

~~[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu rejoined the meeting at this point.]~~

Kowloon District

[Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K), Messrs Patrick W.Y. Wong and Ernest C.M. Fung, Senior Town Planners/Kowloon (STPs/K), and Messrs Jaime H.M. Chan and Charles K.K. Lee, Town Planners/Kowloon (TPs/K), were invited to the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K7/24
(MPC Paper No. 10/25)

29. The Secretary reported that proposed amendments to the Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) mainly involved rezoning of a site at Fat Kwong Street (the Site) for a proposed residential development (Amendment Item A). Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had declared an interest on this item for owning properties in Ho Man Tin. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

30. Other than the Planning Department (PlanD)'s representatives as listed out before paragraph 20 above, the following government representatives and consultant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Jason K.C Wong - Senior Engineer
Mr Ray L.W. Lau - Senior Architect

Consultant

AtkinsRealis Asia Limited

Mr Louis N.K. Lau

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation, Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the proposed amendments to the OZP, technical considerations, consultation conducted and departmental comments as detailed in the Paper. The proposed amendments mainly involved rezoning of the Site in Ho Man Tin from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Residential (Group B) 4” (“R(B)4”) for private residential development (Amendment Item A), subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 19,300m² and a maximum building height (BH) of 160mPD, with provision of social welfare facilities.

32. There were also amendments to the Notes of the OZP consequential to the amendments to the OZP. Other proposed amendments included revisions to the Notes for the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone to align with the control of “R(A)” zones of other Kowloon OZPs and technical amendments in accordance with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.

33. As the presentation of PlanD’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

34. In response to a Member’s enquiry about the possibility of developing the Site as a student hostel after rezoning, the Chairperson said that the Site would be rezoned to “R(B)4”, under which ‘Residential Institution’, which included student hostels, was an always permitted use under Column 1 of the Notes. That said, the proposed amendments to the OZP was intended to rezone the Site for private residential development through land sale, with the aim of increasing housing supply.

35. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that only about 800m² GFA had been reserved for social welfare

facilities, whether the proposed provision was sufficient to meet the community needs;

- (b) whether the floor area of the Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base could be increased if required by the Government, and if such additional space would be exempted from GFA calculation; and
- (c) the future arrangement of the Emergency Vehicular Access (EVA) and pick-up/drop-off facilities for the proposed social welfare facilities.

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

- (a) about 5% of the domestic GFA in the proposed private residential development would be reserved for social welfare facilities with reference to the latest standard for new public housing development. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) considered that the types and scales of the proposed social welfare facilities, i.e. the Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base and an Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness Sub-base, were appropriate and would help alleviate the shortfalls in the district. It should also be noted that the planned 8-storey Ho Man Tin Government Complex at Sheung Foo street near Ho Man Tin Estate, currently in the detailed design stage, would provide additional social welfare facilities to meet the future needs of the local community;
- (b) there were three District Elderly Community Centres and nine Neighbourhood Elderly Centres currently in operation in Kowloon City District. The proposed Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base at the Site was intended to supplement the Neighbourhood Elderly Centre serving Ho Man Tin Estate, which was undersized and experiencing acute service demand. Nevertheless, the location, type and actual provision of social welfare facilities would be examined by SWD during the planning and development process. The proposed BH restriction already incorporated design flexibility, enabling any necessary adjustments

to social welfare facilities, and provision of Government, institution or community facilities as required by the Government would be disregarded from GFA calculation under the Notes of the proposed “R(B)4” zone; and

- (c) SWD had indicated that no extra pick-up/drop-off area was needed for either the proposed Neighbourhood Elderly Community Centre Sub-base or Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness Sub-base. A covered turn space of EVA was allowed on the ground floor under the podium footprint in the notional scheme.

37. Members generally supported the proposed amendments to the OZP. The Chairperson remarked that should the Committee agree with the proposed amendments, the draft OZP would be gazetted for public inspection for 2 months and the representations received, if any, would be submitted to the Town Planning Board for consideration.

38. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- “(a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Ho Man Tin Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K7/24 and that the draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K7/25 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III of the Paper are suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment IV of the Paper for the draft Ho Man Tin OZP No. S/K7/24A (to be renumbered to S/K7/25 upon exhibition) as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Town Planning Board (the Board) for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES will be published together with the OZP.”

39. Members noted that as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Ordinance. Any major revisions would be

submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairperson thanked the government representatives and the consultant for attending the meeting. Mr Patrick W.Y. Wong, Mr Jaime H.M. Chan, CEDD's representatives and the consultant left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K7/123 Proposed Shop and Services (Convenience Store) in "Residential (Group B)" Zone, G/F (Part), 128 Waterloo Road, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. A/K7/123A)

40. The Secretary reported that the application premises (the Premises) were located in Ho Man Tin and the application was submitted by Great Prosper Development Limited (GPDL). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Mr Stanley T.S. Choi | - | owning properties in Ho Man Tin which were in close proximity to the application premises; and |
| Mr Derrick S.M. Yip | - | being a personal friend of the directors of GPDL. |

41. The Committee noted that Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

42. With the aid of some plans, Mr Charles K.K. Lee, TP/K, briefed Members on the background of the application, the proposed use, departmental comments, and the planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the Paper. The Planning Department (PlanD) had no objection to the application.
