institutions, including Jockey Club Institute of Healthcare (IOH) of Hong Kong Metropolitan University (HKMU) and the proposed new campus of HKMU to be completed in coming years;
- (d) the choice of bus and public light bus routes serving Ho Man Tin was limited. There was only one direct bus route to Central and Sheung Wan, and no direct route to the Eastern District, such that residents generally had to interchange, resulting in travelling time of about one hour. The frequencies of several bus and green minibus routes were low, and waiting time during peak hours could be more than 20 to 30 minutes. The current public transport services were considered unsatisfactory, and it was hoped that TD would consider providing additional routes to improve connectivity to other districts;
- (e) Ho Man Tin MTR Station was already congested during peak hours due to travel demand from nearby schools and government offices, resulting in persistent overcrowding and long queues at station exits. Any further population increase would aggravate the situation; and
- (f) the construction of HMTVB, which commenced in 2017, had lasted for many years. The associated piling, rock-breaking and excavation works had caused nuisance/adverse impact on nearby residents, particularly those living

close to HMTVB. Any further development would bring about construction works, exposing residents to extended nuisance and potentially affecting their mental well-being. The Board was urged to take into account residents' views and refine the proposal as far as possible.

R120 – 潘登

17. Mr Pan Deng made the following main points:

- (a) he and his family had moved to Hong Kong under the Government's Quality Migrant Admission Scheme in 2012 and were living in Ultima. He had sought the opinions of local friends on residence, who recommended Ho Man Tin and Kowloon Tong. He chose Ho Man Tin as it had long been regarded as a prestigious residential area in Kowloon;
- (b) being surrounded by slope and green areas, the Site had a very limited developable area. A high-rise, high-density residential development on such a constrained site would adversely affect nearby residents, and property values in the vicinity would decrease. Although the need for the Government to generate revenue from land sale was understandable, the living quality of existing residents should not be compromised;
- (c) the slogan "cities should make life better" had been promoted by the Shanghai Municipal Government when he was living in Shanghai, and was also one of the themes of the World Expo. Hong Kong should uphold the same planning principle, as it had long been regarded as one of the world's more liveable cities;
- (d) referring to a sunset photograph taken from his flat, the existing view consisted of the sea, swimming pool and tennis court. The Site had originally been planned for community and recreational uses, and the erection of a tall building on the Site would result in a loss of this view; and
- (e) he strongly opposed the proposed development. An unreasonable planning

decision would have damaging effect on a community, and planning should aim to improve quality of life rather than sacrificing long-term well-being for short-term gains. With Dalian as an example, high-rise and piecemeal infill developments had altered the city's appearance and eroded its identity as the "Pearl of the North". Similar planning mistakes should be avoided, and the existing development character and scenery of Ho Man Tin should be preserved.

R311 – 張詠思

18. Ms Cheung Wing Sze Vince made the following main points:

- (a) she worked in the property sector and expressed concern about the housing supply situation in Ho Man Tin over the past decade. Having reviewed the latest figures, it was observed that a considerable number of private housing developments had been completed in Ho Man Tin over the past 10 years, with a significant number of units remained unsold, including 281 out of 990 units (28%) in Onmantin; 155 out of 401 units (38%) in Grand Homm; 135 out of 844 units (16%) in In One; 50 out of 71 units (70%) in Madera Garden; 27 out of 175 units (15%) in St. George's Mansions; 19 out of 165 units (11%) in Vau Residence; 18 out of 56 units (32%) in Garden Crescent; 13 out of 110 units (12%) in 128 Waterloo; and 13 out of 80 units (6%) in One Princeton. Other than the above, there were Ultima, Mantin Heights and One Homantin, and in total, more than 5,000 were added in the past decade. It was queried whether there was a need for an additional about 200 units, given that about 700 unsold first-hand units remained in the district;
- (b) according to population census data, the district had a population of over 17,000, with developments concentrated around Ho Man Tin MTR Station. It was considered that the transport capacity had reached its limits. With institutions such as HKMU and the IOH of HKMU in the vicinity, the commuting demand in the area was noted to be increasingly heavy. Ho Man Tin MTR Station was particularly congested during peak hours, and lift capacity was insufficient, with some residents having to walk down 7 storeys

instead of waiting;

- (c) notwithstanding the significant increase in housing supply, government, institution and community (GIC) and supporting community facilities in Ho Man Tin had not kept pace. Members were urged to consider whether supporting facilities such as bus terminus, district shopping centre or sports facilities should be provided at the Site. The Ho Man Tin area lacked a major shopping mall and relied only on Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza;
- (d) recreational facilities in the area were limited, and only one of the 10 private residential developments had a tennis court. It was considered unfair that residents, being taxpayers, were unable to enjoy adequate public space and recreational facilities. The proposed development would worsen privacy conditions and might affect emergency access, noting the recent fire incident in Tai Po where access had been constrained; and
- (e) in conclusion, Ho Man Tin residents had experienced traffic congestion and inadequate community facilities for over a decade. It was urged that the Board should consider carefully whether approving about 200 additional units at the Site was justified and should strike a balance between development and community needs.

