

DRAFT URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY
KAU PUI LUNG ROAD/CHI KIANG STREET DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN
NO. S/K10/URA2/1
CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS NO. TPB/R/S/K10/URA2/1-1 TO 62
AND COMMENTS NO. TPB/R/S/K10/URA2/1-C1 TO C11

Subject of Representations/ Representation Site	Representers	Commenters
Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kau Pui Lung Road / Chi Kiang Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K10/URA2/1	<p style="text-align: center;">Total: 62</p> <p><u>Support (37)</u> R1 to R36, R38: Individuals</p> <p><u>Partly Support and Partly Oppose (1)</u> R37: Individual</p> <p><u>Oppose (23)</u> R39 to R61: Individuals</p> <p><u>Provide Views (1)</u> R62: MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Total: 11</p> <p><u>Provide Responses to R1 to R62(1)</u> C1: Urban Renewal Authority (URA)</p> <p><u>Support (6)</u></p> <p>C2: Individual (Supports R4, R7 and R11)</p> <p>C3 (also R5): Individual (Supports R7 and R8)</p> <p>C4: Individual (Supports R5, R33 and R35)</p> <p>C5: Individual (Supports R5, R7 and R16)</p> <p>C6: Individual (Supports R20, 27 and R29)</p> <p>C7: Individual (Supports R19 and R20)</p> <p><u>Oppose or/and Provide Views (2)</u></p> <p>C8 : Individual (Opposes and Provides Views on R1)</p> <p>C9 (also R61): Individual (Opposes)</p> <p><u>Provide Views (2)</u> C10 and C11: Individuals</p>

Note: The names of all representers and commenters are attached at **Annex III**. Soft copy of their 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/tc/plan_making/S_K10_URA2_1.html, and the Planning Enquiry Counters (PECs) of the Planning Department (PlanD) 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 21.4.2023, the draft URA Kau Pui Lung Road / Chi Kiang Street DSP No. S/K10/URA2/1 (**Annex I**) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance (the pre-amended Ordinance¹).
- 1.2 During the two-month statutory exhibition period, 62 valid representations were received. On 21.7.2023, the representations were published for public comments. Upon expiry of the publication period, 11 comments on the representations were received. On 15.9.2023, the Board agreed to consider all the representations and comments collectively in one group.
- 1.3 This Paper is to provide the Board with the information for consideration of the representations and comments. The respective lists of representers and commenters are at **Annex III**. The representers and commenters have been invited to attend the meeting in accordance with section 6B(3) of the pre-amended Ordinance².

2. **BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 In response to the Policy Addresses (PAs) 2018 and 2019 by the Chief Executive, URA is invited to identify one or two clusters of Civil Servants' Co-operative Building Society (CBS) Scheme³ sites suitable for high-density development as pilot sites, and explore the redevelopment mode in accordance with the usual project implementation approach adopted by URA. Besides, it is the latest policy directive under the PAs 2020 and 2021 for URA to provide more subsidised housing including Starter Home (SH) or other types of subsidised sale flats in its redevelopment projects.
- 2.2 On 22.5.2020, URA submitted the draft Kau Pui Lung Road/Chi Kiang Street DSP to the Board for consideration in accordance with section 25(5) of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (URAO). During public consultations on the DSP between May and July 2020, 1,262 public comments were received on the DSP, of which 915 (i.e. 73%) were objections. To further ascertain the intentions of actual CBS members, URA conducted an opinion survey in November 2021 with affected households within the DSP boundary and found that about 69% of the surveyed households were in support of the project, while about 15% opposed it and the remaining 16% expressed no comments.
- 2.3 After conducting the above procedures as well as further community liaisons, URA submitted on 3.11.2022 responses to public comments with a revised scheme of the draft DSP. A full set of the planning report and Social Impact Assessment (SoIA) reports are deposited at the Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection and is available on the Board's website at

¹ The "pre-amended Ordinance" refers to the Town Planning Ordinance as in force immediately before 1.9.2023.

