

# TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 11051

For Consideration by the  
Town Planning Board on 18.3.2026

DRAFT HO MAN TIN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K7/25

CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K7/25-R1 TO R629

**DRAFT HO MAN TIN  
OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K7/25  
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K7/25-R1 TO R629**

Subject of Representations (Amendment Items)	Representers (No. TPB/R/S/K7/25-)
<p><b><u>Item A</u></b> Rezoning of a site at Fat Kwong Street from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group B)4” (“R(B)4”) with stipulation of building height restriction (BHR).</p> <p><b><u>Amendments to the Notes of the Plan</u></b> (c) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 1 of the Notes for “Commercial” (“C”) zone. (d) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 2 of the Notes for “R(B)” zone. (e) Revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “G/IC” zones.</p>	<p><b><u>Total: 629</u></b></p> <p><b><u>Support Item A (Total: 1)</u></b> R1: Individual</p> <p><b><u>Oppose/Provide Adverse Views on Item A (Total: 627)</u></b> R2: Company R3 to R622, R624 to R626, R629: Individuals R627: 吳奮金 NG Fan-kam (Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) member) R628: 九龍城區議會陳治華議員辦事處 (KCDC member CHAN Chi-wah’s ward office)</p> <p><b><u>Oppose Item A and Amendments (c), (d) and (e) to the Notes of the Plan (Total: 1)</u></b> R623: Individual</p>

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\\_K7\\_25.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K7_25.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 14.11.2025, the draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/25 (the Plan) at **Annex I**, together with the Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES)<sup>1</sup>, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The Schedule of Amendments setting out the amendments to the

<sup>1</sup> The Notes and ES are available at the Board’s website at: [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_K7\\_25.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K7_25.html)

OZP and its Notes is at **Annex II** and the location of the amendment item is shown on **Plan H-1**.

- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, 629 valid representations<sup>2</sup> were received. On 30.1.2026, 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**

### *Items A – Rezoning of the Site at Fat Kwong Street for Residential Development*

- 2.1 The Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to meet housing and other development needs. To meet and expedite housing land supply, the Government has been carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis, including reviews on Government land (GL) currently vacant, under Short Term Tenancies (STTs) or different short-term or government uses, with a view to identifying more suitable sites for residential use. A site at Fat Kwong Street (the Site) (**Plan H-1**) has been identified having potential for private residential development. A feasibility study (FS) was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) to ascertain the technical feasibility of the proposed private residential development with social welfare facilities at the Site.
- 2.2 To facilitate the proposal, the Site has been rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(B)4” subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 19,300m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 160mPD as stipulated on the OZP. A non-building area (NBA) (**Plan H-2**) is incorporated at the existing slope near the eastern boundary of the Site to preserve existing trees and to facilitate wind penetration.

### *Amendments to the Notes of the OZP*

#### “R(B)” zone

- 2.3 In relation to Amendment Item A in paragraphs 2.1 and 2.2 above, the Notes and Remarks for “R(B)” of the OZP have been revised to incorporate development restrictions for the “R(B)4” sub-zone. Besides, ‘Social Welfare Facility (not elsewhere specified) (on land designated “R(B)4” only)’ is included in Column 1 use in the Notes for the “R(B)4” zone. Floor space constructed or intended solely as GIC facilities, as required by the Government, may be disregarded in determining the GFA for the “R(B)4” sub-zone.

#### “R(A)” zone

- 2.4 In Ho Man Tin area, some private sites zoned “R(A)” along Waterloo Road are

---

<sup>2</sup> 697 submissions were received, of which 22 were considered invalid as the identity information cannot be validated, and 46 involve multiple submissions made by the same representers.

composite commercial/ residential developments with plot ratios exceeding the OZP restrictions (i.e. beyond domestic/ total PR of 7.5/9). They are developed before the imposition of such PR/GFA restriction in OZP No. S/K7/5 in 1993<sup>3</sup>. As the extant Ho Man Tin OZP provides for redevelopment up to the PR/GFA of the existing building but is silent on interchangeability of domestic and non-domestic GFA upon redevelopment, this would result in new excessive residential or commercial developments and may overload the infrastructure. To curb the undesirable outcome, a remark in the Notes is incorporated to the effect that only redevelopment for the same type of building as the existing building would be allowed to claim PR/GFA of existing building. This measure aligns with the control of “R(A)” zones of other Kowloon OZPs.

### Technical Amendments

- 2.5 In accordance with the latest Master Schedule of Notes (MSN), the following technical amendments are incorporated in the Notes of the OZP:
- (a) as ‘Market’ use is subsumed under ‘Shops and Services’ use, to update the Notes for “C”, “R(A)”, “R(B)” and “G/IC” zones.
  - (b) to revise the Chinese translation of the user term ‘Research, Design and Development Centre’ from ‘研究所、設計及發展中心’ to ‘研究、設計及發展中心’ in the Notes for “G/IC” zone.

### *The Draft OZP*

- 2.6 On 24.10.2025, the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) agreed that the above amendments to the approved Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24 were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance for public inspection. The relevant MPC Paper No. 10/25 is available at the Board’s website<sup>4</sup> and an extract of the minutes of the MPC meeting is at **Annex IV**. The draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/25 was gazetted on 14.11.2025.

## **3. Local Consultation**

### *Prior to Submission of the Proposed Amendments to MPC for consideration on 24.10.2025*

- 3.1 The Planning Department (PlanD) and CEDD jointly consulted KCDC on 30.9.2025 on the proposed amendment to the OZP for the Site. Members of KCDC generally had no objection to the proposed amendment, while some suggested the inclusion of other GIC facilities such as child care centre at the Site. Some members expressed concerns about the traffic impact arising from the proposed residential development, tree preservation and nuisance during the construction period. Their views and comments have been incorporated into

---

<sup>3</sup> The first OZP covering the entire Ho Man Tin area (i.e. OZP No. S/K7/1) gazetted on 1.11.1985 had no PR/GFA restriction.

