

1. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 19.3.2026.

2. The following Members and the Secretary were 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 K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

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
Ms Fancy L.M. Cheung

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

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr C.K. Yip

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[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.]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations in respect of the draft Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/25 (the draft OZP).
4. The Secretary reported that Members' declaration of interests had been made in the morning session of the hearing on 18.3.2026 and was recorded in the relevant minutes of meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The following government representatives (including the consultant) (hereinafter referred to as "government representatives"), representers and representer's representative 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 |
| Mr Jamie H.M. Chan | - | Town Planner/Kowloon |

Civil Engineering and Development Department (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

R566 – Sze Ho Lam Anson

Ms Sze Ho Lam Anson - Representer

R568 – Wong Yuk Ping

Ms Wong Yuk Ping - Representer

R579 – Ko Wing Leong Algie

Mr Ko Wing Leong Algie - Representer

R598 – Sze Tien Lok

Mr Sze Tien Lok - Representer

R611 – Chong Tsz Nam

R612 – Anthony Wai Tung Chong

Mr Chong Tsz Nam - Representer and Representer's
Representative

R617 – Lui Ying

Ms Lui Ying - Representer

R618 – 林敏嬋

Ms Lam Mun Sim Dora - Representer

R619 – Sun Kam Ming

Mr Sun Kam Ming - Representer

R620 – Lee Yun Ting

Ms Lee Yun Ting - Representer

R621 – 辛茂盛

Mr Sun Mau Shing - Representer

R622 – Ma Suk Kuen

Ms Ma Suk Kuen - Representer

R625 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the presentation made by PlanD in the morning session of 18.3.2026 had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board)'s website for public viewing. 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 representer's representative 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 then be held for this afternoon session after the representers and/or representer's representative had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers and/or the representer's representative. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers and representer's representative would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson invited the representers and/or the representer's representative to elaborate on their representations.

R579 – Ko Wing Leong Algie

8. With the aid of a visualiser and a video clip, Mr Ko Wing Leong Algie made the following main points:

- (a) the zoning amendment under Item A violated the Vision, Mission and Values of PlanD;

Vision

- (b) the vision of PlanD was to make Hong Kong liveable and competitive. Before the completion of the two new residential developments, namely In One and Onmantin, Ho Man Tin MTR Station was already overcrowded with students and commuters. Hong Kong Metropolitan University (HKMU), the Housing Authority Headquarters and Ho Man Tin Government Offices were located in the vicinity. There were also many elderly residents living in Oi Man Estate and Ho Man Tin Estate. Majority of the passengers used Exit A3. There were only three lifts, and passengers had to wait for 12 to 18 minutes for the lifts. Under those circumstances, Ho Man Tin could not be considered a ‘liveable’ area;
- (c) many families in In One and Onmantin were young households with children aged 3 to 6 years old. It was doubtful whether there were enough school places for them in Ho Man Tin;
- (d) the existing Ho Man Tin Sports Centre should be expanded to accommodate tennis, badminton and basketball courts;

Mission

- (e) one of the missions of PlanD was to “formulate sustainable and resilient spatial development strategies and plans”;
- (f) according to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report for the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) Project (CE43/2010 (HY)) (the EIA Report for CKR), it was highlighted in section 14.3.3 of the report that although Ho

Man Tin Ventilation Building (HMTVB) was about 190m to 250m from Ultima, such separation distance was inadequate from air circulation and air quality perspectives. In view of the above, the decision to develop the Site for residential use was questionable;

- (g) as the Site was in close proximity to Ho Man Tin West Fresh Water Service Reservoir (FWSR), there was always a possibility that construction materials and waste from the Site would contaminate the water. The land contamination issue was also mentioned in the EIA Report for CKR; and
- (h) there was a fire in the mobile container office in the works area of CKR at the Site at 7:36 p.m. on 18.10.2020. Given the close proximity of his flat to the Site, the fire caused him to cough for 2 days. In view of the fire risk, he strongly objected to the zoning amendment under Item A for residential development.

[Mr Timothy K.W. Ma joined this session of the meeting during R579's presentation.]

R611 – Chong Tsz Nam

R612 – Anthony Wai Tung Chong

9. Mr Chong Tsz Nam made the following main points:

- (a) he concurred with the comments made by R579 in his oral submission, and objected to the zoning amendment under Item A as no strong justifications had been provided by the Government for the amendment;
- (b) there were a number of developments in Ho Man Tin, including Ho Man Tin Estate, Oi Man Estate, the Hong Kong Polytechnic University, HKMU, Ho Man Tin Government Offices and Housing Authority Headquarters. The overcrowding of Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was an issue. Passengers, including elderly residents and children, had to wait for a long time for the lifts in the station. The carrying capacity of Ho Man Tin MTR Station was insufficient to cater for the additional population in Ho Man Tin;