R363 – 張明瑋

19. Mr Zhang Ming Wei made the following main points:

- (a) since 2017, residents in Ho Man Tin had been continuously affected by noise, blasting and dust from construction works, including those of the CKR, with impacts lasting for at least 8 years. The change of land use of the Site would adversely affect nearby residents and would be unfair;
- (b) the CKR had been planned before the current residents moved in, and its actual impacts on the neighbourhood had not been fully taken into account during the planning stage of the infrastructure. With CKR in operation,

residents were concerned about emissions from HMTVB. Despite meetings with the Highways Department (HyD), no satisfactory response had been provided. It was noted that up to 80% of respirable suspended particulates could be removed after filtration, with the remainder discharged into the environment, which was considered unsatisfactory. Residents had sought assistance from the former District Council member, Mr Wing-kit Yang, but were advised that no further mitigation measures would be implemented. Up till now, neither HyD nor EPD had provided a positive response on the monitoring of emission from HMTVB. The nearest air quality monitoring station was located in the Sham Shui Po District and there was no monitoring facility in the Central Kowloon area. If government officials still failed to give a positive response, residents might consider staging a public petition, which might affect developers' interest in bidding for the Site and discourage prospective buyers;

- (c) Fat Kwong Street and Chung Hau Street, which were driving test routes, had become increasingly congested as the population grew, while recreational and community facilities in the area remained limited. The Oi Man Estate market often closed early and could not meet residents' needs, and the supermarket in Oi Man Plaza was overcrowded during evening peak; and
- (d) while the proposed infill development might be technically feasible, it was considered impractical and would further undermine the liveability of the area. Members were therefore urged to consider carefully the appropriateness of residential use at the Site.

R451 – Song Ting Feng

20. Mr Song Ting Feng made the following main points:

- (a) he owned a property in Ultima and had moved to Hong Kong from the Mainland. There was only one submission supporting the rezoning while more than 600 representers opposed it, such that about 99% of the views were against the rezoning and public sentiment was very clear. Although PlanD

had undertaken substantial work and provided clear responses to each of the points raised by residents, none of the responses had addressed representers' concerns. PlanD's responses were not supported by data and third-party assessments, which was considered inconsistent with the practices in the Mainland and overseas. Members were invited to consider the issues raised by representers carefully;

- (b) he was living in a flat on a lower floor of Block 7 of Ultima, currently receiving about 5 to 6 hours of sunlight in the afternoon, notwithstanding the absence of a sea view. If the proposed housing block was completed, the impact would be very obvious and the sunlight would be blocked, and privacy, as raised by many property owners of Ultima, would not be protected. There were old trees within and near the Site. With the proposed residential development, the trees would no longer receive sufficient sunlight, and a proper assessment of the impact on the trees was therefore considered necessary; and
- (c) Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was already heavily used with very long queues, and congestion would be significantly worsened if the proposed development was implemented without any additional exit. The project should not be approved on technical grounds alone, and human and community considerations should also be taken into account. Members were invited to conduct a site visit and assess the suitability of the Site for development purpose before making a decision, with a balanced view taking into account not only Government's fiscal considerations but also residents' concerns and the overall benefit of the city.

R506 – 麥嘉恩

21. Ms Mark Ka Yan Bridget made the following main points:

- (a) the presentation of PlanD gave an impression that each and every concern raised by representers was addressed. However, the existing problems faced by local residents had not yet been properly resolved, not to mention problems

arising from any future development;

- (b) the provision of a shopping centre that could provide essential services to meet the basic needs of the community should not be neglected merely because Ho Man Tin Plaza and Oi Man Plaza already existed. The reliance on the commercial facilities of Ho Man Tin Plaza and Oi Man Estate to meet the community needs was considered questionable as there were already about 4,700 flats in Ho Man Tin Estate and about 6,000 flats in Oi Man Estate, while total number of flats from the newly developed projects in the area was already comparable to that of the two estates. It was therefore queried why no new shopping centre was provided in Ho Man Tin;
- (c) the proposed crowd management measures by MTRCL, including the deployment of staff and the diversion of passengers to other exits of Ho Man Tin MTR Station, were insufficient to cope with the current situation and would be unable to meet the additional demand from the yet-to-be-occupied flats in the area and the proposed new campus of HKMU, as well as the future population arising from the proposed development;
- (d) regarding the channeling effect and stack effect in the event of fire risk, the proposed emergency vehicular access (EVA) was the only remedial measure but could not address the problem; and
- (e) the Site and its surroundings already accommodated a high concentration of both public and private housing developments, schools, universities, government offices and other facilities, and the existing supporting facilities were inadequate to meet local demand. If the basic community needs had yet to be met, there was no room for any new residential development in the area until the existing problems had been properly resolved.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

22. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representers and/or their representatives in this session 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 the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Proposed Use of the Site

23. A Member enquired whether other GIC uses at the Site had been considered by government departments after de-reservation of the Site for a salt water service reservoir as some representers expressed that the Site should be reserved for community uses. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD explained that de-reserved GIC sites and other government sites such as vacant school premises were subject to regular review for long-term use. Government departments would be consulted if a site was required for GIC purposes, taking into considerations relevant factors such as demand and supply of facilities, cost-effectiveness, resource priority, etc. The Site had gone through the procedures under the GIC site review exercise and no government department had made such request for GIC use of the Site. Having considered relevant planning factors such as land use compatibility and technical feasibility, the Site was proposed for residential use and government departments consulted had no objection to the rezoning. As no government department had indicated the need for reservation of the Site for GIC use, retaining the Site without long-term use was not considered optimal utilisation of land.

Traffic and Transport

24. A Member said that Ultima was close to Exits A2 and A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station and asked why representers preferred to use Exit A3 instead of Exit A2. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Ms Zhang Feng Fen (R36) explained that Exit A2 was mainly used by residents of developments at Fat Kwong Street and Shun Yung Street, while residents of Ho Man Tin Estate, Oi Man Estate and Ultima generally used Exit A3. Residents of Ultima, if using Exit A2, had to walk uphill and cross Fat Kwong Road by using a signalised crossing at Fat Kwong Street/Chung Hau Street, which was inconvenient particularly in the rain and for children carrying school bags.