<sup>4</sup> The MPC Paper No. 10/25 is available at the Board’s website at: [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/775\\_mpc\\_agenda.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/meetings/MPC/Agenda/775_mpc_agenda.html).

MPC Paper No. 10/25 mentioned in paragraph 2.6 above and an extract of the minutes of the KCDC meeting is enclosed at **Annex V**.

*After Gazettal of the Draft OZP on 14.11.2025*

- 3.2 During the statutory exhibition period of the draft OZP (14.11.2025 to 14.1.2026), KCDC members were notified that members of the public could submit representations on the amendments in writing to the Secretary of the Board. Two representations were received from a KCDC member and a member's office (**R627 and R628**).
- 3.3 Following the invitation from some KCDC members, a briefing session to residents of Ultima was held on 12.12.2025 on the OZP amendment where the residents were also given relevant website links regarding further information for the OZP amendment and procedures in relation to public participation in plan making. During the session, residents expressed strong opposition to/concern on the proposed private residential development on Item A site mainly based on aspects including visual, air and microclimate, privacy and safety, and GIC provision listed under three main types of standard formats which are subsequently submitted to the Board as representations (**R3 to R607**).

#### **4. The Representation Site and its Surrounding Areas**

- 4.1 The representation site has the following characteristics:

*Item A site (Plans H-1 to H-5) (about 0.56ha)*

- 4.1.1 The Site comprises solely GL and is mainly located on a platform of a cut-slope in Ho Man Tin area (**Plans H-1 and H-2**). It was originally planned for a salt water service reservoir in 1980s but has subsequently been de-reserved by Water Supplies Department (WSD) since the reserved use is no longer required. The Site has been used as Highways Department (HyD)'s temporary works area for the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) since December 2017 (**Plans H-3, H-4a and H-4b**). Following the opening of CKR (Yau Mei Tei Section) on 21.12.2025, HyD is in the process of site clearance which would be completed by mid-2026. There is an existing service access connecting Ho Man Tin West Fresh Water Service Reservoir (FWSR) and Fat Kwong Street which runs close to the north-western boundary of the Site (**Plan H-2**).
- 4.1.2 The Ho Man Tin West FWSR to the north-west of the Site is to be co-used with a planned open space atop, which is currently occupied by a temporary baseball training ground. At the toe of the slope facing Fat Kwong Street is the Ho Man Tin Ventilation Building (HMTVB) for CKR (**Plan H-2**). The surrounding areas are predominantly residential in nature with Ultima zoned "R(B)" subject to a maximum PR of 5 and BHR of 130mPD and 150mPD (**Plan H-2**). Further across Fat Kwong Street to its east and Hau Man Street to its west are public housing

development of Kwun Fai Court, Ho Man Tin Estate and Oi Man Estate which are all zoned “R(A)” and subject to a maximum domestic/total plot ratio of 7.5/9 and BH restrictions ranging from 100mPD to 160mPD (**Plans H-1 and H-5**). Other GIC facilities within the vicinity include Housing Authority Headquarters, Hong Kong Metropolitan University, Ho Man Tin Sports Centre, and Ho Man Tin East Service Reservoir which are all within “G/IC” zones (**Plans H-1 and H-5**).

4.1.3 The Site is zoned “R(B)4” with a maximum GFA of 19,300m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BHR of 160mPD. The notional scheme of the proposed private residential development is shown in **Drawings H-1 and H-2** and the major development parameters are summarised as follows:

**Table 1: Proposed Development Parameters of the Notional Scheme**

<b>Major Development Parameters</b>	<b>Notional Scheme (Drawings H-1 and H-2)</b>
<b>Rezoning Area (about)</b>	0.56 ha
<b>Net Site Area<sup>(1)</sup> (NSA) (about)</b>	0.42 ha
<b>Maximum GFA</b>	19,300m <sup>2</sup> (for domestic only) (equivalent to domestic plot ratio of 4.6 on NSA)
<b>No. of Storeys</b>	24 domestic storeys atop 2-storey podium and 2-storeys basement carpark
<b>BHR</b>	Not more than 160mPD
<b>Average Flat Size</b>	75m <sup>2</sup>
<b>No. of Flats</b>	About 253
<b>Population</b>	About 658
<b>Other Facilities</b>	Proposed social welfare facilities <sup>(2)</sup>

*Remarks:*

- (1) Excluding the eastern portion of the “R(B)4” zone covering the existing public covered walkway as well as the NBA (**Plan H-2**).
- (2) Including a Neighbourhood Elderly Centre Sub-base (GFA: 237m<sup>2</sup>) and an Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness (GFA: 547m<sup>2</sup>). The location, type and actual provision of these facilities will be subject to detailed design and agreement with relevant Government departments. GIC facilities as required by the Government may be exempted from GFA calculation.

**4.2 Planning Intention**

The “R(B)4” zone under Item A is a sub-zone of “R(B)” which is intended primarily for medium-density residential developments where commercial uses serving the residential neighbourhood may be permitted on application to the Board.

## 5. The Representations

### 5.1 Subject of Representations

- 5.1.1 During the two-month exhibition period, 629 valid representations were received.
- 5.1.2 One representation submitted by an individual supports Item A (**R1**) while 627 representations oppose/providing adverse views on Item A. Those representers include a company (**R2**) and individuals (**R3 to R622, R624 to R626, R629**), a KCDC member and a member's office (**R627 and R628**). Among 627 representations opposing Item A, 605 representations (**R3 to R607**) were submitted in three main types of standard formats, including 186 representations (**R245 to R372, R503 to R517 and R565 to R607**) providing additional grounds/views on top of the standard formats. The remaining representation by an individual (**R623**) opposes Item A and items (c), (d) and (e) of amendments to the Notes of the Plan mentioned above.
- 5.1.3 The major grounds/views of the representations and PlanD's responses, in consultation with relevant Government bureaux/departments (B/Ds), are summarised in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.3 below.