² Pursuant to sections 29(1) and 29(3) of the Town Planning Ordinance currently in force (the Ordinance), sections 6 and 6A to 6H of the pre-amended Ordinance applies to the draft DSP.

³ The CBS scheme is a form of civil servants' housing benefit managed by the Civil Service Bureau (CSB). It was launched in 1952 to allow the Government to grant land at a concessionary premium to enable eligible civil servants to build residential buildings through forming co-operative societies.

https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan_making/S_K10_URA2_1.html.

- 2.4 The Development Scheme (DS) area is about 16,473m². The draft DSP (**Annex I**) has replaced the related area of the approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/30 (**Annex II**). The original zonings of the DS area on the Ma Tau Kok OZP and the current zonings on the DSP are summarised as follows:

	On Ma Tau Kok OZP	On DSP
Zoning	“Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”), Road	“R(A)”, Road
Plot Ratio (PR) restriction	“R(A)” zone only: - PR of 9 for a building that is partly domestic and partly non-domestic, of which the domestic part should not exceed 7.5 - PR of 7.5 for a domestic building - PR of 9 for a non-domestic building	“R(A)” zone only: - PR of 9 for a building that is partly domestic and partly non-domestic, of which the domestic part should not exceed 8 - PR of 8 for a domestic building - PR of 9 for a non-domestic building
Building Height (BH) restriction	“R(A)” zone only: - 120mPD	“R(A)” zone only: - 140mPD

- 2.5 As shown in the table, there is an increase in domestic PR and BH for the “R(A)” zone under the DSP to maximise development potential. The DS area is planned for private housing and SH units with an underground public vehicle park (PVP), Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities, at-grade pedestrianised avenue/event plaza and public open space (POS). The DS area will be developed by URA or its joint venture partners.
- 2.6 On 24.3.2023, the Board considered and deemed the draft DSP together with its Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) as being suitable for publication under section 25(6)(a) of the URAO, and endorsed the ES as suitable for public inspection together with the draft DSP.

3. PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Administrative Arrangement for Public Consultation on the Draft DSP

- 3.1 The draft DSP and the SoIA(Stage 1) report, and subsequently the SoIA (Stage 2) report were made available at the PECs of PlanD for public inspection and comments from 29.5.2020 to 19.6.2020 and 17.7.2020 to 31.7.2020 respectively. In addition, URA consulted Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) on the draft DSP on 23.6.2020 and 2.3.2023.

- 3.2 During the inspection periods, 1,262 comments were received, including 236 (19%) supportive comments, 915 (73%) objecting comments and 111 (9%) comments providing views. These public comments as well as the views of KCDC members were submitted together with the draft DSP for the Board's consideration on 24.3.2023. The relevant TPB Paper No. 10886 is deposited at the Board's Secretariat for Members' inspection while the minutes of the Board meeting is at **Annex VI**. The TPB paper and minutes are also available at the Board's website at https://www.tpb.gov.hk/tc/plan_making/S_K10_URA2_1.html.

Consultation with KCDC after Gazettal

- 3.3 Upon gazettal of the draft DSP No. S/K10/URA2/1, an information paper was circulated to members of KCDC on 27.4.2023 inviting them to submit comments on the draft DSP during the statutory periods. No representation or comment from KCDC members were received.

4. THE REPRESENTATION SITE AND ITS SURROUNDING AREAS

- 4.1 The representation site has the following characteristics (**Plans H-1a to H-1c**, Site Photos at **H-2a to 2d**):

- (a) is bounded by a row of buildings at Ma Tau Wai Road to the east, Ming Fat Building and Chi Kiang Street to the south, Morning Joy Building, City 151 and Kau Pui Lung Road to the west, and 80 Maidstone Road and Lok Shan Road to the north.
- (b) all the buildings within the DS area are residential in nature and of five to six storeys built between 1959 and 1970 (i.e. all aged 50 or above). The number of flats in the DS area is about 460.
- (c) none of the buildings is served by lift or barrier-free access and serviceability is poor. According to URA's building condition survey, most of the buildings are in acceptable conditions. Some of them have completed building rehabilitation works comprising mainly repairing defects in common or public areas of the buildings⁴.
- (d) two exits of MTR To Kwa Wan Station at Lok Shan Road and Kiang Su Street abut the northern boundary and eastern boundary of the DS area respectively.