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the assessment on the distribution of future residents of the proposed residential development from the Site among different transport modes, and for those using MTR, the distribution between Exits A2 and A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station;
- (b) how the residents of the proposed development at the Site and Ultima could access Exit A2 and the level of usage of Exit A2; and
- (c) how the congestion at Exit A3 raised by residents could be addressed.

26. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) in the feasibility study conducted for the rezoning, MTR was expected to be one of the major transport modes used by future residents for commuting, and the impact on the overall capacity of the MTR network was expected to be relatively minor. Most of the future residents of the Site were expected to use Exit A3 which could be directly accessed through the existing public covered walkway located to the immediate east of the Site;
- (b) regarding the concern on overcrowding at Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin Station, three lifts were serving Exit A3 and queuing had been observed during peak hours. From the site visit, it was noted that one of the lifts served all three levels, i.e. the station concourse, Chung Hau Street (also the level of Ultima) and the public covered walkway on upper level. Another one did not stop at the Chung Hau Street level. The remaining one did not stop at the Chung Hau Street level during peak hours. MTRCL had adopted management measures including signage, floor markers and deployment of station staff to help disperse passengers. Passengers were also encouraged to use other available exits, such as Exit A2 at Fat Kwong Street, during peak hours. MTRCL had indicated that it would continue to closely monitor passenger flows and implement further measures where necessary; and

- (c) the residents of the proposed development at the Site and Ultima could reach Exit A2 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station through the signalised pedestrian crossing at the junction of Fat Kwong Street/Sheung Lok Street or via the footbridge across Fat Kwong Street and walk along the pavement of Fat Kwong Street to reach Exit A2. It was also observed during the site visit that pedestrian flow at Exit A2 was relatively low.

27. A Member asked whether TD had explored with MTRCL the provision of shuttle buses during peak hours to divert passengers to Exit A2, given the congestion at Exit A3 and the sloping gradient of the pavement leading to Exit A2. In response, Mr Vico P. Cheung, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, TD said that provision of shuttle bus service would need to take into account factors such as the distance to the exit, availability of suitable pick-up and drop-off facilities, etc. He understood that MTRCL had implemented crowd management measures. TD would liaise with MTRCL on any further measures to be introduced to address the congested situation at Exit A3.

28. A Member asked about the traffic impact arising from the proposed residential development. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) had taken into account existing and planned developments in the area, including the future campus of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) and the new campus of HKMU in Ho Man Tin. According to the findings of TTIA, no insurmountable traffic impact on the local road network was anticipated, and the relevant data had been circulated to TD, which had no comment on TTIA.

Air Quality associated with HMTVB of CKR

29. Noting that some representers raised concerns about air quality associated with emission from HMTVB of CKR, a Member asked about the possible impact of the operation of HMTVB on the proposed residential development and whether the Site was suitable for residential use.

30. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that Preliminary Environment Review (PER) had been undertaken for the proposed residential development at the Site and the PER had taken into account emissions from HMTVB of CKR, traffic emissions from

surrounding roads, other relevant factors and available data for the assessment. Based on the assessment, the overall air quality complied with the prevailing Air Quality Objectives under the rezoning for residential development.

31. Mr Gary C.W. Tam, Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment) (AD(EA)), EPD supplemented that CKR and HMTVB were included in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the CKR project, and the emissions from HMTVB were subject to the Environmental Permit for the CKR project and complied with the relevant standards. Since the operation of CKR, no significant change in air quality had been observed, and the air purification system installed at HMTVB could remove at least 80% of suspended particulates and nitrogen dioxide. With regard to the need for an air quality monitoring station in Ho Man Tin, EPD's general air quality monitoring network was intended to reflect district-wide conditions, and data collected from the monitoring station in the Sham Shui Po District would also represent those of the Ho Man Tin District; hence, a separate monitoring station in Ho Man Tin was not required. EPD had replied to the Management Services Office of Ultima in December 2025 and KCDC in March 2026 on this issue.

32. As invited by the Chairperson, Mr Chan Ka Keung (R7) enquired why actual emissions data and the operation hours of ventilation fans in HMTVB could not be provided instead of relying on EIA simulation results, and questioned whether the Sham Shui Po monitoring station could properly reflect conditions in the Ho Man Tin area. The Chairperson remarked that the main purpose of the meeting was to consider the zoning amendment of the Site for residential development. While the comments raised by Mr Chan Ka Keung (R7) was about the emissions and monitoring work of HMTVB, for the sake of clarity, she invited the government representatives to further elaborate on the EIA and monitoring arrangements of HMTVB. In response, Mr Gary C.W. Tam, AD(EA), EPD clarified that the EIA was conducted specifically for the CKR project under the requirement of the EIA Ordinance, with monitoring arrangements in place for both the construction and operational stages to monitor emissions from HMTVB. Air Quality Assessment for the rezoning proposal had also been conducted by CEDD, and assessment points were selected at the boundary of the Site. The assessment indicated that the air quality complied with the relevant Air Quality Objectives.

Provision of GIC, Recreational, Commercial and Supporting Facilities

33. Some Members asked about the provision of GIC and community supporting facilities in Ho Man Tin and the impact on such provision resulting from the proposed residential development at the Site.