- (c) the Government was requested to re-conduct the feasibility study for the Site. The facades of In One and Onmantin were black glass curtain walls surrounding Ultima, creating a strong sense of oppression for residents;
- (d) as a matter of principle, the public interest should include the interests of the existing residents. Ho Man Tin Sports Centre was a good facility serving the residents in Ho Man Tin Estate, Oi Man Estate and private residential developments in the area. The original plan of the Site was for community use. Consideration should be given to the interests of local residents, including the elderly and children, in considering the use of the Site, instead of rezoning it for private residential development. The capacity of Ho Man Tin Sports Centre might not be able to meet the demand of such a large population with young families and children in Ho Man Tin. Given the air quality impact of HMTVB, the living environment would be deteriorated, which was also a public interest that needed to be considered by the Board; and
- (e) while the developers had placed the attainment of maximum profits as their overriding objective, the Government should play a role in coordinating the developers to resolve and monitor the situation and stipulate relevant requirements in the tender documents to address issues relating to passenger throughput at Ho Man Tin MTR Station, pressure on public transport, building separation and the lack of community facilities. Otherwise, Ultima would become an “urban village” surrounded by high-rise buildings with a lack of natural sunlight or reflection of sunlight from the curtain wall of the proposed residential development onto Ultima.

R617 – Lui Ying

10. Ms Lui Ying made the following main points:

- (a) the air quality impact of HMTVB of CKR was a concern. According to the EIA Report for CKR, HMTVB of CKR was the ventilation building closest to the adjacent residential developments. Adequate buffer distance from

HMTVB should be provided for air ventilation instead of constructing more high-rise buildings. Poor air circulation and wall effect would be resulted from developing the Site for residential use, and more residents would be affected by poor air quality. The efficiency of air dispersal from HMTVB and the living environment would also be affected by the proposed residential development; and

- (b) Ultima and the Site were located in close proximity. A fire incident in the mobile container office in the works area for the CKR project within the Site occurred in 2020. Even with the doors and windows closed, the intense heat of the fire could still be felt. If a fire broke out in the proposed residential development at the Site, it could easily spread to adjacent buildings. With the recent fire incident in Tai Po, the fire risk arising from closely packed high-rise buildings under new development projects should not be overlooked.

R618 – 林敏嬋

11. Ms Lam Mun Sim Dora made the following main points:

- (a) the Government's responses to the representations, as provided in TPB Paper No. 11051 (the Paper), were bureaucratic and failed to address the root causes of the problems;
- (b) regarding site selection and housing supply in paragraph 5.3.1 of the Paper, the Government responded that increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach to support housing and other development needs had been a key policy direction. It was considered that the Government's intention of developing any vacant sites in the urban area for residential use would violate the basic principle of balanced development in the town planning regime;
- (c) based on a rough estimation, more than 5,000 new flats had been completed in Ho Man Tin in recent years, and about 20% of them were yet to be sold. Many of the flats that had been sold were also left vacant. There was no shortage of residential units in Ho Man Tin. Besides, there would be ample

supply of residential units in Kai Tak and the Northern Metropolis;

- (d) regarding land use compatibility and development intensity mentioned in paragraph 5.3.2 of the Paper, the Government responded that property value was not a relevant planning consideration. It was considered that development and planning should be guided by a people-centred approach, taking into account the needs of local residents. After the redevelopment of the former Valley Road Estate, part of the site concerned was subsequently developed for private residential buildings but with no provision of commercial/retail facilities;
- (e) regarding the overcrowding issue relating to Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station mentioned in paragraph 5.3.5 of the Paper, while MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) had adopted crowd control measures, there was still a long queue extending to the station concourse, with long waiting time for lifts especially during the peak hours. People using the Exit A2 had to walk uphill along Fat Kwong Street to Ho Man Tin Estate, government buildings and HKMU under the sun and in the rain, which was inconvenient for elderly residents, children and women. The proposed residential development at the Site would aggravate the abovementioned traffic and overcrowding problems;
- (f) regarding technical aspects related to ground settlement and wall cracks of Ultima resulting from the topside development of Ho Man Tin MTR Station mentioned in paragraph 5.3.7 of the Paper, it was noted from the Government's response that relevant government departments had no adverse comments on the zoning amendment under Item A and the future developer would be required to comply with the control requirements for ground settlement. Based on the above response, it was doubtful if the Government was fully aware of the problem. It appeared that the Government had not attempted to resolve the issue, but instead deferred it to the future developer. The Site was not suitable for residential development as it was close to FWSR and CKR with a maximum tunnel depth of 150m;
- (g) regarding the provision of government, institution and community (GIC) and

commercial facilities mentioned in paragraph 5.3.8 of the Paper, the Government responded that the local shopping centres, namely Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza, were located within walking distance of the Site. It was considered that Oi Man Estate was developed 50 years ago and Ho Man Tin Estate for more than 20 years. The two shopping plazas were designed to cater for residents of the two public housing estates only. No commercial/retail facilities were available within the private residential developments in Ho Man Tin. A local shopping plaza with clinic, convenience store, hardware store, laundry shop and supermarket should be provided for residents of private housing estates in Ho Man Tin;

- (h) in view of the above, the Site, being the only available site for GIC use in Ho Man Tin, was not suitable for residential development. The Government should make better use of the Site for low-density development with the provision of child care, elderly and rehabilitation services, local shops and a public car park; and
- (i) the Site had been included in the 2026-27 Land Sale Programme and budget prior to completion of the statutory planning procedures. It was hoped that Members would not be subject to undue pressure in granting approval for the zoning amendment concerning the Site.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined this session of the meeting during R618's presentation.]

