

**DRAFT HUNG HOM
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K9/29
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K9/29-R1 TO R121**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/K9/29-)
<u>Amendments to the Plan (Plan H-1)</u>	<u>Total: 121</u>
<u>Amendment Item (Item) A</u> Rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Sewage Treatment Plant” (“OU(STP)”) to “Residential (Group A)9” (“R(A)9”) with stipulation of building height (BH) restriction.	<u>Support Item A (Total : 33)</u> R1: Urban Renewal Authority (URA) R2 to R33: Individuals <u>Oppose Item A (Total: 84)</u> R34: 林博 LAM Pok (Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) member) R35: Owners’ Committee of Upper East R36 to R116 and R119: Individuals ^{1, 2}
<u>Item B</u> Rezoning of a site abutting the waterfront at Bailey Street from “G/IC” and “OU(STP)” to “Open Space” (“O”)	<u>Oppose Item A, Support Item B with/without Providing view on Item C (Total: 3)</u> R117, R118 and R120: Individuals
<u>Item C</u> Rezoning of a site to the north of Sung Ping Street from “OU(STP)” to “G/IC” with stipulation of BH restriction.	<u>Provide View on Item A (Total: 1)</u> R121: The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCG)

Note: The names of the representers are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of the submissions is sent to Town Planning Board (the Board) Members via electronic means; and is also available for public inspection at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K9_29.html and the Planning Enquiry Counters of the Planning Department in North Point and Sha Tin. A set of hard copy is deposited at the Board’s Secretariat for Members’ inspection.

1. Introduction

1.1 On 12.9.2025, the draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K9/29 (the

¹ **R107 to R112 and R115** oppose Items A, B and C, and the opposing reasons for three items are identical and only related to Item A. They are counted as representations opposing Item A only.

² **R119** opposes Item A and supports Item B, but the reason for Item B is identical and only related to Item A. **R119** is counted as representation opposing Item A only.

Plan) at **Annex I**, together with the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)³, were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments to the OZP and its Notes are at **Annex II** and the locations of the amendment items are shown on **Plan H-1**.

- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, 121 valid representations⁴ were received. On 12.12.2025, the Board agreed to consider all the representations collectively in one group.
- 1.3 This Paper is to provide the Board with information for consideration of the representations. The list of representers is at **Annex III**. The representers have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the Ordinance.

2. Background

Item A – Rezoning of a site at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street from “G/IC” and “OU(STP)” to “R(A)9” with stipulation of BH restriction for Private Residential Development

- 2.1 As stated in the Policy Address 2023, the Government will provide suitable land for URA at nominal land premium to enhance the viability of the concerned redevelopment projects and increase the usable resources available to URA. On 6.6.2025, the Government announced that the Chief Executive in Council approved granting a site at Bailey Street, Hung Hom (**Plan H-2**) by private treaty to support URA in fulfilling its urban renewal mission. It is considered that the grant could result in optimised land use and enhanced planning gains for the area by accommodating government, institution or community (GIC) facilities to meet the district shortfall, enhancing connectivity of the area, and amalgamating the adjacent Hoi Sham Park to provide public open space.
- 2.2 To take forward the government policy, URA has prepared a notional scheme and conducted various technical assessments to demonstrate the feasibility of residential development with GIC facilities, public vehicle park (PVP) and at-grade outdoor communal space at Item A site. To facilitate URA’s proposed development, Item A site has been rezoned from “G/IC” and “OU(STP)” to “R(A)9” subject to a maximum total and domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 68,490m² and 60,880m² respectively and a maximum BH of 110mPD.

Items B and C – Reflecting the Completed Developments and As-built Conditions adjacent to Item A

- 2.3 The amendments include rezoning two pieces of land to the east of Item A site

³ The Notes and ES are available at the Board’s website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K9_29.html.

⁴ 124 submissions were received. Two submissions were considered invalid as the identity information thereof cannot be validated; and two other submissions were counted as one representation as they were made by the same representer.

from “OU(STP)” and “G/IC” to “O” (Item B) to reflect the as-built Hoi Sham Park extension which was completed in 2023; and from “OU(STP)” to “G/IC” (Item C) to reflect the as-built To Kwa Wan Pigging Station (TKWPS) which was completed in 2017.

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

“R(A)” zone

- 2.4 In relation to Amendment Item A in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 above, the Notes and the Remarks for “R(A)” zone have been revised to incorporate the development restrictions for the “R(A)9” sub-zone. Besides, ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding container vehicle)’ was included in Column 1 use for land designated “R(A)9” only. Floor space constructed or intended solely as GIC facilities and PVP, as required by the Government, may be disregarded in determining the GFA for the “R(A)9” sub-zone.

“OU(Pier)”

- 2.5 There are two “OU(Pier)” zones on the approved Hung Hom OZP occupied by Hung Hom (North) Ferry Pier and Hung Hom (South) Ferry Pier (**Plan H-6**). With various facilities for visitors including the existing hotels, newly opened Hung Hom Urban Park in front of the piers and berthing pier for a harbour cruise, it is envisaged that the area will attract more visitors. Opportunity is therefore taken to amend the Notes of the “OU(Pier)” zone to facilitate the provision of shop and services and eating place to serve the visitors and bring vibrancy to the waterfront. In view of the growing market demand for the above commercial uses at the pier and their impact is relatively small or mitigation measures can be enforced through application for commercial concession stage, Remark (1) was deleted and ‘Shop and Services’ and ‘Eating Place’ were put as Column 1 use in line with the spirit of streamlining development process.