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

- (a) according to available data, the existing population within the area covered by the Ho Man Tin OZP had decreased from about 100,000 in 1996 to about 94,900 in 2021. The change was mainly attributable to the redevelopment of former public housing estates, including Valley Road Estate and Old Ho Man Tin Estate. Valley Road Estate, which comprised about 3,000 flats, was demolished between 2000 and 2002, and was subsequently redeveloped into a number of private residential developments, including Ultima, In One, and Onmantin. Part of the site formerly occupied by Valley Road Estate was rezoned from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), intended for high-density development, to “Residential (Group B)” with the planning intention for medium-density development, and the total number of flats of the three private residential developments was about 2,400 after redevelopment and had not materially exceeded that of the former estate;
- (b) generally speaking, major shopping centres, bus termini, and commercial facilities such as retail shops and eating places were normally located in higher-density residential areas under the “R(A)” zoning, such as Ho Man Tin Estate after redevelopment of Old Ho Man Tin Estate; and
- (c) based on the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities in the Kowloon City District as shown in Annex 6 of the Paper, most recreational facilities, libraries, swimming pools and sports facilities were generally adequate. The main shortfalls were in some elderly, child care and rehabilitation facilities. The Government would continue to identify opportunities to provide such facilities including those on premises basis. A site for the planned 8-storey Ho Man Tin Government Complex at Sheung Foo Street (the Complex) would provide community facilities to serve the public,

including a community hall, social welfare and healthcare facilities. In addition, the current rezoning proposal, taking into account the advice of the Social Welfare Department (SWD), had incorporated a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Sub-base (NEC) and an Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness (ICCMW) to help meet the shortfalls.

35. A Member noted from the Paper that about 5% of the GFA of the proposed development would be for social welfare facilities, and the total GFA of the two proposed facilities, i.e. a NEC and an ICCMW, was about 4% of the total GFA.

36. The same Member followed up and enquired about the implementation programme of the Complex and whether the facilities to be provided in the Complex could address the community's needs, while another Member enquired whether public car parking facilities would be provided in the Complex as some representers expressed concerns about inadequate parking spaces in the area.

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

- (a) the implementation programme of the Complex had yet to be firmed up and was still at the planning stage. Subject to funding approval from the Legislative Council, construction of the Complex might take about 3 to 4 years to complete. The facilities to be accommodated within the Complex would not be sufficient to fully meet all needs of the district, but might help address part of the shortfalls, particularly in respect of the most under-provided services, such as facilities for the elderly and children. For the provision of child care facilities, SWD had adopted multi-pronged approach in identifying suitable locations, and there was already a standalone child care centre in the district, while additional child care centres would be provided under future projects, including premises in planned public housing developments in the Kowloon City District; and
- (b) no public car park had been planned to be provided in the Complex at this stage. Relevant government departments would review district needs when formulating updated proposals for the Complex. If TD considered that there

was a need for such provision in the Complex, the responsible government department, namely the Home Affairs Department, would consider department's request.

38. Noting representers' concerns about insufficient commercial and recreational facilities in the area, a Member asked whether there was any standard population threshold for the provision of a local shopping centre in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), and the reason why the baseball field was only of a temporary nature.

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

- (a) HKPSG did not prescribe a fixed population threshold for the provision of a shopping centre. Instead, HKPSG provided information on different types and scales of shopping facilities, including district, local and neighbourhood centres. The actual provision of retail facilities in any locality was largely market-driven. For Members' information, Ho Man Tin Plaza provided a shopping centre together with a fresh market with an internal floor area of about 9,400m² and Oi Man Plaza provided similar facilities with an internal floor area of about 16,800m², while the number of flats in Ho Man Tin Estate was about 4,700 and that in Oi Man Estate was about 6,300 flats; and
- (b) the baseball field was provided on top of Ho Man Tin West FWSR, which was originally planned for the development of a park, and was granted under a short-term tenancy (STT). As there was no implementation programme for the park, and given that the baseball field would not adversely affect FWSR, the STT had been extended. The arrangement was not uncommon in Hong Kong for optimal use of land pending implementation of the long-term planned use of the site.

Air Ventilation and Visual Impacts

40. Noting that the Site was adjacent to Towers 6 to 8 of Ultima, a Member asked about the shortest distance between the Site and Towers 6 to 8 of Ultima, and any setback measures to address the air ventilation and visual impacts of the proposed development on Ultima. In

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

- (a) referring to Plan H-2 of the Paper, the width of the existing pedestrian footpath between the Site and Ultima ranged from about 3.85m to 5.21m, while the non-building area (NBA) covering the slope area, with the trees to be preserved, ranged from about 5.17m to 14.19m. Together with the minor setback of the building blocks of Ultima from its site boundary, the shortest distance between the Site and Tower 8 of Ultima was estimated to be about 12m to 16m. For Members' reference, the width of Chung Hau Street was about 12m and that of Fat Kwong Street near the junction with Chatham Road was about 15m;
- (b) the annual prevailing winds were mainly from the east and southeast, setback measures or building separation in these directions might not significantly improve air ventilation. The summer prevailing winds were mainly from the southwest and south, and the orientation of NBA as shown in Plan H-2 of the Paper would facilitate summer wind penetration between the Site and Ultima; and
- (c) the NBA would also function as green buffer for separation from Ultima with the existing trees preserved. The EVA in the indicative layout at Drawing H-1 of the Paper could provide further separation, while the layout of the future development including EVA would be subject to detailed design.

Others

41. As invited by the Chairperson, Mr Chan Ka Keung (R7) sought clarification regarding the stance of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) on the rezoning. In response, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, PlanD explained that his earlier presentation was made in response to suggestions from some representers that instead of developing the Site for residential use, alternative sites such as the Housing Authority Headquarters or nearby public open space could be explored for residential development. LCSD had strong reservation about using existing open spaces for housing development as such spaces were essential leisure

areas for local residents to exercise and maintain their well-being.

42. Mr Chan Ka Keung (R7) raised concerns about ground settlement, noting that the two residential developments built on top of Ho Man Tin MTR Station had experienced such problem, and asked how it could be ensured that the proposed development would not give rise to similar issues. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that Geotechnical Assessments had been carried out for the Site, including the impact on the adjacent Ho Man Tin West FWSR. With appropriate construction procedures, earth lateral support systems and monitoring measures for ground settlement, the construction at the Site was considered acceptable and no insurmountable impact to Ho Man Tin West FWSR was anticipated. The Water Supplies Department had no comment on the rezoning.