R619 – Sun Kam Ming

12. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Sun Kam Ming made the following main points:
- (a) he was a resident in Tower 8 of Ultima. All the windows of his flat faced the Site to the west;
 - (b) there was already severe noise pollution arising from the pedestrian flow along the existing public covered walkway next to Ultima extending towards

Ho Man Tin Estate, Kwun Hei Court, Kwun Fai Court, private residential developments, Homantin Plaza and government office buildings. It was likely that the noise nuisance would be further aggravated by additional pedestrian flow generated by the proposed residential development at the Site to Ho Man Tin MTR Station via Exit A3. It was not expected that the future residents of the Site would use Exits A1 and A2 due to the sloping gradient and lack of cover along those access routes; and

- (c) the notional scheme was not a sensible design in view of the potential wall effect on Ultima. The current design was similar to Rambler Crest facing a hotel in Tsing Yi. The layout should be re-designed to minimise adverse visual impact on Ultima.

R620 – Lee Yun Ting

13. Ms Lee Yun Ting made the following main points:

- (a) the minimum separation distance between Ultima and the proposed residential development at the Site was only 25m (i.e. equivalent to about 8 storeys), creating wall effect and adverse visual impact on Ultima. While noting in the Government's response that privacy and noise nuisance should not be the concerns in the densely built urban area, it was considered that the separation distance should be increased to minimise adverse impacts;
- (b) there was significant noise pollution and nuisance arising from the pedestrians using the existing public covered walkway next to Ultima. The windows had to be kept closed at night, as leaving them open would seriously disrupt her children's sleep;
- (c) the proposed 7.3m wide emergency vehicular access (EVA) was considered inadequate for fire engines to reach and spray water onto the upper floors of high-rise buildings in case of fire. A wider EVA should be provided. The fire incident in Tai Po was a lesson to be learnt. It was doubtful that the Fire Services Department had no adverse comments on the rezoning proposal;

- (d) the Government's responses given in the Paper were bureaucratic. The suggestion of using Exits A1 and A2 was impractical for elderly residents and domestic helpers pushing prams uphill along uncovered routes; and
- (e) Members should duly consider whether the Site was suitable for residential development, taking into account environment, air quality, noise and safety concerns.

R621 – 辛茂盛

14. Mr Sun Mau Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he frequently visited his relatives and friends in Ho Man Tin;
- (b) the proposed 24-storey residential development would impede natural lighting for the existing 2-storey houses in Ultima. The current design of the notional scheme of the Site was similar to Rambler Crest facing the hotel in Tsing Yi. That said, Rambler Crest was better as its building height (BH) was higher than that of the hotel. The Board should consider the long-term impacts on surrounding residents in order to make Hong Kong a liveable city;
- (c) the proposal to develop the Site with about 250 nano flats was not in line with the Chief Executive's 2025 Policy Address. The cost effectiveness of the proposal was low. It was suggested that the Board should focus on the development of the Northern Metropolis which was the major centre of job opportunities and housing supply, instead of spending public resources to develop nano flats at the Site;
- (d) the 2025 Policy Address promoted a new mindset in taking forward urban renewal in old and dilapidated areas to enhance the living environment. The construction of an additional residential building in the urban areas through urban renewal instead would not impose significant pressure on the supporting facilities as more facilities were available there, which was more justifiable than the zoning amendment under Item A;

- (e) he took his grandchild to kindergarten in Ho Man Tin Estate daily. The lifts at Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station were already operating at full capacity, with waiting time of about 10 to 15 minutes;
- (f) there was a lack of children's playgrounds, and the existing parks were small in Ho Man Tin;
- (g) people could directly access to Ho Man Tin MTR Station, Ho Man Tin Estate, Kwun Hei Court, Kwun Fai Court, Mantin Heights, Homantin Plaza, the Housing Authority Headquarters, wet markets and adjacent primary and secondary schools via the existing public covered walkway next to Ultima. The proposed residential development at the Site would increase the pedestrian flow on the public covered walkway and exacerbate nuisance; and
- (h) in view of the above, the Board should reconsider whether the Site was suitable for residential development.

R622 – Ma Suk Kuen

15. Ms Ma Suk Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) she went to Ho Man Tin to visit her family members from Monday to Saturday every week;
- (b) Ho Man Tin was an old district, accommodating a substantial number of households. Many people also commuted to work in Ho Man Tin by MTR, and Ho Man Tin MTR Station was overcrowded with commuters; and
- (c) she objected to the proposed residential development at the Site. The need to develop the Site, given its small size, for residential use was doubtful. The Site should be developed into a park for the elderly and children.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R625 – Ms Mary Mulvihill

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

Zoning Amendment of the Site

- (a) she strongly objected to Item A and considered that the Site should be developed for a dedicated GIC complex, which was in line with and respected the planning intention of the “G/IC” zoning for low-rise and low-density development and would provide visual and spatial relief for the area, taking into account the findings of Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA). A low-rise building at the Site could address the negative impacts and issues related to natural lighting, air ventilation, wall effect, HMTVB of CKR, and overcrowding of the lifts at Ho Man Tin MTR Station as raised by local residents, and would improve the quality of life of local residents;
- (b) the plot ratio (PR) and BH had now been suddenly and drastically relaxed, deviating from the original commitment previously made to the public;
- (c) according to paragraph 14.2.2 of the EIA Report for CKR, the Site had been identified as an important public open space and local residents should not be deprived of the recreational, leisure opportunities provided by such amenity facilities. When the Government sought to pursue a new proposal for a site, the consultants would often reinvent the technical assessments to facilitate its implementation;