- 4.2 The surrounding areas have the following characteristics:

- (a) the area is primarily a residential area zoned "R(A)" dominated by medium and high-rise residential developments. Non-domestic uses such as shops and services are found on the ground floors. To the north, there are private residential buildings and some buildings of CBS Scheme.

⁴ The information is based on Buildings Department's records and land search records in Land Registry, provided by URA.

- (b) a row of residential buildings along Ma Tau Kok Road are located to the immediate east of the DS area with a back lane in between. GIC facilities including the To Kwa Wan Market and Government Offices and some schools are concentrated on the opposite side of Ma Tau Wai Road.
- (c) to the west across Kau Pui Lung Road and to the south across Chi Kiang Street is Lok Man Sun Chuen⁵, a public rental housing estate developed by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). Ko Shan Road Park is located to the further south of the DS.
- (d) three relatively new residential buildings, namely City 151, 80 Maidstone Road and Celestial Heights⁶ (existing BH ranging from 115mPD to 150mPD) are located at the north-west/further north-west.

Notional Scheme

- 4.3 According to URA's notional scheme (**Drawings H-1 to H-5**), the proposed development comprises a northern site for private housing development with five residential towers atop podia connected by elevated bridge/deck linkages, and a southern site for SH units with two residential towers atop a podium which is connected to a GIC block for social welfare facilities by elevated bridge/deck linkages. All the residential towers are proposed above two-storey clubhouse/retail/GIC podia with three to four levels of basements for car park/retail. Two vehicular ingress/egress points are proposed at Kau Pui Lung Road for the private housing and SH development respectively.
- 4.4 The development parameters of the notional scheme are set out in the table below:

Notional Scheme	Northern Portion⁽ⁱ⁾ (for private housing)	Southern Portion⁽ⁱ⁾ (for SH units)
Zoning on the draft DSP	R(A), Road	
Gross Site Area (about)	16,473m ²	
Net Site Area for PR Calculation ⁽ⁱⁱ⁾ (about)	15,475m ²	
GFA ⁽ⁱⁱⁱ⁾ / PR		
- Domestic	123,800m ² / 8.0	
- Non-domestic	15,475m ² / 1.0	
- Total	139,275m ² / 9.0	
BH	140mPD	
No. of Floors	37 storeys above three/four basement levels	
Nos. of Flats (about)	1,374	950
Estimated Residential Population	About 6,043 ^(iv)	
Average Flat Size ^(v) (about)	50m ²	58m ²
GFA for GIC Facilities ^(vi)	Not less than 2,500m ² (now proposed to be	

⁵ LPG storage installations are found near Lok Man Sun Chuen Block G (Lok Seen Lau) and Block I (Lok Oi Lau), which are considered Potentially Hazardous Installations (PHIs) (**Plan H-1b**). URA has submitted a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) to demonstrate that the risk levels of the LPG compounds are acceptable after taking into account the proposed DS.

⁶ City 151, 80 Maidstone Road and Celestial Heights are completed in 2019, 2003 and 2009 respectively.