“OU(B)”

- 2.6 Opportunity is also taken to align the control of ‘Government Use (not elsewhere specified)’ across the two schedules (namely Schedule I for open-air development or for building other than industrial or industrial-office building and Schedule II for industrial or industrial-office building) in the Notes for the “OU(B)” zone of the OZP. Same as the current control for Schedule II, ‘Government Use (not elsewhere specified)’ use was moved from Column 2 to Column 1 and ‘Government Use (Police Reporting Centre, Post Office only)’ use was deleted correspondingly from Column 1 under Schedule I of the Notes for the “OU(B)” zone.

The Draft OZP

- 2.7 On 15.8.2025, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) agreed that the above amendments to the approved Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/28 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant MPC Paper No. 7/25 is available at the Board’s website⁵ and the extract of the minutes of the MPC meeting is at **Annex IV**. The draft Hung Hom OZP No.

⁵ The MPC Paper No. 7/25 is available at the Board’s website at:
https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/771_mpc_agenda.html

S/K9/29 was then gazetted on 12.9.2025.

3. Consultation

Consultation with Harbourfront Commission

- 3.1 PlanD and URA jointly consulted the Harbourfront Commission (HC) Task Force on Harbourfront Developments in Kowloon, Tsuen Wan and Kwai Tsing (KTF) on 28.7.2025 regarding the proposed residential development at Bailey Street and the proposed amendments to the Notes for the “OU(Pier)” zone. HCKTF members generally supported URA’s proposed development at the Bailey Street, and considered it beneficial in optimising the long-term development of the site, improving connectivity for both pedestrians and vehicles and creating vibrant harbourfront spaces. In addition, HCKTF advised URA to soften the building mass to reduce visual impact and improve air ventilation along the harbourfront, ensure no adverse impacts on on-street car parking in the vicinity due to the closure of the existing car park, and work closely with Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for further refining the interface between the open space within the site and the adjacent Hoi Sham Park. URA noted the meeting’s request for updating the HCKTF during detailed design stage. The extract of minutes of the HCKTF meeting is attached in **Annex Va**.

Consultation with District Council

- 3.2 PlanD and URA jointly consulted the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) on 24.7.2025 regarding the proposed residential development at Bailey Street and the proposed amendments to the Notes for the “OU(Pier)” zone. KCDC generally had no adverse comment on the proposed amendments. Their concerns were on visual impact and whether the existing road system would be able to cope with the increased traffic flow. KCDC suggested that the Bailey Street Site should be well connected to the waterfront. URA was advised to explore opportunities to provide more GIC / social welfare facilities for the local community and the district. The extract of minutes of the KCDC meeting is enclosed at **Annex Vb**.
- 3.3 The views and comments from HCKTF and KCDC have been incorporated into the MPC Paper No. 7/25 mentioned in paragraph 2.7 above. During the statutory exhibition period of the draft OZP, KCDC members were notified that members of the public could submit representations on the amendments in writing to the Secretary of the Board. One representation from a member of KCDC was received (R34).

4. The Representation Sites and their Surrounding Areas

4.1 Representation Site under Item A

- 4.1.1 Item A site (0.76ha) is entirely government land largely zoned “G/IC” (over 99%) with a strip of land zoned “OU(STP)” (less than 1%) and is located at the junction of Bailey Street and Chi Kiang Street in Kowloon City District. It is bounded by Hoi Sham Park, Bailey Street and Chi Kiang

Street to its north, south and west respectively (**Plan H-2**). Item A site (except for the strip of land zoned “OU(STP)”) was previously reserved for secondary school development and is now being used as a temporary fee-paying PVP (**Plans H-3 and H-4**). Upon review, the Education Bureau (EDB) considered that this site can be released for other use. The strip of land zoned “OU(STP)” is currently vacant and no longer required to serve the adjacent sewage treatment facility. Item A site is currently accessible via Bailey Street to its immediate south.

- 4.1.2 Item A site is located near the harbourfront and surrounded by a cluster of “G/IC” zones with building height restrictions (BHR) ranging from 3 to 10 storeys. Developments within these “G/IC” zones include a group of schools to the west, Kowloon City Government Office and APB Centre (an Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) office) to the south and To Kwa Wan STP and To Kwa Wan Pigging Station to the east. Hoi Sham Park and its extension abutting the Victoria Harbour are to the north and east of Item A site. To the further south and southwest is a cluster of sites zoned “Commercial” (“C”) and “OU(B)” subject to a maximum plot ratio of 12 and BHRs ranging from 100mPD to 120mPD. To the further west across Sung On Street are predominantly residential areas zoned “R(A)” with retail activities on lower floors (including the URA’s Kowloon City Action Area (KCAA)⁶ subject to a maximum domestic / total plot ratio of 7.5/9 with BHRs ranging from 100mPD to 140mPD (**Plan H-5**).
- 4.1.3 Item A site has been rezoned to “R(A)9” subject to a maximum domestic / total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 60,880m² / 68,490m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 110mPD. GIC facilities and PVP as required by the Government may be exempted from GFA calculation.
- 4.1.4 The notional scheme of the proposed private residential development in support of the rezoning is shown at **Drawings H-1 to H-4** and its development parameters are summarised below:

Table 1: Development Parameters of the Notional Scheme

Site Area (subject to survey and detailed design)	About 7,610m ²
Total GFA	About 68,490m ² (PR 9)
- Domestic GFA	- About 60,880m ² (PR 8)
- Non-Domestic GFA	- About 7,610m ² (PR 1)
Non-Domestic GFA for GIC provision⁽¹⁾ (proposed to be exempted from GFA calculation)	About 3,100m ²
BH (at main roof level)	110mPD
No. of Storeys	31 (including 4-storey podium and 2-

⁶ KCAA1 is located about 200m to the west of the Site (**Plan H-5**). According to URA, the proposed development at the Site can have synergy with the nearby KCAA1 to foster a vibrant and cohesive community.

	level basement)
No. of Blocks	2
No. of Flats	1,218
Average Flat Size	About 50m ²
Proposed Site Coverage (excluding basement)	85%
Harbourfront At-grade Communal Space	About 760m ²
Private Open Space	About 2,924m ²
Green Coverage	Minimum 20%
Planned Population⁽²⁾	2,924
Internal Transport Facilities for the Proposed Development	
Ancillary car park	
- private car parking spaces	343 nos.
- motor-cycle parking spaces	14 nos.
- Loading / Unloading bays	11 nos.
PVP	
Coach parking spaces (shared use with commercial vehicles)	15 nos.
Anticipated Completion Year	2032

Remarks:

- (1) For the GIC facilities, the location, type and their actual provision will be subject to detailed design by the URA in consultation with relevant government departments.
- (2) Assumed person per flat (PPF) of 2.4.

4.2 *Representation Site under Item B*

- 4.2.1 Item B site (0.32ha) located to the east of Item A site is the extension of Hoi Sham Park which was completed in 2023 and has been rezoned to “O” to reflect the as-built situation.

4.3 *Representation Site under Item C*

- 4.3.1 Item C site (0.07ha) sandwiched between Item B site and Item A site is occupied by a single-storey TKWPS which was completed in 2017, and has been rezoned to “G/IC” to reflect the as-built situation.

4.4 Planning Intentions

The planning intentions of the zones in relation to the above representation sites are as follows:

- (a) the “R(A)9” zone under Item A site is intended primarily for high-density residential developments. Commercial uses are always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building or in the purpose-designed non-residential portion of an existing building;
- (b) the “O” zone under Item B site is intended primarily for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for active and/or passive recreational uses serving the needs of local residents as well as the general public; and

- (c) “G/IC” zone is intended primarily for the provision of GIC facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. It is also intended to provide land for uses directly related to or in support of the work of the Government, organizations providing social services to meet community needs, and other institutional establishments.

5. The Representations

5.1 Subject of Representations

- 5.1.1 During the two-month exhibition period, 121 valid representations were received.
- 5.1.2 33 are representations (**R1 to R33**) supporting Item A, including one from the URA (**R1**). The others were submitted by individuals (**R2 to R33**).
- 5.1.3 84 representations (**R34 to R116 and R119**) oppose Item A. These include a representation by a district council member (**R34**) with a summary of 446 questionnaires, and a representation by the Owners' Committee of Upper East (**R35**) with the findings of 72 questionnaires from the residents of Upper East. The remaining 82 representations were submitted by individuals with 45 (**R72 to R116**) using a standard template.
- 5.1.4 Three representations oppose Item A and support Item B (**R117, R118 and R120**). Among them, two also (**R117 and R120**) provide views on Item C.
- 5.1.5 The remaining representation by a company provides views on Item A (**R121**).
- 5.1.6 The major grounds/views and proposal of the representations and PlanD's responses, in consultation with relevant Government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are summarised in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.4 below.

5.2 Supportive Representations

Item A

Major View	Representation No.
(1) Proposed zoning amendment can optimize scarce urban land resources, fully utilize the development potential and provide an opportunity to adopt holistic planning of Item A site for comprehensive residential development with commercial and social facilities. The proposed development can increase housing supply to meet the demand in the future.	R1 to R33
(2) The proposed development provides an	

<p>opportunity for providing social facilities which can benefit the district.</p> <p>(3) The provisions of at-grade communal space and retail belt fronting Hoi Sham Park enhance the inland-to-waterfront linkage, create a vibrant and diversified public realm, create a synergy effect with the Hoi Sham Park, enhance vibrancy and attractiveness of the waterfront area and uplift the overall living environment around the area.</p> <p>(4) The proposed development delivers substantial public benefits that align with the Government’s Single Site, Multiple Use initiative and the ‘people first, district-based, public participatory’ approach to urban renewal.</p>	
<p>(5) The proposed development is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed BH supports a carefully planned building layout and possibility for breaking up the podium bulk, allowing design flexibility for the building blocks of the proposed development while addressing site constraints. The integrated approach optimizes land potential, combining residential, communal space and GIC facilities. The podium accommodating GIC/retail/clubhouse/parking facilities, with the proposed retail belt fronting Hoi Sham Park ensures that the ground-level space is dedicated to uses benefiting both residents and the public, striking a balance between development needs and planning gain.</p> <p>(6) The proposed development aims to create a node between the URA’s KCAA1 Core Area at inland and the waterfront, featuring with retail belt, at-grade communal space and community facilities that integrate with the adjacent Hoi Sham Park for enjoyment by future residents and the surrounding neighbourhood and brings together diverse communities, green space and active recreation areas, delivers tangible social benefits including enhanced livability, strengthened local cohesion, social interaction and community bonding and a broader positive impact on the public realm.</p> <p>(7) URA will consider the Government’s Enhanced Facilitation Measures for Buildings Adopting Modular Integrated Construction (MIC) under Joint Practice Note No. 8 (JPN No.8) and Lands Department Practice Note No. 9/2025 (LandsD PN</p>	<p>R1</p>