Housing Land Supply and Land Sale Programme

- (d) the Site was already included in the 2026-27 Land Sale Programme, which underlined the pressure on the Board to approve Item A;
- (e) while it was stated that the zoning amendment of the Site was to meet and expedite housing land supply, the real intention was for the Government to rely on land sales to fund its often-grandiose development plans. To

increase housing land supply, the focus should be on expediting redevelopment of hundreds of dilapidated low-rise buildings in urban districts. The Urban Renewal Authority (URA) was designated to resolve the issue, but instead of redeveloping the ageing building stock, URA now focused on taking over areas occupied by open space and recreational facilities such as Carpenter Road Park and the sports facilities beside the Flower Market for residential developments without land cost. This had the negative impact of deterring developers from acquiring old buildings in urban area for redevelopment, thereby undermining the Government's commitment to improving living conditions. While a few representatives suggested a number of small parks as alternative sites for residential use, it was considered that each park was a valuable asset to society;

- (f) while there was considerable open space in Ho Man Tin, it was expected that in the coming few years, there would be proposals to convert much of it to residential use to boost land revenue;

BH

- (g) the BH of the proposed development at the Site would likely be increased to 170 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) in view of the new policy of exempting aboveground car park from the calculation of gross floor area (GFA) in private development projects as announced by the Development Bureau recently, resulting in more pronounced wall effect and a bulkier podium. The notional scheme of the Site showing two floors of underground car park was misleading;

Non-building Area (NBA) and Wind Corridor

- (h) the Site fell within a wind corridor and the proposed NBA near the eastern boundary of the Site would help facilitate wind penetration. This implied that there would be significant impact on air ventilation and the NBA could only help facilitate air flow but not fully resolve the issue;

Transport and Pedestrian Flow

- (i) the additional population arising from the proposed development would lead to further overcrowding and longer waiting time for lifts in Ho Man Tin MTR Station. She had exited the station once during non-peak hours, and the experience was claustrophobic, with long queues for the lifts;

Water Supply

- (j) the proposed diversion of existing water mains and access road to FWSR would involve significant disruption and inconvenience to the community;

Provision of GIC Facilities

- (k) there was currently no community centre to serve the increasing population in Ho Man Tin. A planned community hall at the junction of Fat Kwong Street and Sheung Shing Street was not yet developed;
- (l) there were shortages in a number of GIC facilities such as child care centre and community care services facilities. The shortage of GIC facilities was obscured by presenting data for the entire Kowloon City district rather than for Ho Man Tin. Referring to the Explanatory Statement of the previous Ho Man Tin OZP approved in 2015, according to the 2011 Population Census, the population in the area was about 92,350 persons. If the planned uses on the OZP were fully developed, the planned population for the area would be about 106,840 persons (i.e. around one-fifth of the total population of Kowloon City). It was suspected that the shortfall of community facilities in Ho Man Tin was greater than that of the wider district. Information on the provision of GIC facilities on an OZP basis should be provided;
- (m) district facilities should be within easy reach of residents. The need for community space that could be adapted to handle unforeseeable events was demonstrated during COVID-19 pandemic and the recent fire incident in Tai Po;

Protection of Private Views

- (n) the Government's response to a Member's previous enquiry on private views that there was no inherent "right to a view" or an easement of prospect under the Hong Kong law meant that the developers could build in front of an existing building, blocking its view. The only protected views were those of certain ridgelines on both sides of Victoria Harbour. That said, such ridgelines were frequently breached on the grounds of "iconic" building and urgent housing needs;

Public Consultation

- (o) during the 2-month statutory exhibition period of the draft OZP, 629 representations were received, of which 628 representations opposed/provided adverse views on Item A;
- (p) the consultation process for the OZP amendments had been perceived as a box-ticking exercise. Regardless of how convincing the arguments were, most OZP amendments in recent years were approved by the Board. Only two development plans relating to Fanling Golf Course and the Global Innovation Centre proposed by The University of Hong Kong at Pok Fu Lam were modified;

Others

- (q) the Site was currently used as a works area by the Highways Department (HyD) for the CKR project and was surrounded by developments. Instead of stating that the ecological value and biodiversity within and near the Site were low as indicated in the Preliminary Environmental Review under the Feasibility Study for the Site, sites granted for temporary use to facilitate public works should be reinstated once the associated project was completed; and
- (r) the area had already been excessively developed underground. The issue of

extensive underground facilities and possible earthquake in the region had not been considered.

17. As the presentations of the representers 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 representers, representer's representative and/or government 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.

HMTVB and Air Quality of Tunnel Exhaust

18. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the purpose of HMTVB and its impact on the local residents in the surrounding areas including those of Ultima; and
- (b) the impact of HMTVB on air ventilation of the surrounding area with or without the proposed residential development at the Site.