### 5.2 Supportive Representation

#### *Item A*

<b>Major View</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
(1) Item A is supported as it contributes to increasing residential housing supply and land sales revenue.	<b>R1</b>
<b>Response</b>	
(a) The supportive view is noted.	

### 5.3 Opposing Representations/Adverse Views

#### *Item A*

#### 5.3.1 Site Selection and Housing Supply

<b>Major Ground / View</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
(1) The proposed residential development is not justified given the ample supply of private housing in the local area and at the territorial level and there is no urgency to further increase supply of private housing. The Site is also too small for high-rise residential development and its contribution to the overall increase of housing	<b>R245, R251, R349, R506, R579, R596, R610, R618, R622</b>

<p>supply or land sale revenue is minimal. The Site should not be used to develop nano flats.</p>	
<p>(2) Residential development should be prioritized on brownfield sites and idle land. The fringe of country park should also be considered for residential development. Other alternative sites in Ho Man Tin area, such as Fat Kwong Street Garden No. 1 and Fat Kwong Street Playground, Housing Authority Headquarters and parks at Sheung Lok Street (<b>Plan H-1</b>) could also be considered for residential use.</p>	<p><b>R2, R251, R503, R566 to R569, R571 to R575</b></p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>In response to (1) to (2):</p> <p>(a) Increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach to support housing and other development needs has been a key policy direction. The Government has been carrying out various land use reviews on an on-going basis, including reviews on brownfield sites, Government land currently vacant, under Short Term Tenancies (STTs) or different short-term government uses, with a view to identifying more suitable sites for conversion to residential use. The originally planned use for the Site as a salt water service reservoir has been de-reserved and the Site will soon be available after the completion of works for CKR. In the land use review of de-reserved and available sites, Bureaux/Departments (B/Ds) have no adverse comments on the Site being identified as a potential site for residential development subject to FS. Subsequently, CEDD completed a FS for the Site ascertaining its suitability for residential use.</p> <p>(b) The Government will continue to sustain its effort in rolling out land in a prudent and pragmatic manner. While different land supply options will not be ruled out, the Government will prioritize and flexibly adjust the land disposal strategy according to market situation to meet the development needs of society.</p> <p>(c) The suggested locations by the representers are occupied as existing public open spaces, recreational facilities or Government offices. There is no current plan to relocate these facilities and any change of use to these sites would inevitably affect users of these open space and government facilities. Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS) has strong reservation about converting these open spaces/recreational facilities into residential development as they are essential leisure areas for local residents to exercise and maintain their well-being. In addition, Fat Kwong Street Playground is also an important soccer pitch and handball court used for training by the Hong Kong team and local athletes. Moreover, the availability of other sites, if any, does not negate the suitability of the Site in question which has already been ascertained by the FS.</p> <p>(d) In recent years, the Government has imposed a minimum flat size</p>	

requirement of at least 26m<sup>2</sup> in saleable area for new private developments to enhance the liveability of Hong Kong as a compact high-density city and respond to public aspirations for larger living space. The average flat size of the notional scheme is assumed to be 75m<sup>2</sup>, which has made reference to the flat type in the locality.

### 5.3.2 Land Use Compatibility and Development Intensity

<b>Major Ground / View</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<p>(1) The proposed development deviates from the original planning intention of the site for low-rise GIC development. The site and the adjacent community sports compound form a complete belt of public / community facilities and space for local residents.</p> <p>(2) The proposed development is incompatible with surrounding open spaces and low-rise GIC developments which would lead to adverse impact on the local character. The proposed development is not an optimum use and balanced development of land. TPB has to act lawfully and reasonably to duly consider the broader strategic planning intentions and the planning need for the area in reviewing the land use for the site.</p>	<p><b>R3 to R607, R611, R612, R613, R616, R618, R624 to R626</b></p>
<p>(3) Comprehensive planning review should be conducted to determine the best possible use of the Site before rezoning of Site for residential development bringing irreversible adverse impacts to the neighbourhood. The development proposal fails to balance societal needs and the impact to local residents.</p>	<p><b>R251, R260, R503, R506, R565, R579, R596, R614, R615, R624</b></p>
<p>(4) The proposed development is not in line with Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) Chapter 11 in relation to development density and BHR. The density of the proposed residential development should be substantially reduced.</p>	<p><b>R265, R611, R612, R624</b></p>
<p>(5) There is a strong possibility that the BHR of the Site will be further increased beyond 160mPD to accommodate above ground car parking spaces.</p>	<p><b>R625</b></p>

<p>(6) Local residents bought the property at Ultima with the expectation that the adjacent site (i.e. Item A site) would be retained as low-rise and open development. The proposed development would result in a planning blight, and deviates from the legitimate expectation of property buyers. Property buyers should be compensated from the potential decrease in property value in relation to the proposed development.</p>	<p><b>R264, R299, R316, R318, R371, R372, R503, R504, R565, R587, R596, R611, R612, R618, R625</b></p>
---	--

**Responses**

In response to (1) to (5):