<p>No. 9/2025) on GFA exemption arrangement for aboveground parking spaces in private development. Adoption of these measures will be reviewed at the subsequent detailed design stage.</p> <p>(8) Comprehensive technical assessments on various aspects were conducted to ascertain the feasibility of the proposed development and no adverse comments were received from the relevant government departments.</p> <p>(9) The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) confirmed that the proposed development would not induce adverse impact on the surrounding road traffic or pedestrian network. A public vehicle park with 15 coach parking spaces for shared use with commercial vehicles is proposed to address potential parking shortfall due to the closure of the existing car park. This adaptive parking design ensures sufficient capacity while avoiding neighbourhood congestion. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) and the Commissioner of Police (C of P) have raised no in-principle objection to or adverse comments on the TIA.</p> <p>(10) The TKWPS does not contain any gas storage facility or gas holder for town gas storage. The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) has been consulted and it is confirmed that a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) to evaluate the potential risk near the TKWPS is not required. A hazard-to-life assessment was included in the Environmental Assessment (EA) report (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) which reaffirmed that the proposed development would not lead to any unacceptable risk due to the TKWPS.</p> <p>(11) An Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) had been conducted and confirmed that with the proposed good design measures, including a notional tower separation of about 15m above the podium and a minimum 10m building setback from Bailey Street, the existing air pathway along Bailey Street will be preserved and airflow to the inland will be maintained. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) accepted the AVA.</p>	
--	--

<p>(12) A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) has been conducted to assess the visual effects from both district-wide and local perspectives. The selected viewing points were determined in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), with local viewing points identified based on the project setting and views of local significance. The VIA concluded that the proposed development would be compatible with the existing and planned visual context of the skyline in the nearby residential area. Although some changes to the visual experience at the street level, along the waterfront and in the hinterland are anticipated, the proposed at-grade communal space and podium landscape treatments will provide visual permeability along Bailey Street and create visual interest to the area.</p> <p>(13) URA has consulted KCDC, HCKTF and four nearby schools, namely the Po Leung Kuk Anita L.L. Chan (Centenary) School, CCC Kei To Secondary School, Chi Yun School, and Po Leung Kuk Ngan Po Ling College regarding the proposed development at Item A site. KCDC and the members of the four schools raised no objection to and no adverse comments on the proposed development. HCKTF expressed general support for the proposed development.</p>	
<p>(14) Item A can improve URA's financial situation and enable URA to expedite the process of taking forward other redevelopment projects, such as 13 streets project.</p>	<p>R3, R8, R16 and R31</p>
<p>Response</p>	
<p>The supporting views are noted.</p>	

Item B

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
<p>(1) Support the provision of open space.</p>	<p>R117 (part), R118 (part) and R120 (part)</p>
<p>Response</p>	
<p>The supporting view is noted.</p>	

5.3 Opposing Representations

Item A

5.3.1 Planning Intention, Land Use and Development Intensity

Major Ground / View	Representation No.
<p><i>Planning Intention and Land Use</i></p> <p>(1) The site should not be used as a funding source for other URA projects such as the 13-streets project. There are many on-going URA redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan / Hung Hom areas, and there is no need to provide another site to URA.</p> <p>(2) The site should not be used for private residential use as it is not compatible with the surrounding schools and industries. Alternatively, the site should be used for the extension of promenade and Hoi Sham Park with 20m buffer between the site and Hoi Sham Park to facilitate park planning. The site should also be used for public facilities such as swimming pool/ sports centre/ library, and multi-storey carpark.</p>	<p>R34, R35, R37, R38, R39, R40, R43, R44, R46, R49, R50, R56, R61, R63, R64, R66, R67, R70, R72 to R117 (part) and R120 (part)</p>
<p>(3) There are too many residential developments planned in the surrounding area. Under the current economic situation, rezoning the site for residential use in this area is not justified.</p> <p>(4) Rezoning of the site for residential development would violate the intention of the planning of the Victoria Harbour area and Victoria Cove area.</p>	<p>R35, R38, R40, R41, R44, R49, R56, R68, R69 to R120 (part)</p>
<p><i>Development Intensity and BH</i></p> <p>(5) The proposed high-density residential development at the site, with a total plot ratio of 9 and BH of 110mPD, is incompatible with the Hoi Sham Park, the surrounding developments and other buildings along the promenade in the Hung Hom area. Stepped height concept from waterfront to inland as mentioned in the OZP should be kept.</p> <p>(6) Further increase in BH will be allowed for adopting MIC and this will cause adverse impact on the city view.</p> <p>(7) The proposed notional scheme did not take into account LandsD PN No. 9/2025 Gross Floor Area Exemption Arrangement for Aboveground Parking Spaces in Private Developments. With the aboveground carpark, the adoption of MIC allowed under JPN8 and the GIC facilities exempted from GFA calculation, the future building bulk will be much greater than that illustrated in the</p>	<p>R35, R38, R40 to R42, R56, R61, R63, R65, R68 to R70, R72 to R116 and R120 (part)</p>