Notional Scheme	Northern Portion ⁽ⁱ⁾ (for private housing)	Southern Portion ⁽ⁱ⁾ (for SH units)
	not less than 4,500m ²)(vii)(viii)	
POS and Pedestrianised Avenue/Event Plaza	- Not less than 2,400m ² of at-grade pedestrianised avenue / event plaza ^(ix) - Not less than 400m ² of at-grade POS	
Private Open Space	Minimum 1m ² per person	
Parking Facilities		
- Ancillary Parking Spaces	611	
- Ancillary L/UL Bays	28	
- Public Car Parking Spaces	164	
Tentative Completion Year	2033	
<u>Notes:</u>		
(i) The boundary between the northern portion and the southern portion is indicative and subject to site survey and changes.		
(ii) Figure provided by URA. According to URA, net site area includes all private lots, the government lanes, the portion of Maidstone Road and Kiang Su Street within the DS. The public pavements at the periphery where affected buildings overhang will be excluded from the PR calculation.		
(iii) The exact GFA and PR are subject to the Board’s approval, detailed design and prevailing Schedule 1 of the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R).		
(iv) Persons per flat ratio (PPF) of 2.6 assumed.		
(v) Indicative only, subject to detailed design at project implementation stage.		
(vi) GIC facilities proposed to be exempted from GFA calculation.		
(vii) The proposed GIC facilities will be located in the 3-storey GIC block (Drawing H-3c) and/or within the non-domestic portion of the development. The height of the GIC block is subject to revision for accommodating the additional GFA for GIC facilities.		
(viii) The GFA for GIC facilities will accommodate various social welfare facilities suggested by the Director of Social Welfare (DSW), for example, Neighbourhood Elderly Centre, Special Child Care Centre, 60-place Day Care Centre for the Elderly and Home Care Services for Frail Elderly Persons.		
(ix) Pedestrianised avenue/event plaza will be open for public use at reasonable hours according to URA.		

Planning Intention

- 4.5 The "R(A)" zone is intended primarily for high-density residential developments with the provision of underground PVP, GIC facilities, at-grade pedestrianised avenue/event plaza and POS. 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.

5. THE REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS

5.1 Subject of Representations

- 5.1.1 There are 62 representations, including 37 supportive representations (**R1 to R36⁷ and R38**), one representation partly supports and partly opposes (**R37**), 23 opposing representations (**R39 to R61**) and one representation providing views (**R62**). All the representations are submitted by individuals, except

⁷ R36 indicates support to the redevelopment without providing reasons.

one representation submitted by the MTRC (**R62**).

- 5.1.2 The major grounds of representations and their major views/proposals if any, 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

Major Grounds/Views/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) The buildings within the DS area are dilapidated and in poor conditions, posing a danger to the residents. The buildings without lift provision hinder mobility of residents in particular the elderly and mobility-impaired. The high maintenance cost for repairing and managing the buildings impose financial burden to the residents, especially for the retired. Upon redevelopment, living conditions of affected residents could be improved.	R1 to R30, R32 to R35, and R37 (part)
(2) The redevelopment would better utilise land development potential and/or increase housing supply.	R5, R6, R8, R10, R12, R14 to R16, R20, R22, R30, R32 to R35
(3) Redevelopment projects carried out by URA/the Government would provide reasonable rehousing and compensation and could avoid piecemeal redevelopment.	R30, R35 and R38
(4) The redevelopment restructures road network and provides car parking facilities. Provision of GIC facilities benefits the public.	R35
(5) Piecemeal redevelopment should be avoided and better planning with more greenery and environmentally friendly design should be adopted.	R32
(6) Relevant authorities should speed up progress of the subject redevelopment.	R11 and R38
(7) It is suggested to increase the PR and lower the percentage of subsidised units.	R31
(8) Sufficient compensation and rehousing should be provided.	R32
(9) The proposal of 'same location same size replacement option' put forward by some individual CBS is not supported. The 'single ownership development plan' proposed by the coalition formed among eight CBSs only reflects the demands of some chairman and members of CBS.	R38
Responses	
(a) The supportive views at (1) to (9) are noted.	
(b) In response to (5):	