19. In response, Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Territory South) (PEPO(TS)), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) made the following main points:

- (a) part of CKR was constructed in the form of a tunnel. HMTVB was built for air exchange purpose for the tunnel section. An EIA had been conducted during the planning stage of the CKR project, well before the formulation of the proposal of residential development at the Site. CEDD had undertaken an Air Quality Assessment under the feasibility study for rezoning the Site, in which assessment points were selected along the site boundary including the side closest to HMTVB, for a worst-case scenario, and the results indicated that the air quality at the Site complied with the relevant Air Quality Objectives (AQOs); and

(b) an AVA had also been conducted under the feasibility study by CEDD.

20. Noting that HMTVB was equipped with air purification system as explained by the project team in the hearing meeting on 18.3.2026 and the development of Ultima should have been taken into account in the EIA for CKR, another Member enquired whether the air quality of tunnel exhaust complied with the AQOs in the Air Pollution Control Ordinance (Cap. 311) and those standards/requirements laid down in the EIA. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD said that during the feasibility study stage for the Site, pollution sources surrounding the Site had been identified, including HMTVB and traffic emissions from vehicular traffic and bus stops. Data were gathered from relevant government departments for model formulation and assessment, and the findings indicated that the air quality of the Site was in compliance with AQOs under the worst-case scenario. EPD had no adverse comment on the assessment findings.

21. As regards the effectiveness of the air purification system and the monitoring issue raised by the same Member, Mr Vico P. Cheung, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon (CTE/K), Transport Department (TD) responded that the operation of the system was adjusted based on the level of traffic flow. The operation contractor of CKR was responsible for monitoring the system and the air quality of tunnel exhaust to ensure compliance with the relevant standards. The Chairperson remarked that referring to the recent written replies from both HyD and EPD to address the concerns over air quality monitoring near HMTVB of the CKR as discussed in the Food, Environment and Hygiene Committee (FEHC) of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) on 17.3.2026, the system was equipped with air quality sensors for real-time measurement of the air quality of tunnel exhaust, mainly fine suspended particulates (PM_{2.5}) and nitrogen dioxide, and according to the conditions of the Environmental Permit (EP), at least 80% of particulates and nitrogen dioxide inside the CKR tunnel should be filtered and removed before discharge to the atmosphere via the ventilation buildings. As stated in the written reply from HyD to FEHC of KCDC, the CKR (Yau Ma Tei Section) was commissioned in December 2025 and the air quality of tunnel exhaust complied with the requirements stipulated in the EP.

22. Noting that there was real-time measurement of the air quality of tunnel exhaust from CKR, a Member suggested that the relevant air quality data associated with HMTVB could be released to KCDC and local residents on a regular basis to ease their concerns. In response, the Chairperson invited the TPB Secretariat to follow up with HyD on the matter.

Building Separation and NBA

23. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the notional scheme and layout of the Site could be amended in view of the concerns raised by some of the representers regarding wall effect and insufficient building separation;
- (b) whether the NBA could be enlarged in order to achieve a more uniform width to facilitate air ventilation, taking into account the prevailing summer winds from the southern direction, and to ensure certainty in building separation; and
- (c) the currently proposed building separation compared with that of other developments in the district.

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

- (a) the brown-coloured area, as shown on Drawing H-1 of the Paper, illustrated the indicative building tower while the orange-coloured area showed the indicative podium for the proposed residential development. Other than the NBA as demarcated in the eastern portion of the Site, the remaining area of the Site, especially the northwestern corner, had not been utilised for development under the notional scheme. There was room for the future developer to adopt different layout design. That said, the future development at the Site should comply with a number of requirements such as EVA and others to ensure that the adjacent FWSR would not be affected by the proposed development;
- (b) the proposed NBA was not of a uniform width as it generally followed the existing slope in the eastern portion of the Site. The NBA was also demarcated to preserve the existing trees thereon. The portion of NBA to the immediate west of Tower 8 of Ultima was wider while that adjacent to

Tower 7 of Ultima was narrower. Since Tower 7 had been set back from the boundary of Ultima, the building separations between the proposed residential development at the Site and Towers 7 and 8 were of similar width. The proposed NBA, although not uniform in width, could still facilitate air ventilation, taking into account the prevailing summer winds from the south and southwest; and

- (c) referring to Plan H-5 of the Paper, Onmantin and Ultima were separated by Chung Hau Street with a width of about 12m. As for the proposed residential development at the Site, the building separation could be more than 12m, taking into account the proposed NBA, existing public covered walkway, setback of individual tower(s) of Ultima and the EVA within the Site, with the EVA subject to detailed design.

Ground Contamination Assessment and Geotechnical Study

25. Noting some representers' concerns on environmental pollution and ground settlement, a Member enquired whether ground contamination assessment and geotechnical study had been conducted to demonstrate that the Site was technically feasible for the proposed residential development of such scale and BH. In response, Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) whether ground contamination assessment should be conducted for a development project depended on the previous use(s) of the concerned site. Since the Site was used as a works area of the CKR project and not for uses such as vehicle repairing workshops and scrapyards, or petrol filling stations, there was no need to conduct such an assessment after consulting EPD;
- (b) a Geotechnical Assessment had been conducted and no cavities or fault zone were identified at the Site. No insurmountable impact on building construction was anticipated. The findings had been submitted to relevant government departments and no adverse comments were received; and
- (c) the Site was close to Ho Man Tin West FWSR. An assessment on the impact

on the structure of reservoir in respect of settlement had been conducted. No adverse comment was received from the Water Supplies Department regarding the proposed residential development.