<p>photomontage.</p> <p>(8) The site should be used for low-rise public housing development instead of private residential development.</p>	
<p>Responses</p>	
<p>In response to (1) to (4):</p> <p>(a) The Government pledged in its Policy Address 2023 that it will provide suitable land for the URA at nominal land premium to enhance the viability of the concerned redevelopment projects and increase the usable resources available to support URA in fulfilling its urban renewal mission. On 6.6.2025, the Government announced granting Item A site by private treaty to URA as financial support to enable it to carry out redevelopment and fulfil other statutory missions in a self-financing manner. As the originally reserved school use on the site is no longer valid, the site is considered suitable for other gainful development upon its release. Given its proximity to the URA's KCAA1 Core Area in To Kwa Wan inland area, Item A site is proposed for residential development. Through integrated planning, it will achieve better utilisation of the valuable land resource of the site itself and synergistic effects between the waterfront and the hinterland.</p> <p>(b) The site is situated at the harbourfront location in a neighbourhood that is being actively transformed into new high-rise residential and business area intermixed with government offices and schools (Plans H-1 and H-2). In close proximity to and abutting Hoi Sham Park, the street block of industrial buildings along Yuk Yat Street zoned “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) are being or having been redeveloped into residential developments. Similarly across Sung On Street including the URA's KCAA1, the aged buildings zoned “R(A)” are being redeveloped into new residential towers. The “OU(B)” zoning covering clusters of factories to the south of Item A site facilitates their gradual redevelopment or conversion into offices and shops. Rezoning the site for residential use with a balanced mix of community facilities and other uses is considered compatible with the surrounding area which is under transformation.</p> <p>(c) Rezoning the site presents the opportunity to accommodate and expedite the provision of GIC facilities as well as connection to Hoi Sham Park. The rezoning proposal reserves 3,100m² GFA (about 5% of domestic GFA) for a welfare facility such as residential care home for the elderly (RCHE). Besides, by making good use of the stormwater drainage reserve area as an at-grade outdoor communal space (of not less than 760m²), the rezoning will improve the physical and visual connection to the Hoi Sham Park from Bailey Street through direct links within the site (Drawing H-3).</p> <p>(d) Currently Item A site is fenced off for temporary carparking use. The notional scheme which allocates retail belt and alfresco dining along the frontage facing the harbour would provide a transition between the future development and Hoi Sham Park while creating spaces for social interaction and economic activities.</p>	

- (e) All in all, the proposed development aligns with the Harbour Planning Principles in meeting the needs of the community, enhancing the overall liveability of the surrounding area, bringing vibrancy to the waterfront, and elevating visitors' experience to the waterfront.

In response to (5) to (8):

- (f) Residential sites in the vicinity of the waterfront are high-density in nature subject to a maximum domestic / total plot ratio of 7.5/9. These cover the hinterland sites across Sung On Street (including the URA's KCAA1) zoned "R(A)" and waterfront sites along Yuk Yau Street zoned "R(E)" subject to a BHR from 100mPD to 140mPD (**Plan H-5**). Having regard to the site context and waterfront developments in the area, the proposed domestic / total PR of 8/9 backed by policy support and technical assessments is considered acceptable. The BHR of 110mPD has taken into account of the maximum PR together with the inclusion of GIC facilities, the drainage reserve which is a site constraint and will be developed as an at-grade communal space, and the provision of design flexibility at detailed design stage (e.g. provision of more aboveground carpark in accordance with the new policy initiative). While the proposed BHR is slightly higher than those sites immediately abutting the waterfront, taking a wider context in particular the developments in the hinterland and the nearby cluster of "C" and "OU(B)" zones (subject to a BHR 120mPD), the overall BH profile (descending towards the waterfront) can still be maintained.
- (g) As shown from the section plan of the notional scheme by URA (**Drawing H-2**), a welfare facility and one-storey aboveground car park can be accommodated under the BHR. Should there be need to further increase in BH due to the adoption of MIC or reduction of basement carpark, URA is required to seek planning permission from the Board with full justification and technical assessments. Public comments will be solicited and considered in the planning application process.

5.3.2 Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
<p>(1) The BHR of Item A site was 8 storeys. Increasing the BHR from 8 storeys to 110mPD will block the sea view from nearby buildings and adversely affect the visual enjoyment of and the property value of the surrounding residential developments. The proposed development with 110mPD will also disrupt the skyline.</p> <p>(2) Visual blockage should be minimised in the area to maintain the connection between the street and public space. One of the submitted photomontages cannot reflect the bulkiness of the proposed development and the other photomontage was taken from a spot not publicly accessible.</p> <p>(3) The proposed development will block the wind corridor and disturb the wind to inland from the sea side. It will create ‘wall effect’ which generates adverse impact on air ventilation and natural lighting, and lead to the sense of oppression to the surrounding area. The openness of the site should be maintained. The blocking of wind corridor will also lead to the ‘heat island effect’.</p>	<p>R34 to R43, R52, R54, R56, R58 to R66, R68, R70, R72 to R120 (part)</p>
<p><i>Proposal</i></p> <p>The BHR should not exceed 80mPD and a 30m-wide wind corridor for air ventilation should be provided within the site.</p>	<p>R70</p>
<p>Responses</p>	
<p>(a) URA had conducted a VIA (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25). The photomontages from different publicly accessible viewpoints demonstrated that the proposed development would inevitably result in partial reduction of the sea view and visual openness as viewed from short-distance inland/park viewing points. However, views along the Bailey Street visual corridor towards the harbourfront would largely be maintained and the scale, massing and height of the proposed development are not incompatible with the surrounding context (Drawings H-5 to H-13). Moreover, as demonstrated in the VIA, none of the identified key medium-to-long distance public viewing points (including the strategic viewing point at the HK Convention and Exhibition Centre) would have significant adverse visual impacts. The results concluded that the visual impacts on the surroundings are not unacceptable with mitigation measures such as responsive building disposition, 15m-wide building separation, building setback and at-grade communal space. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comments on the conclusion of the VIA.</p>	