- (a) The Site is located in an area dominated by medium to high density residential developments intermixed with GIC facilities and has been currently used as a temporary works area for the CKR. Over the years, there are residential developments in the locality including redevelopment of Ho Man Tin Estate and Valley Road Estate, the latter of which has been developed into Ultima as well as topside residential developments of Ho Man Tin Station (i.e. In One and Onmantin). Ultima is zoned “R(B)” subject to a maximum plot ratio of 5 with BHRs of 130mPD and 150mPD.
- (b) The permissible development of 19,300m<sup>2</sup> (equivalent to domestic plot ratio of 4.6 on NSA) has taken into account the setting of the neighbourhood, the prevailing plot ratio of the surrounding area, the site constraints as well as the requirement to accommodate GIC facilities and NBA. It is of similar scale as and compatible with its neighbouring residential developments including Ultima. The proposed development would blend in with the residential clusters forming a development extension in the area. The maximum BHR of 160mPD has taken into account the surrounding building height profile and the higher formation level of the Site, which descends towards Chung Hau Street to the north and south and Oi Man Estate to the west (**Plan H-5**). The proposed BHR of 160mPD has already taken into account design flexibility to allow provision of above ground car parking spaces.
- (c) The recommendation of the Site for residential use in the land use review as mentioned in the responses in paragraph 5.3.1 has taken into account the land use of the surrounding areas. In the subsequent FS, the notional scheme was formulated for the purpose of conducting technical assessments on traffic, noise and air ventilation aspects, etc. There would be flexibility for the future developer to adjust the layout and design of the buildings within the Site at the building plan submission stage.

In response to (6):

- (d) Property value is not a relevant planning consideration and it falls outside the ambit of the Board. Changes to the land uses on the OZP, supported by feasibility assessments, are to meet societal needs. Both PlanD and CEDD

followed established procedures to conduct local consultation for this proposed rezoning as stated in paragraph 3. Under the Ordinance, members of the public could submit representations on the amendments to the Board during the statutory exhibition period of the draft OZP. All representations would be thoroughly considered by the Board under the provisions of the Ordinance.

5.3.3 Visual, Landscape and Air Ventilation Aspects

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<i>Visual Impact</i>	
(1) The proposed development is too close to the residential towers of Ultima which leads to adverse visual impact including blocking of views, obstruction of natural lighting resulting in sense of confinement for local residents. Access to natural lighting is essential to well-being and health of the residents especially elderly and children. The proposed development will lead to adverse impact on the skyline of the local area which would affect visual comfort from public perspective.	<b>R3 to R609, R611 to R616, R618, R620, R624 to R629</b>
(2) The proposed development may also lead to light pollution due to reflection of sunlight by the façade of the new development. Sensitive design should be applied to the layout and design of the building block(s) to minimize permanent blockage and shadows.	<b>R314, R620, R624</b>
<i>Landscape Impact</i>	
(3) The proposed development will lead to loss of existing trees and green spaces within the Site and the associated change in microclimate may also lead to adverse impact on other vegetation in the area. The Site should be kept as green spaces/green belt.	<b>R3 to R609, R613 to R618, R624 to R627</b>
(4) The proposed number for tree compensation should not exclude the eight existing trees of undesirable species.	<b>R625</b>
(5) The greening ratio at the local district is less than the recommendation as specified under HKPSG.	<b>R614, R615</b>
<i>Air Ventilation Impact</i>	
(6) Adverse air ventilation impact, wall effect and heat island effect arising from the proposed development will affect the microclimate of the	<b>R3 to R609, R613 to R616, R618, R620, R624 to R628</b>

area. Additional microclimate study using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) is required to assess wind reduction rate, heat island effect and other environmental issues.

**Responses**

In response to (1) and (2):

- (a) The proposed development at the Site and the Ultima will be separated by the existing public walkway (with width of about 4m to 5m) and the NBA demarcated on the OZP (with width of about 5m to 14m) (**Plan H-2**) covering the existing slope near the eastern boundary of the Site. According to the notional scheme, there is also a proposed Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) within the Site with width of about 7.3m (**Drawing H-1**).
- (b) According to the Preliminary Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) of the FS, although the proposed residential block situated on a high platform would inevitably result in a minor to partial obstruction to the sky view as viewed from short-distance open-air viewing points, the massing and height of the proposed development are not incompatible with the surrounding context and the overall visual impact of the proposed development would range from “negligible” to “moderately adverse” for the six identified public viewing points (**Drawings H-3a to H-3f**). CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed development from urban design and visual perspectives.
- (c) The objective of the FS is to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the notional scheme representing a worst-case scenario. Indeed, the proposed development is subject to detailed design and there would be flexibility for the future developer to adjust the layout and design of the building which should comply with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines (SBDG) under Practice Notes for Authorized Persons, Registered Structural Engineers and Registered Geotechnical Engineers (PNAP) APP-152 in addition to the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).
- (d) The lighting provision at the habitable rooms of residential development is self-sustained under the B(P)R and the layout of the proposed development at the Site would be subject to detailed design and should fulfil the requirements as stated in relevant Ordinances.
- (e) As mentioned in TPB Guidelines TPB PG-No. 41A, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations in the highly developed context of Hong Kong. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists.

In response to (3) to (5):

- (f) The Site is currently used as a temporary works area which is mainly occupied by construction site offices and open storage. Existing trees within the Site are mainly confined to the periphery of the Site. According to the FS, there is no Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) at the Site. 22 trees within the Site (mostly located within NBA (**Plan H-4c**)) are to be preserved while the other 31 trees are recommended to be removed due to conflict with the proposed development. As illustrated in the conceptual landscape plan of the notional scheme (**Drawing H-4**), a total of 50 new trees (which is more than the required amount of 23 compensatory trees<sup>5</sup>) of various species are recommended to be planted within the Site which could improve the overall landscape environment of the area.
- (g) In accordance with HKPSG, requirements of site coverage of greenery will be imposed on all new private developments where practicable. Greenery coverage under the SBDG and other relevant requirements on landscape provision and compensatory planting will be imposed on the Site through administrative means or contractual means. Regarding the proposal to change to the Site to green belt (without development) for more greenery, it should be clarified that the Site (except the NBA) is not green as it is a works area for CKR.