Fire Risk

26. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the fire safety requirements in Hong Kong; and
- (b) whether fire-fighting and rescue at Ultima would be affected by the proposed residential development at the Site.

27. In response, Mr Ray L.W. Lau, SA, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) all residential buildings in Hong Kong were required to comply with specific fire service installation requirements such as provision of hose reels in accordance with the Code of Practice for Minimum Fire Service Installations and Equipment. There were also specific requirements governing separation between openings of buildings and from site boundary to prevent the spread of fire to adjacent buildings as well as specific requirements for the provision of EVA. The notional scheme for the Site complied with the relevant statutory fire safety requirements; and
- (b) Ultima was self-contained with its own EVA. Fire engines could reach Ultima via Fat Kwong Street and Chung Hau Street without relying on the Site for fire-fighting and rescue purposes.

Transport and Pedestrian Flow

28. Noting that all the exits of Ho Man Tin MTR Station were situated on the eastern side of the station concourse, except for Exit A3, and the long waiting time for lifts at Exit A3, some Members enquired whether any studies were being conducted and whether there were concrete measures, including improvements to hardware (such as the addition of more lifts) in

the long term, to increase the passenger capacity of Exit A3. In response, Mr Vico P. Cheung, CTE/K, TD made the following main points:

- (a) the above comments would be conveyed to relevant colleagues in TD for discussion with MTRCL; and
- (b) the location and design of MTR exits usually made reference to a walking distance of about 400m to 500m, taking into account accessibility for passengers and connectivity. Other than Exit A3, Exits A2 and B2 (Plan H-6 of the Paper) were also close to Ultima.

29. Mr Stephen C.C. Lo, CE, CEDD supplemented the following main points:

- (a) the project team had liaised with MTRCL in respect of the proposed residential development at the Site;
- (b) there were three lifts at Exit A3. One 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 did not stop at the Chung Hau Street level, while the remaining one did not stop at the Chung Hau Street level during peak hours. As observed by the project team, there was quite a number of passengers waiting for the lifts during the morning and evening peak hours. As for the non-peak hours, the waiting time for lifts was considered acceptable. MTRCL responded that they were fully aware of the situation and crowd management measures had been in place to alleviate overcrowding. MTRCL would continue to monitor the situation and further measures would be implemented where necessary; and
- (c) the scope of the feasibility study for the Site did not include investigation of the possibility to improve the lift operations at Exit A3 as the lift operations at Ho Man Tin MTR Station was under the responsibility of MTRCL.

30. The Chairperson invited TD to liaise with MTRCL on Members' suggestion to improve the hardware at Exit A3.

Existing Public Covered Walkway and Associated Noise Nuisance

31. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the management agent of the existing public covered walkway next to Ultima;
and
- (b) the noise control regulations applicable to the public covered walkway.

32. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the public covered walkway was owned and managed by the Government. The walkway cover was maintained by HyD; and
- (b) the Noise Control Ordinance (Cap. 400) enforced by EPD could address noise pollution issues, while the Police could enforce the law in relation to public nuisance problems.

Land Sale Programme/List

33. Noting the concerns raised by Ms Mary Mulvihill (R629) in her oral submission, a Member enquired about the arrangement regarding the inclusion of the Site in the Land Sale Programme, given that the statutory planning procedures had yet to be completed. In response, 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 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.

Provision of GIC Facilities

34. In response to a Member's enquiry about the provision of GIC facilities, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) a table showing the provision of major community facilities and open space in the KCDC area (including Ho Man Tin) was at Annex VI of the Paper. Based on the planned population, the current and planned GIC provision was assessed to determine whether there was any shortfall in a particular type of GIC facility;
- (b) three types of GIC facilities were currently in shortfall, namely child care centre, community care services facilities for the elderly and rehabilitation services;

- (c) an 8-storey Ho Man Tin Government Complex at Sheung Foo Street (the Complex) was planned to be built. Under the current proposal, the Complex would accommodate a community hall, an integrated community centre for mental wellness, residential care home for the elderly cum day care unit, Kowloon City district health centre and integrated family service centre. Subject to the funding approval by the Legislative Council, construction of the Complex was expected to be completed within 4 years; and
- (d) as the Complex project was still at the planning stage, there was scope to revise the proposal to incorporate other GIC facilities such as child care centre to address the current shortfall in the KCDC area. To meet such shortfall, SWD had also planned to incorporate child care centres in the new public housing development projects in the district.