<p>The DS area has been comprehensively planned for high-density residential developments with an underground PVP, GIC facilities, at-grade pedestrianised avenue/event plaza and POS. The proposed redevelopment will achieve a minimum coverage of greening of 20% of the net site area. The adoption of environmentally friendly design will be considered by URA at the detailed design stage in accordance with relevant regulations and guidelines.</p>
<p>(c) In response to (7):</p> <p>Total PR of 9 of the proposed redevelopment is the maximum development intensity of “R(A)” zone in Kowloon with due consideration of the planned infrastructure and traffic capacity of the Ma Tau Kok area. Within the total PR limit, the domestic PR has been increased to 8, which represents maximisation of floor spaces for flats development and keeping a suitable amount for local shops. The DS seeks not only to meet the housing needs of the society, but also improve the overall environment with planning gains.</p> <p>The proposed housing mix is a response to the latest directive under the PAs to provide subsidised sale flats in redevelopment projects to meet the housing demands of a wider sector of the community, and is supported by the Secretary for Development (SDEV).</p>
<p>(d) In response to (8) and (9):</p> <p>Acquisition, compensation and rehousing arrangements are outside the scope of the DSP and the ambit of the Board. These issues will be dealt with separately by URA under prevailing policies and arrangements.</p>

5.3 Adverse Representations

5.3.1 Planning for Redevelopment

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) The redevelopment is not justified as CBS buildings within the DS area are in good building conditions and without environmental hygiene or security issues, as well as with high occupancy rate. The Government/URA should instead redevelop low-density buildings, dilapidated buildings, or buildings with fewer existing residents.	R58 to R60
(2) Redevelopment of buildings not of high degrees of dilapidation is not in line with the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS).	R58
(3) There is no reason why nearby CBS/non-CBS buildings on Kau Pui Lung Road/Maidstone Road are not included in the DS.	R60
(4) The redevelopment is not justified as there is a surplus of private housing units in Hong Kong. The site should be	R61

handed over to the Government for providing a mix of public housing and SH units.	
(5) The originally proposed public housing at the southern portion of the site was removed. Public housing is much needed in Hong Kong.	R44
(6) The redevelopment should provide elderly-friendly units to allow the increasing number of elderly to age in place.	R61
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) to (5):</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is a pilot project by URA in response to the PAs to redevelop low-density CBS Scheme sites in the urban area to fully utilise their development potential to increase housing supply. The existing buildings within the DS area are of five to six storeys in height and with building ages over 50 years (Plans H-3 and H-4) with poor serviceability and without lift. The proposed redevelopment could facilitate redevelopment of existing old buildings for an improved living environment.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is in line with the URS which main scope encompasses restructuring and replanning of aged urban areas and rationalising land uses therein, thereby providing district-wide planning benefits like more open space and community/welfare facilities. The redevelopment proposal will provide 2,324 flats, almost about five times the numbers of existing flats. It brings about additional community facilities including an underground PVP, GIC facilities, at-grade pedestrianised avenue/event plaza and POS. Besides, through comprehensive planning and restructuring of land uses, the current dead-end of Maidstone Road would be converted to provide a pedestrianised avenue for the public to walk comfortably between Lok Shan Road and Chi Kiang Street and to the MTR To Kwa Wan Station. At-grade connections and an underground shopping street with possible connection to the MTR station are also proposed to enhance the surrounding pedestrian network.</p> <p>The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply to meet the acute housing demand for different types of housing. Various land supply options have been vigorously pursued by the Government. A number of sites have been identified by the Hong Kong Housing Authority and the HKHS for public housing development/redevelopment. The subject DSP is one of the pilot projects undertaken by URA to increase private housing supply. The provision of SH units and private housing meets the market demands of different tiers of income groups.</p>	
<p>(b) In response to (3):</p> <p>In view of limited resources for urban renewal, in delineating the boundary of the DSP under a pilot project and setting priority for urban renewal among aged urban areas, URA has to review holistically a basket of factors, including but not limited to numbers of CBS involved, numbers of affected residents and operators, planning feasibility and merits, financial viability, building age and condition, site context and existing development density. The scope of</p>	

the subject DS is considered suitable.
<p>(c) In response to (6):</p> <p>URA intends to create an elderly-friendly living environment in the future development as far as practicable and will consider the suggestion at the detailed design stage.</p>