In response to (6):

- (h) The Preliminary Air Ventilation Assessment in the form of Expert Evaluation (AVA-EE) of the FS for the Site has identified that the annual prevailing winds of the Site consist of east-northeasterly, easterly and east-southeasterly winds whilst the summer prevailing winds consist of easterly, south-southwesterly and southwesterly winds (**Drawings H-5a to 5c**). Regarding the 'wall effect' and 'heat island effect', the AVE-EE concludes that the design measures including NBA and building setbacks as incorporated in the notional scheme (**Drawing H-1**) would help facilitate wind penetration and no significant adverse air ventilation impact to the surrounding pedestrian wind environment is anticipated. Furthermore, future development is required to follow relevant requirements as stated in the SBDG.
- (i) Both EE and CFD assessments are acceptable tools for conducting an AVA under the Joint HPLB-ETWB Technical Circular on AVA No. 1/06 (the TC). The current AVA-EE was undertaken based on the TC. The AVA-EE indicates that, with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures including at least 25m-wide building setback from the northern site boundary, at least 5m-wide building setback from the north-western site boundary and an NBA at the existing slope near the eastern site boundary (**Drawing H-1**), wind could be penetrated through the proposed development. In view of the above, no significant adverse impact on the pedestrian wind environment around the Site is anticipated.
- (j) CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the proposed development

---

<sup>5</sup> Out of the 31 trees to be felled, only 23 are to be compensated because eight trees (*Leucaena leucocephala*) are undesirable species that no compensation is required.

from air ventilation perspective.
-----------------------------------

5.3.4 Environmental Aspect

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<i>Air Quality and Noise Impact</i>	
(1) The Site is not suitable for residential development given its proximity to HMTVB of CKR. The proposed development may lead to adverse environmental impact to the area. In particular, the new high-rise tower may affect air ventilation and worsen the performance of the exhaust air dispersal from the HMTVB. The cumulative impact of air pollution, noise pollution and the problem of rodent infestation would adversely affect the well-being and health of local residents.	<b>R3 to R609, R613 to R615, R617, R618, R624, R625, R626</b>
(2) The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for CKR recommended separation between ventilation building and residential development. As the proposed development is situated between the ventilation building and Ultima, further assessment should be conducted to ascertain no adverse air quality impact arising from the proposed development.	<b>R579, R592, R617</b>
(3) The proposed development will bring additional pedestrian flow to the existing public walkway next to Ultima ( <b>Plans H-2 and H-4c</b> ) which would lead to additional noise pollution.	<b>R327, R619</b>
(4) The construction works will lead to adverse noise and air ventilation impacts to the local residents and users of the surrounding GIC and recreational facilities.	<b>R253, R258, R265, R295, R317, R319, R321, R367, R596, R597, R628</b>
<i>Local Ecology and Biodiversity</i>	
(5) The proposed development will affect the habitat of local species or small animals in the local area.	<b>R247, R248, R576, R577, R627</b>
<b>Responses</b>	
In response to (1) to (4):	
(a) According to the Preliminary Environmental Review (PER) under the FS, no insurmountable environmental issues are anticipated from the proposed development. A quantitative assessment has been conducted in the PER to evaluate the cumulative air quality impact on the identified Air Sensitive	

Receivers (ASRs) within the Site from nearby emission sources including the vehicular emissions and the emissions from HMTVB using the most updated and best available information. The assessment concludes that all the identified ASRs would comply with the prevailing Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) under the Air Pollution Control Ordinance, and no adverse air quality impact is anticipated. It is noted that the residential towers of Ultima are located even more further away from HMTVB than the Site, adverse air quality impact on Ultima is not anticipated.

- (b) Regarding the existing public covered walkway next to Ultima (**Plans H-2 and H-4c**), pedestrian flow at public place in general should not cause annoyance. If rowdy behaviour at public place is involved, the nuisance is controlled under the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO) and relevant authorities can take action deemed appropriate.
- (c) The potential noise and air quality impacts during construction period have been assessed in the PER. For construction noise impact, it is concluded that with proper mitigation measures such as adoption of quieter construction method, Quality Powered Mechanical Equipment (QPME), temporary noise barriers and other best practices as per relevant guidelines and practice notes, no adverse noise impact is anticipated. In addition, the construction works is subject to control under relevant pollution control ordinance including the Air Pollution Control Ordinance and NCO. EPD will take appropriate enforcement action if relevant ordinances are violated. As for air quality impact, proper air quality control measures in accordance with the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulation, Air Pollution Control (Non-road Mobile Machinery) (Emission) Regulation and Air Pollution Control (Fuel Restriction) Regulations would be implemented. Therefore, adverse air quality impact is not anticipated.
- (d) The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) has no adverse comment on the zoning amendment from environmental perspective.
- (e) Regarding the concern on rodent infestation, relevant B/Ds have been carrying out rodent prevention and control work in Ho Man Tin area and have been working with private sectors in a collaborative effort. Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene (DFEH) has no adverse comment on the zoning amendment from environmental hygiene perspective.

In response to (5):

- (f) The Site is currently used as HyD's works area for CKR and surrounded by developments. The ecological value and biodiversity within and near the Site are low as per the PER. Hence, the proposed housing development is unlikely to induce significant ecological and biodiversity impacts within and near the Site. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) has no adverse comment on the OZP amendment.