- (b) Regarding the ‘wall effect’, the notional scheme has adopted design measures such as 15m-wide building separation to mitigate possible adverse air ventilation impacts. Moreover, a minimum of 10m building setback from Bailey Street would also preserve the existing air pathway and facilitate smoother airflow to the inland. According to the AVA conducted by URA (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25), with the abovementioned good design measures, adverse air ventilation impact is not anticipated. Furthermore, according to URA, the proposed development will also follow the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) to improve air ventilation, enhance the environmental quality at pedestrian level and mitigate heat island effects. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed amendments to the OZP from air ventilation perspective.
- (c) Given the site constraint due to the drainage reserve, together with the inclusion of GIC facilities and aboveground carpark, setting a BHR at 80mPD would inevitably reduce the overall PR, which goes against the policy objective of optimising the development potential of the site.
- (d) The response in paragraph 5.3.1(f) regarding building height is also relevant.

5.3.3 Technical Aspects

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
<p><i>Traffic aspect</i></p> <p>(1) The proposed development will bring adverse traffic impact by overloading the existing road and public transport.</p> <p>(2) Redeveloping the heavily used PVP into a residential development will increase illegal on-street parking. URA does not propose any mitigation measures for the loss of PVP.</p> <p>(3) There is no bicycle parking provided along waterfront which is the aspiration of the community.</p> <p><i>Infrastructure capacity, gas and fire safety and hygienic impact</i></p> <p>(4) There is a rapid increase in the number of large-scale developments around the site in To Kwa Wan. Increase in population will overload the infrastructural capacity of the area and may cause potential risk to gas safety from pigging station, fire safety and hygiene of the area.</p>	<p>R34 to R38, R40, R45, R47 to R49, R52 to R57, R60, R63, R64, R68, R70, R72 to R120 (part)</p>
<i>Construction Noise and Air Impacts</i>	R38, R68 and R72

<p>(5) During construction period, adverse noise and air quality and construction waste impacts may be brought to the surrounding developments. It may affect the marine ecology.</p> <p><i>Felling of Trees</i></p> <p>(6) The biodiversity of the area may also be affected as trees will be felled which may lead to loss of soil.</p>	<p>to R116</p>
<p><i>Flooding</i></p> <p>(7) There may be risk of flooding as the site is located near the waterfront. Developing the site from PVP to residential development may decrease the permeability and increase the flooding risk.</p>	<p>R35 and R38</p>
<p><i>Sustainable Development</i></p> <p>(8) High-density development will deviate from the objective of sustainable development which promotes low carbon operation and encouraging greenery.</p>	<p>R38, R40, R56, R63, R69 and R72 to R116</p>
<p>Responses</p>	
<p>In response to (1) to (3)</p> <p>(a) URA has conducted a TIA (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) to assess the traffic impact brought by the proposed development. With the proposed junction improvement for Hung Hom Road / Tai Wan Road East, all the assessed junctions would be operating within capacity after the completion of the proposed development. Regarding the provision of public transport facility, relevant Government departments will review it from time to time to ensure adequate public transport facilities are provided to serve the local need. C for T and C of P have no in-principle objection to/ adverse comments on the TIA and the zoning amendment from traffic engineering perspective.</p> <p>(b) To address the demand for car parking spaces in the area and due to the closure of the current PVP, a PVP with 15 coach parking spaces for shared use with commercial vehicles (CV) is proposed in addition to the ancillary parking facilities for the proposed development. Furthermore, public car parking facilities are also provided in the URA's KCAA1 Core Area to be completed in coming years to meet the district demand. C for T considered the proposed 15 shared-use CV parking spaces is unlikely to meet the strong demand in the district given the high utilization of the coach parking spaces at the current PVP. URA is therefore reminded to continue exploring the feasibility of and carry out consultation with relevant stakeholders about increasing the number of CV parking spaces in the proposed PVP.</p>	

- (c) While the notional scheme of the proposed development does not indicate provision of bicycle parking, there are designated parking places along the 13km-GreenWay in Kai Tak area which extends to Hoi Sham Park. Designated parking spaces are provided in various locations along the GreenWay for the use of the cyclists. The Government will continue to explore the opportunity for providing additional parking spaces.