5.3.2 Technical Aspects

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) The redevelopment would overburden the existing utility infrastructure such as the storm water drainage system.	R40
(2) Demolition of existing buildings in good conditions generate excessive waste.	R41 and R43
(3) An increase in BH restriction to 140mPD will exacerbate adverse effects to neighbouring sites in terms of overshadowing, poor ventilation and limiting views. The proposed increase in domestic PR is not justifiable and will pose an undesirable precedent. An increase in flat supply should not be an excuse for increasing PR.	R41 and R42
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1):</p> <p>Technical assessments including Drainage Impact Assessment (DIA), Sewerage Impact Assessment (SIA) and Water Supply Impact Assessment (WSIA) demonstrated that no insurmountable impacts on environmental and infrastructural aspects arising from the proposed redevelopment are envisaged. Relevant Government departments including Chief Engineer/Mainland South, Drainage Services Department (CE/MS, DSD), Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department (CE/C, WSD) have no objection to the DSP.</p>	
<p>(b) In response to (2):</p> <p>According to the Environmental Assessment, URA has committed to adopt the 3R (reduce, reuse & recycle) principles to minimise the generation of construction and demolition (C&D) waste from buildings demolition. For instance, inert C&D materials will be reused on-site for site formation while non-inert C&D materials will be reused and recycled in other projects as far as practicable. Relevant legislations and guidelines on proper waste management will be followed by URA in the implementation. DEP has no objection in this aspect.</p>	
<p>(c) In response to (3):</p> <p>In order to provide a considerable width of at-grade pedestrian passageway, two ventilation/visual corridors as well as GIC facilities, the BH has to be</p>	

slightly increased to 140mPD. With the relaxation of BH restriction, it enables creation of wider gaps between buildings for better views and air ventilation and reduction of visual bulkiness of the development. The proposed BH restriction of 140mPD is not incompatible with the surrounding high-rises which are subject to BH restriction of 120/140mPD (**Plan H-4**). The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) submitted by URA concluded that the proposed redevelopment will not result in visual incompatibility with the surrounding built environment and will not create significant blockage of views from the key local viewpoints (**Drawings H-6a to 6e**). Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) considered that the proposal would unlikely induce significant adverse effect on the visual character of the surrounding townscape.

The Air Ventilation Assessment–Initial Study (AVA-IS) submitted demonstrated that the notional scheme would not generate any significant adverse impact on the pedestrian wind environment when compared with the OZP-compliant scheme with incorporation of two ventilation corridors (i.e. a minimum 15m-wide breezeway along the pedestriansied avenue/Maidstone Road and a minimum 20m-wide podium separation along Kiang Su Street) (**Drawing H-5**). As set out in the AVA-IS report, the two ventilation corridors aim to address the potential adverse air ventilation impact induced by the proposed development on the surroundings.

Besides, the proposed redevelopment will be subject to compliance with statutory requirements under the Buildings Ordinance on natural lighting and ventilation.

As for the proposed PR, with the adjustment of domestic and non-domestic PR split to 8.0 and 1.0 respectively, development potential of the site could be optimised for comprehensive residential development with increased flat supply to meet the acute housing need while keeping the total PR unchanged. Moreover, the lower non-domestic PR of 1.0 creates smaller podia for a more human-scale pedestrian environment. Technical assessments have demonstrated the feasibility of the proposal and relevant Government departments have no adverse comments.

5.3.3 Provision of GIC Facilities

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) It is unclear whether the educational establishments, hospitals and clinics have sufficient places/capacities to cope with the increase in population arising from the subject redevelopment and other nearby developments.	R58
(2) The proposed GFA reserved for GIC facilities is inadequate as many community facilities in the district are in deficit.	R61
Responses	
In response to (1) and (2):	

The existing and planned provision of major GIC facilities in Ma Tau Kok are generally adequate to meet the demand in accordance with the requirements of Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and concerned B/Ds' assessment, except secondary school places, hospital beds and social welfare facilities including child care centre, community care services facilities, residential care homes for the elderly and pre-school rehabilitation services (**Annex V**). For the shortfall in secondary school places (-101 classrooms), it is planned on a territory-wide basis and can be met by surplus provision in the Kowloon City District (**Annex VIII**). As for hospital beds (-787 beds), there is a surplus in the Kowloon City District. Besides, it is planned on a cluster basis and hospital redevelopment projects planned in Kowloon Central Cluster in the First and Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plans will provide additional beds for the population. Regarding the provision of elderly, child care and rehabilitation facilities, the standards were reinstated in the HKPSG in 2018, 2020 and 2022 respectively, reflecting a long-term goal. The actual provision would be subject to the consideration of Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate.