35. 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, representer's representative and government 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, representer's representative and government representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

36. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

37. Members generally supported Item A and considered that the proposed residential use at the Site was compatible with the surrounding areas. Most of the representations were submitted by the residents of Ultima and their main concerns and comments were not directly related to the Site. No strong justifications had been provided by the representers to demonstrate that the Site was unsuitable and technically infeasible for residential use. A Member expressed that the assertion of some representers that the proposed residential development at the Site was not in line with the vision and mission of PlanD was not substantiated, and the Board, in considering the zoning amendment under Item A, should take into account the public interest after balancing a host of relevant factors, rather than merely the

views of some local residents of a particular residential development which represented only part of the local community. Members had no objection to other amendments to the OZP.

The Notional Scheme

38. While noting that the layout, as presented in the Paper, was indicative as the worst-case scenario for the purpose of ascertaining the technical feasibility of the proposed residential development at the Site, some Members were of the view that there was room to improve the layout such as improving the disposition of building block to avoid potential wall effect facing nearby developments where site conditions permitted. This would help minimise impact on the local residents. In that regard, the Chairperson agreed and said that from the perspective of public perception of the Government, a more realistic layout for assessing the technical feasibility of the site concerned should be drawn up and presented to the public as far as practicable. A Member also said that based on the proposed key development parameters for the Site, the site coverage (SC) of the building tower was about 19% only. It was likely that the future developer would not build the residential tower(s) close to Ultima to avoid overlooking between adjacent buildings. Regarding the NBA, a Member suggested that it could be of a uniform width of 12m to 15m to form a landscaped passageway, thereby providing certainty in building separation, given that the width of the southern boundary of the Site was about 60m and the alignment of the proposed EVA might be subject to the design of the future developer. On land use planning, a Member opined that while the Site was suitable for residential use, there might be alternative uses worthy of consideration. In response to the above Members' comments, Mr C.K. Yip, Director of Planning, made the following main points:

- (a) the notional scheme was formulated to demonstrate the technical feasibility for the proposed development parameters including GFA/PR and BH. It was envisaged that the future developer of the Site would design the layout with the orientation of building tower(s) facing the existing open space or FWSR for better and more open view;
- (b) the visual impact of building bulk arising from the proposed PR and BH of the Site on the surrounding areas had been assessed. Based on a proposed PR of 4.6 (based on net site area) and BH of 160mPD (24 storeys), the SC was about 19%. Taking into account the bonus PR and exempted GFA, it

was anticipated that the SC would be more than 19% but less than 33% as permitted under the Building (Planning) Regulations, having regard to a number of statutory requirements such as EVA, natural lighting, air ventilation as well as market considerations including flat size;

- (c) the proposed development at the Site and Ultima would be separated by the existing public covered walkway (about 4m to 5m wide) next to Ultima and the NBA (with a width ranging from 5.17m to 14.19m) covering the existing slope near the eastern boundary of the Site, taking into account the setback of Tower 7 of Ultima from its site boundary. According to the notional scheme, there was also a proposed EVA with a width of 7.3m. Such building separation generally exceeded that of nearby residential developments such as Chun Man Court, Cascades and One Homantin. Further increase in NBA might affect the design flexibility of the Site given its small size; and
- (d) given the scarcity of available land in the urban area, priority would be given to optimised use like residential use where the site was considered suitable and technically feasible, and no departmental request for GIC use has been received. If the Site was designated for GIC or open space uses, it might remain idle until a concrete programme with funding was secured. Under the current proposal, some social welfare facilities could be delivered at the Site for the local community within a shorter timeframe.

MTR Exits and Public Car Park

39. A Member said that based on experience, MTR exits were usually located close to the station. Where physical constraints existed but pedestrian connectivity warranted, subway(s) might be provided as part of the station. Noting that all exits of Ho Man Tin MTR Station were on the eastern side except Exit A3 as shown on Plan H-6 of the Paper, and given that Exit A3 was a standalone structure physically separated from the main station, the Vice-chairperson and some Members considered that its usage might have been underestimated at the planning stage. To address the representers' concerns and for the benefit of the local residents, in addition to management measures, MTRCL/TD should explore hardware improvements, such as installation of additional lifts/escalators, in order to resolve the issue of

overcrowding and long waiting time for lifts at Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station, and should consider and formulate measures to divert passengers to Exit A2, including provision of a covered walkway/escalator along Fat Kwong Street. Government funding for such works might also be considered.

40. In response, Mr Vico P. Cheung, CTE/K, TD made the following main points:

- (a) other than Exit A3, Exit B2 at Chung Hau Street was an alternative exit for the residents as it was close to Ultima in terms of physical distance (less than 100m) and the walking route was on a flat terrain. Exit A2 at Fat Kwong Street, while needed to walk uphill, was also less than 100m; and
- (b) according to TD's guidelines, consideration would generally be given to the construction of covered walkways or installation of escalators/lifts when the anticipated passenger flow reached 3,000 per hour or above. Such passenger flow standard might not be met for Fat Kwong Street in this case. Alternatively, such facilities could be proposed by the District Council for the implementation by the Government.

41. Regarding the lack of public car park in Ho Man Tin as raised by some representers and Members, Mr Vico P. Cheung, CTE/K, TD responded that a public car park was available in Ho Man Tin Sports Centre.

HMTVB

42. On the noise impact arising from HMTVB as raised by some Members, Ms Marlene Y.H. Ho, PEPO(TS), EPD said that the issue had been considered in the feasibility study conducted by CEDD and measures had been derived to address the noise impact on the Site. The future developer would be required to submit a noise impact assessment with proposed mitigation measures based on the finalised layout.