5.3.5 Traffic Aspect

Major Ground(s) / View(s)	Representation No.
(1) The additional vehicular traffic may lead to adverse traffic impact onto the local road network.	<b>R300, R369, R511, R566, R568, R618, R624, R627</b>
(2) The additional population from proposed development will induce pressure on local public transportation network giving rise to concern related to over-crowdedness including long waiting time for lifts and safety issues for women. In fact, the lift(s) of exit A3 of the Ho Man Tin MTR Station ( <b>Plan H-6</b> ) are already jammed in the peak hours.	<b>R2 to R609, R613, R616, R618 to R621, R624 to R627</b>
(3) Traffic associated with the construction of the proposed development may lead to adverse traffic impact and jeopardize pedestrian safety.	<b>R317, R321</b>
<p>In response to (1) to (2):</p> <p>(a) A preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) has been conducted under the FS to assess the traffic and transport impacts of the notional scheme with a new vehicular access to the Site and modification works at the junction of Fat Kwong Street and Sheung Lok Street junction (<b>Drawing H-1</b>). The TTIA concludes that no adverse impact will be brought to the surrounding road junctions including junctions along Fat Kwong Street and all assessed pedestrian facilities (including footpaths and footbridge etc.) would operate satisfactorily at the design year of 2034. Commissioner for Transport (C for T), Chief Highway Engineer/ Kowloon (CHE/K) of HyD and Commissioner of Police (C of P) have no adverse comment on the OZP amendment.</p> <p>(b) There are three lifts at exit A3 of Ho Man Tin MTR Station mainly serving residents of Ho Man Tin Estate, Oi Man Estate, developments at Chung Hau Street and Ultima. It is observed that during peak hours, MTRC has adopted management measures including signages, floor markers and deployment of station staff to help dispersal of passengers. Passengers are also encouraged to use other available exits such as exit A2 at Fat Kwong Street (<b>Plan H-6</b>) during peak hours.</p> <p>In response to (3):</p> <p>(c) Due to the relatively small scale of the proposed development, only a small number of construction trucks is expected to be deployed on-site. Moreover, the location of the construction vehicular access from Fat Kwong Street would be similar to the traffic arrangement as indicated in the notional scheme (<b>Drawing H-1</b>) and the TTIA concludes that no adverse traffic impact will be brought to the surrounding road junctions by the</p>	

<p>proposed development. C for T has no adverse comment on the above arrangement.</p>
---

### 5.3.6 Water Supplies Aspect

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<p>(1) The proposed development in particular the construction works may impact the operation of Ho Man Tin West FWSR.</p> <p>(2) Diversion of existing watermains associated to the proposed development may cause disruption to the community.</p>	<p><b>R579, R624, R625</b></p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p> <p>In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>(a) All construction works at the Site will be subject to relevant regulations and guidelines as specified by WSD including the compliance of “Conditions of Working in the Vicinity of Waterworks Installations”. Such requirements will be made through administrative provisions and measures as appropriate at land disposal stage and will be closely monitored throughout the development process.</p> <p>(b) The existing watermains falls outside the Site, and the proposed diversion of water mains in the FS will be subject to further study at the detailed design stage such that the service of Ho Man Tin West FWSR to the community will not be compromised.</p>	

### 5.3.7 Other Technical Aspects

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<p><i>Safety Aspects</i></p>	
<p>(1) The lack of building separation between the proposed development and Ultima will jeopardize safety of the residents on various aspects including:</p> <p>(a) possible creation of stack/chimney effect that accelerates spreading of fire and communicable disease;</p> <p>(b) higher fire risk of the Site due to its high formation level. This in turn would affect the safety of Ultima as a close neighbour;</p> <p>(c) privacy of Ultima residents will be threatened leading to criminal activities such as burglary</p>	<p><b>R3 to R609, R613, R616 to R618, R624, R628</b></p>

<p>and peeping; and</p> <p>(d) possible creation of wind tunnel effect bringing safety risk to the residential towers of Ultima during typhoon situation as large windows are common in the facades of the residential unit.</p>	
<p>(2) The proposed residential development may cause ground settlement, affecting the development of Ultima. The construction works of the topside development of Ho Man Tin MTR station caused cracks on the floor and walls of building blocks of Ultima.</p>	<p><b>R323, R371 to R607, R618, R624</b></p>
<p>(3) The construction works including foundation works associated with the proposed development may impose safety risk to the operation of CKR.</p>	<p><b>R503</b></p>
<p><i>Other Considerations</i></p>	
<p>(4) Impact assessment on cultural landscape (i.e. low-density character of the local area) and heritage aspects should be conducted.</p>	<p><b>R251, R624</b></p>
<p>(5) The proposed development will deviate from objectives of sustainable development in relation to environmental protection, equality, justice and sustainable future.</p>	<p><b>R251, R265, R576, R579, R614, R615, R624</b></p>
<p>(6) Local residents have already been affected by construction activities in relation to CKR which are still ongoing. The cumulative impact of the construction activities from both CKR and the proposed development would adversely impact the quality of life of residents. The Government may consider spreading out the program of construction activities to minimize environmental impact.</p>	<p><b>R628</b></p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>In response to (1) to (3):</p> <p>(a) Regarding the concern on fire safety and public health due to building separation, as mentioned in response (a) in paragraph 5.3.3, the proposed development at the Site and the Ultima will be separated by the existing covered public walkway and the NBA demarcated on the OZP (<b>Plan H-2</b>). Furthermore the notional scheme draws up a 7.3m-wide EVA within the Site (<b>Drawing H-1</b>). The layout of the proposed development including the EVA will be subject to detailed design and should comply with the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and other relevant regulations. Detailed fire</p>	

safety requirements of the proposed development will be scrutinized at the building plan submission stage. Relevant B/Ds including Fire Services Department and Department of Health have no adverse comment on the OZP amendment.