43. Mr Chan Ka Keung (R7) supplemented that if the Site remained zoned “G/IC”, it could be used for low-rise development for community facilities such as a clinic, community services, retail facilities and public car park. He considered that these facilities would better address local concerns and attract fewer objections than the proposed residential development.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong rejoined this session of the meeting and Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left this session of the meeting during Q&A session.]

44. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the presentation and Q&A session for the morning session of the hearing on the day was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers of the Board’s decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

45. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be adjourned for lunch break.

[This session of the meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:40 p.m.]

46. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 18.3.2026.

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

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

Chairperson

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 Vincent K.Y. Ho

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

48. The following government representatives, representers and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

PlanD

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai - DPO/K

Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong - STP/K

Mr Jaime H.M. Chan - TP/K

CEDD

Mr Stephen C.C. Lo - CE

Mr Ray L.W. Lau - SA

AtkinsRealis Asia Limited

Mr Louis N.K. Lau - Consultant

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R188 – 許智邦

Mr Hui Chi Pong - Representer

R251 – Li Kin Kent

Mr Li Kin Kent - Representer

Ms Or Sin Man - Representer's Representative

R260 – 曹志芳

Ms Cao Zhifang

- Representer

Mr Gu Yi

- Representer's Representative

R282 – 徐君芳

Ms Xu Junfang

- Representer

R312 – 李榮玲

Ms Lee Wing Ling

- Representer

R313 – 呂迪新

Mr Lui Dick Sun

- Representer

R324 – Ng Tan Hung

Ms Ng Tan Hung

- Representer

R356 – 裴印韋 (Pei Yin Wei)

Mr Pei Yin Wei

- Representer

R565 – 陳健

Mr Chen Jian

- Representer

R603 – 孫慧

Ms Sun Hui

- Representer

49. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the video recording of PlanD's presentation in the morning session of the meeting had been uploaded to the Board's website for public viewing. The Chairperson invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations:

R188 – 許智邦

50. Mr Hui Chi Pong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Ultima and had been living there for about 10 years;
- (b) although he did not doubt the findings of the technical assessments on the traffic and environmental aspects of the proposed residential development at the Site, he questioned why the Site was selected and prioritised for residential use;
- (c) while the Government prioritised increasing housing land supply as its top policy agenda, not every piece of land in the territory was suitable for rezoning to residential use. The Ho Man Tin area mainly comprised “R(B)” (for medium-rise residential developments) and “G/IC” zones. Rezoning the Site from “G/IC” to “R(B)4” would exacerbate the existing shortage of supporting community and commercial facilities needed by residents in the area;
- (d) there was a lack of local commercial facilities, such as laundry shops, clinics, convenience stores and eating places, within reasonable walking distance of his residence. While Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza were local shopping centres, they were built many years ago and were designed primarily to serve the needs of the nearby public housing residents. Their layouts and tenant mixes did not keep pace with current needs and could not adequately serve the residents of Ultima and other private housing developments;
- (e) a number of residential developments, including Dragon View, One Homantin, Grand Homm, Mantin Heights, Homantin Hillside, Ultima, Kwun Tak Court, Onmantin and In One, were completed in recent years in the Ho Man Tin area, providing a total of about 6,000 flats and resulting in a rapid increase in population. Nevertheless, no commercial/retail floorspace was provided in those residential developments to meet residents’ daily needs. The additional population from the proposed residential development at the Site would further worsen the shortage of retail facilities;

- (f) PlanD stated that the provision of GIC facilities was generally adequate for the planned population in the Ho Man Tin area, and the planned population had already taken into account the population of Ultima, In One and Onmantin, i.e. the site of the former Valley Road Estate. Nonetheless, the demolition of Valley Road Estate for the construction of Ho Man Tin MTR Station and its topside/nearby residential developments displaced the community and commercial facilities formerly located there, and no such facilities were provided in Ultima, In One and Onmantin;
- (g) the proposed residential development at the Site might cause ground settlement that could affect the structural safety of Ultima. Construction works of the topside development of Ho Man Tin MTR Station had already caused cracks in the floors and walls of Ultima's building blocks. Noting that the future developer of the Site would be required to meet ground settlement control requirements and submit relevant assessment reports to government departments for approval, it would be prudent to conduct a comprehensive geotechnical assessment before rezoning the Site for residential use;
- (h) while the statutory planning procedures for rezoning the Site were still underway, the Lands Department (LandsD) had already included the Site in the 2026-27 Land Sale Programme and the Government had announced the programme to the public. This undermined the statutory planning process and the role of the Board, for the Board might be perceived as a rubber stamp and under pressure to approve the rezoning. Meanwhile, it gave a misleading impression to the public that the Site had already been approved for residential development; and
- (i) from a macro perspective, given that there was ample land in the Northern Metropolis, a number of completed residential developments in Kai Tak and many unsold residential units in Ho Man Tin, the Government should critically re-examine whether it was cost-effective to rezone the Site, which was small, located on sloping ground and had narrow vehicular ingress/egress, for residential use. Producing only about 200 flats at the Site would make a

negligible contribution to the overall housing supply and land sale revenue. An imbalance between the provision of community/commercial facilities and residential units in Ho Man Tin should be avoided.