In response to (4)

- (d) The proposed development will bring about 3,000 new population. To assess the potential impact on the capacity of infrastructure, drainage, sewerage and water supply impact assessments (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) were carried out to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed development. Stormwater discharge from the proposed development is proposed to be collected by proposed terminal manholes and discharged via the proposed new drainage pipes to a box culvert designed to handle stormwater flow under extreme conditions. All downstream existing sewers are able to cater for the expected peak sewage flow from the proposed development. In terms of fresh and salt water supply, the increase in demand can be accommodated by the existing waterworks facilities. As such, no adverse impacts are anticipated on infrastructure. Relevant government departments including the Drainage Services Department (DSD), Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and Water Supplies Department (WSD) have no objection to or no adverse comments on the proposed development.
- (e) The TKWPS does not contain any gas storage facility or gas holder for town gas storage. EPD and EMSD have been consulted and it is confirmed that TKWPS and the Intermediate Pressure B (IPB) pipeline are classified neither as a Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI) nor a Notifiable Gas Installation (CAP. 51). Thus, no quantitative risk assessment is required. Notwithstanding, a hazard-to-life assessment has been carried out by URA and included in the EA report (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) which confirmed that the proposed development would not lead to any unacceptable risk due to the TKWPS. To further lower the potential risk, the assessment proposes mitigation measures such as requirement on security fence directly facing the pigging station; building layout in such a way that no window opening or no balcony will be facing directly to the pigging station, etc. EMSD and the Director of Fire Services (DFS) have no adverse comments on the zoning amendment from gas and fire safety aspects respectively. EMSD advised URA to liaise with HKCG regarding any safety concern, setback distance requirement and to materialise the risk mitigation measures identified in the hazard-to-life assessment in the EA report (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25). On the provision of emergency vehicular access, DFS advised that the requirements stipulated in the relevant code of practice for fire safety shall be complied with.
- (f) Other concern on hygiene will be subject to the scrutiny of relevant Government departments including the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department.

In response to (5)

- (g) The potential noise and air quality impacts and waste management during construction period have been assessed in the EA (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) and it is concluded that with proper mitigation measures such as minimizing the view angle from the windows to the road traffic and adoption of best practices as per relevant guidelines and practice notes, no adverse noise, air quality and environmental impact is anticipated.
- (h) DEP has no adverse comment on the zoning amendment from environmental perspective. With proper waste management, marine ecology shall not be affected during construction phase. Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no comments regarding the representation's concern on marine ecology.

In response to (6)

- (i) According to the Conceptual Landscape Design Plan and Tree Survey Report prepared by URA (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25), among the 20 existing trees within the site to be affected by the proposed development, 19 trees of average to poor condition would be felled (including 6 undesirable species) and the remaining one tree will be transplanted within the site. A total of 13 new trees would be planted within the site, mainly on the at-grade communal space, to meet the 1:1 compensatory ratio. Adverse impact on biodiversity is also not anticipated. CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no comments on the zoning amendments from landscape planning aspect.

In response to (7)

- (j) The Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA) submitted by URA (**Attachment V** of the MPC Paper No. 7/25) has confirmed that with the proposed new pipes, no adverse drainage impact will be resulted from the proposed residential development. The risk of flooding is insignificant.
- (k) URA has been reminded to assess the coastal risks (e.g. coastal flooding or facility damage due to storm surge and overtopping wave); and implement appropriate coastal protection measures to reduce the coastal risks to the site and the surrounding, if necessary.

In response to (8)

- (l) Developments are governed by extant regulations and standards including green building design and greenery coverage. The proposed development, according to URA, will follow the SBDG which will be subject to the scrutiny by the Buildings Department (BD) at the building plan submission stage.

5.3.4 Provision of public facilities

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
<p>(1) Rezoning the site from GIC use to private residential use will decrease the provision of public facilities to serve the nearby community and additional population generated from the residential development will increase the burden on the capacity of public facilities including welfare, leisure and sport facilities and open spaces which will deteriorate the living environment.</p> <p>(2) The proposed scheme does not offer GIC facilities and open spaces for the future residents and residents nearby.</p>	<p>R34, R35, R37, R38, R39, R43, R44, R47, R49, R50, R51, R63, R67, R69, R70, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part)</p>
Responses	
<p>(a) The site was reserved for secondary school development and subsequently released by EDB upon review. To optimise the use of land resources in a timely manner, B/Ds have no adverse comments on rezoning the site for residential development.</p> <p>(b) As shown in the table of Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in the Kowloon City District Council Area (Annex VI), the existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population based on the requirements of HKPSG and relevant B/D's assessment, except for some elderly, child care and rehabilitation services/facilities. The HKPSG requirements for these welfare facilities are long-term goals, and the actual provision would be subject to consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate. GIC 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. The Government has also implemented the policy of allocating 5% of domestic GFA for social welfare facilities in the new public housing developments. Moreover, various GIC facilities such as RCHE and a team of Home Care Services for Frail Elderly Persons will also be provided in the URA's KCAA1 Core Area in coming years to meet the district demand.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development has reserved space for GIC facilities and open spaces as mentioned in paragraph 5.3.1 (c) above.</p>	

5.3.5 Public consultation

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
<p>More public consultations should be conducted and residents' comments should be incorporated.</p>	<p>R38 and R63</p>
Responses	

Since the Government announced granting the site to URA in June 2025, PlanD and URA have jointly consulted KCDC and HCKTF, and URA has further consulted four nearby schools about the proposed development. At consultees' request, URA will be required to continue consulting relevant parties in the subsequent detailed design stage.

5.4 **Representations Providing Views**

Item A

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
As the proposed development is in close vicinity to the IPB pipeline at Hoi Sham Park and TKWPS, URA is suggested to conduct QRA to evaluate the potential risk based on the forecasted ultimate population and determine the necessary mitigation measures if required. URA should consult HKCG in design and construction stages and provide protective measures.	R121
Responses	
According to EMSD, the TKWPS does not include any gas storage facilities or gas holders for town gas. Additionally, both TKWPS and the IPB pipeline are neither classified as a PHI nor designated as a Notifiable Gas Installation under Cap. 51. Therefore, there is no requirement for carrying out any quantitative risk assessment.	
Nevertheless, the URA is advised to liaise with HKCG in design and construction stages to address any safety concerns, confirm setback distance requirements, and implement the risk mitigation measures identified in the hazard-to-life assessment of the EA report (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 7/25).	