- (b) Regarding privacy and public safety, overlooking among adjacent developments is not fully avoidable in the context of highly developed urban areas in Hong Kong. Life, property and public order is safeguarded by laws and regulations, and the Hong Kong Police Force would collaborate with the community to ensure public safety.
- (c) Regarding building and infrastructure safety, in general, the design and construction of new buildings are subject to the control of BO, related legislations and other code of practice. The Geotechnical Assessment under the FS concludes the proposed development is geotechnically feasible. The future developer is required to follow the control requirements for ground settlement and submit relevant assessment report(s) to the Building Authority for approval. Chief Building Surveyor/Kowloon (CBS/K), Buildings Department (BD), Head of Geotechnical Office (H(GEO)) of CEDD and Chief Engineer/Major Works, HyD have no adverse comment on the OZP amendment.

In response to (4):

- (d) As mentioned in the responses (a) and (b) in paragraph 5.3.2, the Site is located in an area dominated by medium to high density residential development intermixed with GIC facilities and the proposed development is considered compatible with the surroundings. According to the FS, there are no declared monuments, graded historic buildings and sites of archaeological interest identified in the vicinity or within the Site. Thus, heritage impact assessment is not required. The Antiquities and Monuments Office has no objection to the proposed OZP amendment.

In response to (5):

- (e) Increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach has been a key policy direction and the Government will continue to sustain its effort in rolling out land in a prudent and pragmatic manner to meet the housing and development needs of society. The response (a) in paragraph 5.3.1 and responses (a) and (b) in paragraph 5.3.2 in relation to land supply and planning aspects are relevant.
- (f) The FS for the Site has concluded that the proposed residential development is technically feasible with no insurmountable problems. Moreover, new developments are governed by extant regulations and standards such as SBDG which includes requirement on green building design and greenery coverage. These requirements will be subject to the scrutiny by the BD at the building plan submission stage.

In response to (6):

- (g) As advised by HyD, construction works within the Ho Man Tin area in relation to CKR have been substantially completed. The construction works in relation the proposed development is subject to approval from relevant B/Ds at the detailed design stage following the approval of the OZP and disposal of the Site.
- (h) The construction of CKR and the proposed development will not overlap, hence there will be no cumulative environmental impacts from these two developments. Regarding the concern on the environmental impact from the construction activities of the proposed development at the Site, the response (c) in paragraph 5.3.4 is relevant.

### 5.3.8 Provision of GIC and Commercial Facilities

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
<p>(1) There is insufficient GIC provision including social welfare, education, recreation, medical facilities, wet market and community hall in the Ho Man Tin area and the provision of these facilities has not been increased with the increase in population of the Ho Man Tin Area over the years. The additional population from the proposed development will further intensify the problem of shortage for such facilities.</p> <p>(2) The Site should be used for providing additional low-rise GIC, recreational facilities, carpark and/or open spaces to serve local needs.</p> <p>(3) At least 30% of the Site should be used as open/green space for public enjoyment.</p>	<p><b>R3 to R609, R613 to R618, R621, R623 to R628</b></p>
<p>(4) GIC and open space provision should be assessed based on OZP boundary instead of District Council boundary.</p>	<p><b>R625</b></p>
<p>(5) The proposed development will lead to loss of baseball practice field in the area.</p>	<p><b>R594</b></p>
<p>(6) There is general shortage of commercial facilities provision in the Ho Man Tin area including restaurants and shop and services and development of such facilities (e.g. shopping centres/ low-rise commercial facilities) should be prioritized over additional residential developments.</p>	<p><b>R287 to R289, R300, R322 to R326, R348, R350 to R352, R371 to R609, R618, R623, R627, R628</b></p>

<p>(7) The proposed residential development together with the Campus Expansion at Ho Man Tin Slope for Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) will induce cumulative adverse impact to the local residents in respect of provision of facilities and services.</p>	<p><b>R518 to R607</b></p>
<p><b>Responses</b></p>	
<p>In response to (1) to (4):</p>	
<p>(a) As shown in the table of Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in the KCDC Area (<b>Annex VI</b>), the existing and planned provision 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 social welfare facilities are long-term goals, and the actual provision would be subject to consideration of the Social Welfare Department (SWD) in the planning and development process as appropriate. The planned eight-storey Ho Man Tin Government Complex at Sheung Foo Street near Ho Man Tin Estate will provide additional community, social welfare and healthcare facilities to serve the public. Opportunity has also been taken to provide appropriate social welfare facilities within the proposed development in the Site (<b>Table 1</b>). The exact provision is subject to detailed design and agreement with relevant Government departments.</p> <p>(b) The provision of car parking facilities for the proposed development would comply with the requirements of the HKPSG. Other public car parking spaces are also available in the vicinity of the Site, such as the public car park at Ho Man Tin Park. C of T has no objection to the proposed development and has not indicated the requirement to provide additional public carparking space on the Site.</p> <p>(c) The GIC and open space provisions are generally summarized based on DC boundary. In assessing the provision for GIC services/facilities, relevant B/Ds may adopt a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision for GIC services/facilities as appropriate and the provision will be carefully planned/reviewed by relevant B/Ds taking into account different considerations including locational factors and design requirement for individual facilities.</p>	
<p>In response to (5):</p>	
<p>(d) The existing baseball training ground atop Ho Man Tin West FWSR (<b>Plans H-2 and H-3</b>) is outside the boundary of the Site and the operation of the baseball field will not be affected by the proposed development.</p>	
<p>In response to (6):</p>	
<p>(e) The local shopping centres, namely Oi Man Plaza and Ho Man Tin Plaza,</p>	

are located within 400m walking distance from the Site (**Plan H-1**) providing various commercial services, shops and restaurants to the residents nearby.