R251 – Li Kin Kent

51. Mr Li Kin Kent made the following main points:

- (a) over the past 10 years, more than 5,000 new residential units were completed in the Ho Man Tin area. Nonetheless, no corresponding new public space/facilities was provided to serve the increased population;
- (b) in accordance with section 3 of the Town Planning Ordinance, the function of the Board was to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. Rezoning the Site for residential development without corresponding provision of new public space/facilities would undermine the Board's function in promoting 'convenience' and 'general welfare of the community';
- (c) with reference to the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, the planning intention was to provide 'quality living environment' in the Ho Man Tin area. The rezoning deviated from this planning intention by neglecting the need of providing public space/facilities;
- (d) HKPSG was a government manual setting out the provision standards and requirements for open space and GIC facilities. According to HKPSG, the open space provision should be 2m² per person. An enhanced open space provision of not less than 3.5m² per person was recommended under the "Reimagining Public Spaces in Hong Kong – Feasibility Study". Assuming an average household size of 2.7 persons, the 5,000 newly-added residential units had resulted in an increase of more than 10,000 people in the area. Based on the provision standard of 3.5m² per person, several hectares (ha) of open space should be provided, yet no new open space was provided in the area in the past decade. Besides, according to HKPSG, a sports centre

should be provided for every 50,000 to 65,000 persons. Based on a total population of about 90,000 to 100,000 in the Ho Man Tin area, two sports centres should be provided but there was only one. These figures demonstrated that the provision of open space and GIC facilities in the area was insufficient to meet the needs of the existing population. Additional population arising from the proposed residential development at the Site would further exacerbate this shortfall; and

- (e) it was questionable whether the rezoning had taken into account the adequacy of the provision of open space and GIC facilities to cater for the needs of the community. Prior to rezoning the Site for residential use, the Government should conduct a comprehensive review of supply and demand for open space and GIC facilities in the Ho Man Tin area, re-examine the optimal use of the Site and consider allocating it for open space and/or GIC facilities.

[Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho joined this session of the meeting during R251's presentation.]

R260 – 曹志芳

52. Ms Cao Zhifang made the following main points:

- (a) she was a representative of the Ultima residents and strongly objected to rezoning the Site from “G/IC” to “R(B)4” for the development of a residential tower with 253 medium-to-large units;
- (b) the Site was in close proximity to Ultima and the proposed residential development would further aggravate the already overburdened local transport system and insufficient provision of open space and GIC facilities in the Ho Man Tin area, while also creating adverse impacts on natural lighting, air ventilation and fire safety for Ultima;
- (c) from transport perspective, according to the 2021 Population Census and other relevant data, with the increase in population arising from recently completed residential developments such as Ultima (527 units), Onmantin

(990 units), In One (844 units), Mantin Heights (1,429 units) and One Homantin (561 units), the total number of private housing units in Ho Man Tin was more than 24,000 and the overall population reached 104,000. Majority of the residents in Ho Man Tin relied on MTR for daily commuting. Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station, which was frequently used by residents of Ultima, Ho Man Tin Estate, Oi Man Estate and residential developments along Chung Hau Street, was already overcrowded. Passengers had to queue for a long time to use the three lifts connecting the station concourse to the Chung Hau Street level (to Ultima) and/or the footbridge level (to Ho Man Tin Estate/Oi Man Estate) during the morning and evening peak hours. Exit A3 had already exceeded its capacity. Assuming an average household size of 2.6 persons, the proposed residential development at the Site would add over 600 residents who would also use Exit A3, thereby substantially increasing queuing and waiting time for the lifts. The additional population would also increase vehicular traffic on the already congested Fat Kwong Street, Sheung Lok Street and Ma Tau Wai Road;

- (d) as regards natural lighting, air ventilation and fire safety, the high-rise residential building at the Site would obstruct natural lighting and air ventilation to most blocks of Ultima. Access to natural sunlight and fresh air was essential for residents' well-being and health, particularly for the elderly and children. According to HKPSG and relevant building regulations, new developments should not create adverse lighting and ventilation impacts on the neighbouring developments. The Tai Po fire incident revealed that closely spaced high-rise buildings could be prone to higher fire risk during large-scale building maintenance works. Insufficient separation between Ultima and the proposed development at the Site could hinder access for fire engines and emergency rescue;
- (e) with regard to the provision of open space and GIC facilities, there was deficiency in such facilities in the Ho Man Tin area, particularly sports/recreational facilities, children's playgrounds, clinics and libraries. Existing provision of open space was limited to Ho Man Tin Park and Ho Man Tin East Service Reservoir Playground, and there was no sports centre

or library. Although some social welfare facilities, i.e. a NEC and an ICCMW, were proposed at the Site, the overall provision remained insufficient; and

- (f) she strongly requested that:
- (i) the zoning amendment under Item A should be rejected. Alternatively, the development intensity/PR of the proposed residential development at the Site should be substantially reduced;
 - (ii) the Government should conduct detailed assessments on traffic (in particular the carrying capacity of Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station), natural lighting, air ventilation, fire safety and provision of open space and GIC facilities, and should consult residents on the findings; and
 - (iii) before rezoning the Site for residential development, the Government should address the capacity issues of Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station and the shortfall in open space and GIC facilities in the area. Consideration should be given to installing additional lift(s), constructing underground walkway(s) and implementing effective passenger diversion measures at Ho Man Tin MTR Station, and providing more open space and sports/recreational facilities in the Ho Man Tin area.

[Mr K.L. Wong joined this session of the meeting during R260's presentation.]