For the planning of GIC facilities as a whole, the Government will continue to adopt a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable sites such as designating GIC sites and identifying suitable premises in public housing redevelopment projects. The original proposal plans to provide not less than 2,500m² of non-domestic GFA for new GIC uses as stated in the ES. Subsequently, in response to Board members' comments in the meeting for consideration of the DSP, URA (C1)(**Annex IV**) undertakes to increase the GIC provision to not less than 4,500m² GFA for needed social welfare facilities such as Day Care Centre for the Elderly which is in deficit in Ma Tau Kok. In addition, the Notes provides exemption of GFA for GIC facilities as required by the Government which could facilitate enhanced provision of social welfare facilities by URA at detailed design stage.

5.3.4 Preservation of CBS buildings

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
The CBS buildings are prime examples of mid-century modern architecture and of historical significance. These buildings represent a unique era in the culture of CBS and civil servants' dedication to serving the people of Hong Kong. Removing this piece of history would be an environmental and cultural disaster.	R41
Responses	
The CBS buildings within the DS are not declared monuments. They are neither graded buildings, nor included in the list of new items for grading assessment.	

5.3.5 Public Consultation

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) No effort has been made to consult residents to work towards a rehousing plan.	R40

(2) Lack of data available to the public on both URA and the Board's websites. There is nothing posted under 'URA Development Scheme Plans Currently Inviting Comments' on the Board's website.	R61
(3) Comments submitted at the 1 st and 2 nd stages of public consultation have still not been responded by URA.	R58
(4) Affected residents' concerns raised at the Housing and Development Planning Committee (HDPC) working group meeting of KCDC over urban renewal held on 2.3.2021 have not been recorded in the Board paper No. 10886 for consideration of the draft DSP. URA and relevant government departments did not attend that meeting.	R58
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) to (4):</p> <p>The public consultation procedures for processing DSP have been duly followed as elaborated in paragraph 3 above. URA has been communicating with affected residents and stakeholders since commencement of the DSP. For example, three public briefings were held in July 2020 to collect stakeholders' views and explain the details of the redevelopment including prevailing acquisition and rehousing policy. Besides, nine briefing sessions were organised by URA from 22.11.2021 to 24.11.2021 for affected occupiers of the DS to explain the details of the DS including acquisition policy, as well as collecting their views for implementation of the project.</p> <p>The draft DSP with its Notes and ES, together with the planning report, technical assessments and SoIAs were published for public comments from 29.5.2020 to 19.6.2020 (Stage 1) and from 17.7.2020 to 31.7.2020 (stage 2) before consideration by the Board on 24.3.2023. The subject Board paper containing URA's responses to the public comments received and prevailing acquisition, tenant's ex-gratia allowance and rehousing policies adopted by URA in relation to the draft DSP, is available at the Board's website and was considered and agreed by the Board on 24.3.2023.</p>	
<p>(b) In response to (4):</p> <p>URA and concerned government departments have provided written responses to affected residents' concerns at the subject HDPC working group meeting on 2.3.2021. URA attended the HDPC meetings on 23.6.2020 and 2.3.2023 and responded to comments raised by KCDC members at the meetings. URA's responses and available meeting minutes were attached in the Board Paper of the draft DSP for Board's consideration. Affected residents' views presented in the subject HDPC working group meeting on 2.3.2021, which are largely related to acquisition, compensation and rehousing arrangement, are similar to those raised by KCDC members at the HDPC meetings on 23.6.2020 and 2.3.2023.</p>	