43. The Vice-chairperson and some Members also made the following comments and suggestions:

Commercial/Retail Facilities

- (a) the representers' argument regarding the shortfall of commercial/retail facilities in the area and their request to develop a local shopping plaza at the Site were considered unconvincing, as residents should have been fully aware of the provision of such facilities when they moved in. The addition of about 200 flats at the Site would not have significant impact on the demand for such facilities;
- (b) there were existing local commercial/retail facilities within walking distance of Ultima. As 'Shop and Services' was a Column 2 use under the "R(B)" zone, the future developer could submit a section 16 planning application if there was a demand for commercial/retail facilities in the area;
- (c) the retail/catering facilities of the proposed 20-storey education institution development by HKMU could be expanded to serve the local residents if considered necessary;

HMTVB

- (d) while the EIA for the CKR project and the feasibility study conducted by CEDD for the Site had demonstrated that the tunnel exhaust from HMTVB would not have adverse impact on the local residents in the area, real-time air quality monitoring data of tunnel exhaust from HMTVB could be released on a regular basis to alleviate concerns of local residents regarding air pollution;

Provision of GIC facilities

- (e) a public car park and additional GIC facilities could be accommodated in the proposed Complex to meet the needs of local residents; and
- (f) while noting that a GFA equivalent to about 5% of the total domestic GFA of the proposed development would be reserved for GIC facilities, the proposed social welfare facilities under the current proposal, including a

Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Sub-base (GFA: 237m²) and an Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness (GFA: 547m²) accounted for only about 4% of the domestic GFA.

Conclusion

44. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed through the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. The Chairperson remarked that Members' views/suggestions on increasing the passenger capacity of Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station and enhancing the use of Exit A2 for passenger diversion; and releasing information/data on the air quality of tunnel exhaust from HMTVB of CKR would be conveyed to TD/HyD and HyD/EPD to follow up respectively. Members' suggestions on the provision of public car park and more GIC facilities in the proposed Complex would be followed up by PlanD and relevant government departments. Mr Vico P. Cheung, CTE/K, TD remarked that the issue on overcrowding of Exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station had been followed up by KCDC and relevant parties. On the building separation issue, a Member suggested and the meeting agreed that the issue would be incorporated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP to ensure that the future developer would duly consider such issue at the detailed design stage.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Professor B.S. Tang and Messrs Simon Y.S. Wong and Rocky L.K. Poon left this session of the meeting during deliberation.]

45. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1** on Item A, and decided not to uphold **R2 to R629** and agreed that the draft Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/25 should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Item A

- (a) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply to support housing and other development needs, including carrying out

various land use reviews on an on-going basis. The site under Item A (the Site) is located in an area dominated by medium to high density residential development intermixed with government, institution and community (GIC) facilities. The proposed residential use represents optimisation of the use of vacant government land not required by relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) and contributes to the supply of flats in the urban area. The proposed development is of similar scale to and compatible with its neighbouring developments (**R2 to R607, R610 to R616, R618, R622 and R624 to R626**);

- (b) relevant technical assessments on traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation, geotechnical and public utilities aspects in the feasibility study confirmed that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures, there would be no insurmountable technical problem in developing the Site for private residential use. 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 (**R2 to R609, R611 to R621 and R624 to R629**);
- (c) the overall provision of open space and GIC facilities is generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in the Kowloon City District Council Area in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and relevant B/Ds' assessments, except for some elderly, child care and rehabilitation services/facilities. These services/facilities will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise (**R3 to R609, R613 to R618, R621 and R623 to R628**);
- (d) the established practices for statutory and administrative procedures for public consultation for the rezoning exercise have been duly followed. (**R503, R565 to R569, R571 to R575 and R624**); and

Items (c) to (e) of Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (e) the amendments in relation to ‘Market’ use are technical in nature to align with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans where ‘Market’ use is subsumed under ‘Shop and Services’ use **(R623)**.”

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

[Post-meeting note: Paragraph 8.3.7 of the ES of the OZP was amended to address Members’ concerns regarding building separation. The paragraph was amended to read as:

“8.3.7 A site at Fat Kwong Street near Ho Man Tin West Fresh Service Reservoir is zoned “R(B)4”, which is subject to a maximum GFA of 19,300m² and a maximum building height of 160mPD. In determining the maximum GFA of the development/redevelopment in the “R(B)4” zone, any floor space that is constructed or intended for use solely as GIC facilities, as required by the Government, may be disregarded. A NBA is designated at the existing slope near the eastern boundary of the site to preserve existing trees and to facilitate wind penetration. Existing trees within the NBA should be preserved as far as practicable. ***In addition to the NBA, opportunities for maximizing the buffer distance between the proposed development at the site and the residential towers of Ultima should be explored.*** In view of the proximity of the site to the Ho Man Tin West Fresh Water Service Reservoir, requirements on protection of the waterworks installations should be taken into account in the design and construction stages of the development. Diversion of existing water mains and access road to Ho Man Tin West Fresh Water Service Reservoir would be required to materialize the housing development.”]

47. The meeting was closed at 5:05 p.m.