R282 – 徐君芳

53. Ms Xu Junfang made the following main points:

- (a) she shared similar views as presented by some other representers earlier at the meeting, and strongly objected to the proposed residential development at the

Site;

- (b) she had been living in Block 8 of Ultima for about 10 years and Block 8 was only about 25m from the Site;
- (c) she and her family had already been affected by the prolonged construction noise and dust associated with the construction of CKR and HMTVB. They would suffer from similar impacts again during the construction of the proposed residential development at the Site;
- (d) she expressed concern on fire safety. A fire broke out at the construction site of HMTVB some time ago and firefighters had taken about 30 minutes to reach the site. She was concerned that a fire at the Site could jeopardise the safety of Ultima residents, given the close proximity; and
- (e) her residential unit was purchased at a high price. The proposed residential development at the Site would adversely affect the property value of Ultima. She could not afford to sell her unit and move to another area.

R312 – 李榮玲

54. Ms Lee Wing Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she concurred with the views presented by some other representers earlier at the meeting; and
- (b) if the Site was used for residential development, the Ho Man Tin area would become more congested. The proposed development would create wall effect, adversely affecting the neighbourhood character. There was a lack of GIC facilities in the area to cater for the needs of the residents. Insufficient separation between the proposed development and Ultima would create fire safety concerns and threaten the privacy of the Ultima residents. The Government should address these issues.

R313 – 吕迪新

55. Mr Lui Dick Sun made the following main points:

- (a) he shared similar views as presented by some other representers earlier at the meeting; and
- (b) there were already many residential developments in the Ho Man Tin area. If the Site was used for residential development, the area would be more crowded with high-rise buildings, and the additional population would place further burden on the transport system. Given the shortfall in GIC provision in the area, the Site should be used for the provision of GIC facilities instead.

R356 – 裴印韋 (Pei Yin Wei)

56. Mr Pei Yin Wei made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Ultima;
- (b) the campus, teaching buildings and student halls of two universities, i.e. HKMU and PolyU, as well as some government office buildings such as the Housing Authority Headquarters and Ho Man Tin Government Offices were located in the Ho Man Tin area. Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was used not only by residents but also university students and government staff. Exit A3 was already very congested, with long queues for the lifts. To align with the Government's initiative to develop Hong Kong into an international hub for post-secondary education, HKMU and PolyU had been expanding their university facilities in Ho Man Tin to accommodate more students. It was anticipated that more students would use Exit A3 in the near future. Additional population from the proposed development at the Site would further overcrowd Exit A3. The Government should resolve the overcrowding issue at Exit A3 before rezoning the Site for residential use;

- (c) given that the Site was government land and the Government was still identifying sites for welfare facilities, it was questionable why the Site, which was small yet strategically located near Ho Man Tin MTR Station, could not be used to provide welfare facilities for the community;
- (d) the proposed development at the Site would create wall effect and obstruct daylight penetration and air ventilation to Ultima;
- (e) there were concerns on fire safety. The Government should draw lessons from the Tai Po fire tragedy and avoid placing high-rise buildings in close proximity. Given that the proposed development at the Site was only about 25m from Block 8 of Ultima and Onmantin was also located close to Ultima, concurrent large-scale building maintenance works in the future could expose Ultima to elevated fire risk; and
- (f) he questioned why the Site was included in the 2026-27 Land Sale Programme even though statutory rezoning procedures were still in progress, and whether tendering of the Site would proceed despite strong public objection.

R603 – 孫慧

57. Ms Sun Hui made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Block 8 of Ultima;
- (b) she was shocked to learn that the Site, located only about 25m from her home, would be used for the development of a 24-storey residential tower at 160mPD, which would adversely affect the livelihood of her and her family;
- (c) as the mother of two children, she was concerned about the lack of recreational facilities for children in the Ho Man Tin area. The area had only one park (i.e. Ho Man Tin Park) and two local shopping centres (i.e. Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza) with limited recreational facilities for children;

- (d) the proposed development at the Site would block natural sunlight to Ultima, thereby severely affecting the growth and development of her children; and
- (e) the Government should reconsider the land use of the Site.

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

BH, Building Separation and Fire Safety

59. Noting that the BH restriction of the Site was 160mPD and some representers expressed grave concerns regarding fire safety given the close proximity between the Site and certain residential blocks of Ultima, a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the absolute BH of the proposed residential development at the Site; and
- (b) whether there were any building separation requirements under the prevailing building regulations, and whether any fire safety measures would be applicable when adjacent residential buildings were undergoing concurrent large-scale maintenance and renovation works.

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

- (a) the site formation level of the Site was about 68mPD and the BH restriction was 160mPD. Thus, the absolute maximum BH of the proposed residential development at the Site would be about 92m. For Ultima, the site formation level ranged from 45mPD to 62mPD and the BH restrictions were 130mPD and 150mPD; and

- (b) according to the Building (Planning) Regulations, every room used for habitation should be provided with natural lighting and ventilation. Besides, according to the Practice Note for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineer – Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (PNAP APP-152), a building or a group of buildings within a site having a continuous projected façade length of 60m or above was required to comply with the building separation requirement by providing building gaps.

61. On fire safety, the Chairperson supplemented that following the blaze at Wang Fuk Court in Tai Po, the Government had been actively pursuing follow-up actions. As part of those measures, the Buildings Department and the Fire Services Department were reviewing the fire safety requirements for residential buildings in close proximity that were undergoing concurrent large-scale maintenance and renovation works, including the possible imposition of a minimum separation distance between buildings undergoing such works.

62. In response to the Member's follow-up question on whether the proposed development at the Site, being in close proximity to Ultima, would constrain firefighting if a fire broke out at Ultima, Mr Ray L.W. Lau, SA, CEDD said that Ultima had its own EVA and fronted two major roads, i.e. Chung Hau Street and Fat Kwong Street, enabling fire engines to access its residential blocks for firefighting. The Site was not required as an EVA for Ultima.