In response to (7):

- (f) The technical assessments of the FS for the Site have already taken into account all planned and committed developments within the study area including the PolyU campus expansion which is currently under construction. The PolyU campus expansion is self-contained in that it will provide academic and hostel facilities to serve the needs of staff and students of the campus and will be well connected to PolyU's existing main campus.

### 5.3.9 Local Consultation

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
(1) There is insufficient public consultation and public participation during the planning process and there is a lack of transparency in decision making. Affected residents and stakeholders should be duly informed and consulted before OZP amendment.	<b>R503, R565 to R569, R571 to R575, R624</b>
<b>Responses</b>	
<p>In response to (1):</p> <p>(a) Prior to the submission of zoning amendments to the Board for consideration on 24.10.2025, PlanD and CEDD jointly consulted KCDC on 30.9.2025 (<b>Annex V</b>). KCDC members' views were reflected in the MPC Paper No. 10/25 for MPC's consideration.</p> <p>(b) The draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection on 14.11.2025 under the Ordinance. In addition, PlanD and CEDD joined a briefing session to the residents of Ultima on 12.12.2025. The residents were informed of the website links to the OZP amendments and procedures for public participation including submission of representations to the Board during the statutory exhibition period of the draft OZP. The exhibition of the draft OZP for public inspection and the provision for submitting representations are integral parts of the statutory consultation process as specified under the Ordinance. The representers are also invited to attend the hearing in March 2026 to present their grounds and proposals directly to the TPB members in accordance with the Ordinance.</p>	

### *Technical Amendments*

#### 5.3.10 Items (c), (d) and (e) of amendments to the Notes of the Plan

<b>Major Ground(s) / View(s)</b>	<b>Representation No.</b>
(1) The deletion of ‘Market’ use from “C” and “R(B)” zones and revision of “Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 2 of the Notes for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “G/IC” zones would further constrain the provision of wet markets and essential livelihood facilities needed to meet residents’ daily needs.	<b>R623</b>
<b>Responses</b>	
(a) These technical amendments are made to reflect the latest MSN and revised Definition of Terms used in Statutory Plan, in which ‘Market’ use is subsumed under ‘Shops and Services’ use to provide flexibility for provision of such facility in relevant land use zones.	

## **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) Secretary for Education
  - (c) Secretary for Health
  - (d) ES (A&M), AMO, DEVB
  - (e) Project Manager (East), CEDD;
  - (f) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
  - (g) DEP;
  - (h) Director of Fire Services;
  - (i) D of Housing;
  - (j) Director of Health;
  - (k) DLCS;
  - (l) Director of Social Welfare;
  - (m) C for T;
  - (n) C of P;
  - (o) District Lands Officer/Kowloon West, Lands Department (LandsD);
  - (p) Chief Estate Surveyor/Land Supply, LandsD;
  - (q) District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department;
  - (r) Chief Architect/3, Architectural Services Department
  - (s) CBS/K, BD;
  - (t) DFEH;
  - (u) DAFC;
  - (v) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, HyD;
  - (w) Chief Engineer/Major Works, HyD;
  - (x) Chief Engineer/Railway Development 1-1, Railway Development Office, HyD;
  - (y) Chief Engineer/Construction of WSD;
  - (z) Chief Engineer/Kowloon of WSD;
  - (aa) Chief Engineer/Mainland South of DSD;

- (bb) CTP/UD&L, PlanD; and
- (cc) H(GEO) of CEDD.

## 7. Planning Department's Views

- 7.1 The supportive view of **R1** is noted.
- 7.2 Based on the assessments in paragraph 5 above, PlanD does not support the representations of **R2 to R629** and considers that the draft OZP 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 is located in an area dominated by medium to high density residential development intermixed with GIC facilities. The proposed residential use represents the optimization of usage of vacant GL not required by relevant government B/Ds and contributes to the supply of flats in the urban area. The proposed development is of similar scale as 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 FS confirmed that, with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures, there is 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 in 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 are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in C Area in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG 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 government 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**); and
- (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), (d) and (e) of amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (e) the amendment in relation to ‘Market’ use is technical in nature to align with the latest MSN where ‘Market’ use is subsumed under ‘Shops and Services’ use (**R623**).

**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 ES<sup>6</sup>, are suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**9. Attachments**

<b>Annex I</b>	Draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/25
<b>Annex II</b>	Schedule of Amendments to the Approved Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24
<b>Annex III</b>	List of Representers
<b>Annex IV</b>	Extract of Minutes of the MPC Meeting held on 24.10.2025
<b>Annex V</b>	Extract of Minutes of the KCDC Meeting held on 30.9.2025
<b>Annex VI</b>	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in the KCDC Area
<b>Drawing H-1</b>	Indicative Layout Plan (Item A)
<b>Drawing H-2</b>	Indicative Section Plan (Item A)
<b>Drawings H-3a to 3f</b>	Photomontages (Item A)
<b>Drawing H-4</b>	Conceptual Landscape Plan (Item A)
<b>Drawings H-5a to 5c</b>	Major Air Paths (Item A)
<b>Plan H-1</b>	Location Plan
<b>Plan H-2</b>	Site Plan
<b>Plan H-3</b>	Aerial Photo
<b>Plans H-4a to H-4c</b>	Site Photos
<b>Plan H-5</b>	Building Height Plan showing the Surrounding Developments of the Site
<b>Plan H-6</b>	Locations of the Exits of Ho Man Tin MTR Station

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT  
MARCH 2026**

---

<sup>6</sup> The Notes and ES are available at the Board’s website at [https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan\\_making/S\\_K7\\_25.html](https://www.tpb.gov.hk/en/plan_making/S_K7_25.html).