Item C

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
More information should be provided under this amendment item for redevelopment of building.	R117 (part)
There is no need to rezone the land as “OU” as the pigging station is effectively a service facility like the sewage treatment plant.	R120 (part)
Responses	
Rezoning the site to “G/IC” is to reflect the one-storey as-built TKWPS. There is no plan to redevelop the building.	

6. **Departmental Consultation**

6.1 The following B/Ds have been consulted and their comments, if any, have been incorporated in the above paragraphs, where appropriate:

- (a) Secretary for Development;
- (b) Commissioner for Harbourfront, Development Bureau;
- (c) Secretary for Education;
- (d) Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), Development Bureau;
- (e) Chief Architect/3, Architectural Services Department;
- (f) Project Manager/East, Civil Engineering Development Department
- (g) C for T;
- (h) C of P;
- (i) CE/C, WSD;
- (j) CE/MS, DSD;
- (k) Chief Highway Engineer/Urban, Highways Department;
- (l) DFS;
- (m) Director of Health;
- (n) Director of Leisure and Cultural Services;
- (o) Director of Social Welfare;
- (p) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (q) Director of Environmental Protection;
- (r) Chief Estate Surveyor / Urban Renewal, LandsD;
- (s) District Land Officer/Kowloon West, LandsD;
- (t) CBS/K, BD;
- (u) Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene;
- (v) Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation;
- (w) District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department; and
- (x) CTP/UD&L, PlanD.

7. **Planning Department's Views**

7.1 The supportive views of **R1 to R33, R117 (part), R118 (part) and R120 (part)** and views provided by **R117 (part), R120 (part) and R121** are noted.

7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 5 above, PlanD does not support the representations of **R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part)** and considers that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

Item A

- (a) taking forward the pledge to enhance URA's financial capability in the Policy Address 2023, the Government approved granting URA Item A site as financial support to enable URA to carry out redevelopment and fulfil other statutory missions in a self-financing manner. Taking into account factors including site context, the character of the area and infrastructure capacity, rezoning the site for high-density residential development meets the policy objective of optimising land use and enhancing planning gains for the area. The maximum total PR and domestic PR of 9 and 8 respectively and a BHR of 110mPD for Item A site is compatible with the surrounding land uses. The

proposed development with new open space, GIC facilities, retail uses, PVP and enhanced accessibility to the harbourfront could benefit the local community and the public and bring vibrancy to the harbourfront; **(R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part))**).

- (b) relevant technical assessments on traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation, hazard-to-life, drainage, sewerage and water supply aspects confirmed that, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures, there are no insurmountable technical impacts arising from the proposed developments. The development details and other technical aspects of the proposed developments would be subject to the scrutiny of concerned government departments in subsequent development stage in accordance with relevant guidelines, requirements and ordinances **(R34 to R116, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part))**;
- (c) QRA is not required as both the TKWPS and the IPB pipeline are neither classified as a PHI nor a Notifiable Gas Installation under the Gas Safety Ordinance (Cap. 51). Nonetheless, a hazard-to-life assessment carried out by URA has confirmed that the proposed development would not lead to any unacceptable risk due to the TKWPS, and mitigation measures have been proposed in the assessment to further lower the potential risk **(R40 and R121)**;
- (d) the overall provision of open space and GIC facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in KCDC Area in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG, except for elderly, child care and rehabilitation services / facilities. These services/facilities will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant government B/Ds, and premises-based GIC facilities could be incorporated in future development/redevelopment when opportunities arise. The proposed residential development with a welfare facility would expedite the provision of the needed services and the at-grade communal space would enhance accessibility to and create synergy with the adjacent Hoi Sham Park **(R34, R35, R37, R38, R39, R43, R44, R47, R49, R50, R51, R63, R67, R69, R70, R117 (part), R118 (part), R119 and R120 (part))**; and
- (e) the consultation procedures for rezoning exercise have been duly followed. URA will further liaise with relevant parties in the subsequent detailed design stage **(R38 and R63)**.

8. Decision Sought

- 8.1 The Board is invited to give consideration to the representations taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendments to the Plan to meet/partially meet the representations.
- 8.2 Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the Plan to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the Plan, together with its Notes and ES², are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

9. Attachments

Annex I	Draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/29
Annex II	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/28
Annex III	List of Representatives
Annex IV	Extract of Minutes of the MPC Meeting held on 15.8.2025
Annex Va	Extract of Minutes of the HCKTF meeting held on 28.7.2025
Annex Vb	Extract of Minutes of the KCDC Meeting held on 24.7.2025
Annex VI	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in the Kowloon City District Council Area
Drawing H-1	Indicative Block Plan (Item A)
Drawing H-2	Indicative Section Plan (Item A)
Drawing H-3	Landscape Design Concept Plan (Item A)
Drawing H-4	Artist's Impression of the Notional Scheme (Item A)
Drawings H-5 to H-13	Photomontages (Item A)
Plan H-1	Location Plan
Plan H-2	Site Plan
Plan H-3	Aerial Photo
Plans H-4a to H-4b	Site Photos
Plan H-5	Existing BH and BH Restrictions under OZP
Plan H-6	Location Plan (Piers)

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
JANUARY 2026**