Accessibility to MTR Station

63. Noting that some representers had mentioned that Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was overcrowded with long queues for the lifts, a Member enquired about the current situation of the station exits, particularly Exits A2 and A3, and whether mitigation measures had been or would be adopted. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) there were three lifts at Exit A3. Currently, during peak hours, one lift stopped at all levels, i.e. the station concourse, the Chung Hau Street level (to Ultima) and the footbridge level (to Ho Man Tin Estate/Oi Man Estate), while the other two lifts only stopped at the station concourse and the footbridge

level (to Ho Man Tin Estate/Oi Man Estate), and queues for the lifts were observed. During non-peak hours, few passengers waited for the lifts. CEDD had approached MTRCL to convey residents' concerns about long waiting time during peak hours. MTRCL replied that they had implemented crowd management measures at Exit A3 during peak hours, including deploying station staff to assist with passenger dispersal, and would continue to monitor lift usage. Passengers were also encouraged to use other exits, such as Exit A2 at Fat Kwong Street; and

- (b) future residents of the Site might use Exit A3 at Chung Hau Street via the existing covered walkway/public footpath or Exit A2 at Fat Kwong Street via footbridge/signalised junctions/pavement, depending on their commuting patterns.

Population and Provision of Open Space, GIC and Commercial Facilities

64. A Member raised the following questions to PlanD's representatives:

- (a) clarification and elaboration on the population and facility figures cited by R251;
- (b) whether there was any public library in the Ho Man Tin area and what the provision standard for public library was, noting R260's assertion that there was no public library in the vicinity; and
- (c) details of open space and recreational facilities in Ultima and whether those facilities were open for public use.

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

- (a) based on the then estimated figures in 1996, the planning scheme area of the OZP had an existing population of about 100,000 and an estimated planned population of about 111,000. In 2021 estimate, the existing population was

about 94,900 while the estimated planned population was about 101,300. Thus, the planned populations based on the estimates in 1996 and 2021 were broadly similar, i.e. around 100,000 to 111,000. It should be noted that the 2021 planned population estimate had taken into account (i) the demolition of Valley Road Estate (about 3,000 units) for the construction of Ho Man Tin MTR Station and its topside/nearby private residential developments (i.e. Ultima, In One and Onmantin) and the student halls of PolyU; and (ii) the redevelopment of Old Ho Man Tin Estate into the current Ho Man Tin Estate and other private residential developments (including Mantin Heights and One Homantin). Therefore, the 2021 estimate included the population of planned/committed private residential projects as mentioned above as well as other population including transients and university hostel students. It was concluded that apart from shortfalls in some elderly, child care and rehabilitation services/facilities, the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities such as library and sports centre was generally adequate for the overall planned population;

- (b) there was a public library, i.e. Kowloon Public Library, within the planning scheme area of the OZP. According to HKPSG, public library provision was planned on a district basis and a library would serve a wider community catchment; and
- (c) there was no information on hand about the details of open space and recreational facilities in Ultima. Ultima was zoned “R(B)2” on the OZP and there was no requirement for the provision of public open space or other public facilities within that zone.

66. Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, asked PlanD’s representatives to elaborate on the open space provision figures mentioned by R251. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that according to the GIC table, there was no deficit in the provision of district open space (DO) and local open space (LO) in the Kowloon City District based on the provision standard of 1m² per person for DO and LO respectively. The enhanced open space provision standard of 3.5m² per person and the refined criteria on countability for open space (such as excluding steep slope and inaccessible area) in

the latest Chapter 4 of HKPSG promulgated in December 2025 had not yet been reflected in the GIC table as the figures were being updated. A preliminary estimation using the 3.5m² standard indicated a shortfall of about 3 ha. It should be noted that the changes in provision standard or countability of open space did not affect public use of the existing open space. While achieving the new provision standard of 3.5m² per person was a long-term goal, an incremental approach would be adopted to meet the enhanced standard and emphasis would equally be placed on improving the quality of existing open spaces to enhance public enjoyment and well-being.

67. Noting R188's presentation that the design of Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza had not kept pace with current needs and the shops and facilities could not adequately serve Ultima residents, the Member asked R188 which types of shops and facilities were lacking. In response, Mr Hui Chi Pong (R188) said that there was a shortage of eating places. During lunch hours, there were long queues outside eateries as the nearby university students and government staff went out for lunch. Moreover, the two shopping centres lacked banks and chain pharmacies that offered a wider range of products.

Land Sale Programme

68. Noting that some representers raised concern about including the Site in the Land Sale Programme while the statutory rezoning procedures were still underway, a Member asked for the Government's response. In reply, Mr Maurice K.W. Loo, Director of Lands, made the following main points:

- (a) it had been a long-established practice for the Government to announce the annual Land Sale Programme or currently known as Land Sale List (the List) after the Budget Speech by the Financial Secretary, which set out each and every piece of land that was planned to be disposed of during the next financial year. The purpose was to enhance transparency for the prospective bidders for those sites and for the benefit of the general public about the amount of land and the number of residential units which would be made available for Hong Kong as a whole, demonstrating the Government's commitment to ensuring steady housing land supply in the coming financial year;

- (b) as revealed in previous years, the List represented only the Government's plan at the prevailing time, and there was no certainty that each and every piece of land in the List would eventually be disposed of in the subsequent year. The pieces of land tendered out might not match exactly those included in the List; and

- (c) when announcing the List, it was clearly pointed out that some of the sites in the List were subject to planning applications/zoning amendments on OZP which would need to be considered and approved by the Board. The land sale plan would be adjusted if the related planning applications/zoning amendments were not subsequently approved by the Board. There was therefore no question of the Government putting any pressure on Members in the course of their consideration of the relevant development projects and related planning applications/zoning amendments. The tendering process would only proceed when all the statutory planning procedures were completed.

69. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session for the afternoon session of the hearing on the day was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

70. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.