5.3.6 Acquisition, Compensation and Relocating and Impact on Affected Residents

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) Current acquisition, compensation and rehousing package/arrangement should be improved.	R48, R52, R54, R56 to R61
(2) Valuation should be made based on the whole piece of land including the area where the common area is situated.	R53, R55, R57 to R59
(3) The Development Bureau did not provide reasonable explanation for refusing to handle the complaint referred by the Legislative Council Redress System regarding the compensation arrangement for the existing 27 shared parking spaces. In determining the compensation for the shared parking spaces, it would be unfair to follow the guideline for dissolution of CBSs as property owners of large units will be the minority and small flat owners (the majority) will push for a plan that is beneficial to them.	R47, R49 to R55
(4) Requirement of payment of land premium by the residents is unjustified and unfair.	R49, R50, R53, R55, R56, R58 and R60
(5) It is unreasonable to require dissolution of CBS before acquisition of properties.	R47, R51, R53, R55 and R58
(6) There is no statutory basis for the Board to deal with matters in relation to acquisition and compensation arrangements. Affected residents are deprived of the rights to have their objections being considered.	R58
(7) URA did not provide a concrete and clear compensation arrangement/package or the figure of premium payable, leaving affected occupiers feeling anxious.	R37(part), R40, R42 and R59
(8) Replacing affordable CBS units with homes that are out of the financial reach of the majority of the displaced tenants is creating housing problems. The redevelopment should improve living conditions of existing residents instead of forcing them to move to other districts with poor transport and few employment opportunities.	R61
(9) There are concerns on the negative impacts of the redevelopment on existing residents, in particular on the retired and elderly residents as they may face various difficulties, such as difficulty in relocation and adaption to a new environment, and high management fee. URA did not provide sufficient assistance to affected residents.	R40, R42, R45 to R48, R51, R58 and R59
Responses	
(a) In response to (1) to (9): The dissolution arrangement of CBSs, acquisition, compensation and	

rehousing arrangements are outside the scope of the DSP and the ambit of the Board. These issues will be dealt with separately by URA and concerned parties under their prevailing policies and arrangements.

(b) In response to (8) and (9):

URA has conducted SoIAs and proposed mitigation measures to minimise impacts to the directly affected and the stakeholders. For example, the Social Service Team (SST) will conduct programs to assist affected residents in adapting to the new neighbourhood upon relocation. URA's "Project Engagement" team and the SST will also proactively follow up with singleton and doubleton elderly households through home visits and offer prompt assistance to them. URA and the SST will assist affected residents and address their concerns in a timely manner.

On accommodation, URA will offer flat-for-flat (FFF) option to affected eligible owner-occupiers under prevailing compensation policy. Besides, the Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) in Kai Tak to be completed in 2025 (**Plan H-1d**) is an alternative for those opting to stay in the same district.

5.3.7 Others

Major Ground(s)/View(s)/Proposal(s)	Representations
(1) CBS is a form of housing benefit provided to the civil servants who have contributed greatly to Hong Kong. Their rights and properties should not be taken away.	R39, R42, R58 and R60
(2) The redevelopment is a violation of the Sino-British Joint Declaration / the Basic Law (including its Article 100) that civil servant benefits shall remain unchanged.	R57 and R58
(3) The redevelopment should be done in one go when the Shatin to Central Link was constructed so as to minimise the disturbance and pollution to the residents caused by construction works.	R58 and R60
Responses	
<p>(a) In response to (1) and (2):</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is in line with the PAs to redevelop CBS Scheme sites to optimise land resources for more housing supply and provide a better living environment for the community. The proposed redevelopment is a pilot project by URA to redevelop low-density CBS Scheme sites in the urban area to fully utilise land development potential. This is one of the options pursued by the Government under a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply in meeting the acute housing demand. Compensation and rehousing arrangements will be provided to affected tenants/owners of the DS according to URA's prevailing policies and arrangements. According to the CSB, the CBS Scheme is a discretionary housing benefit where the provision is subject to resource availability. The CBS Scheme is not a condition of service and hence cannot be regarded as a life-long housing benefit of CBS member. An eligible civil servant is considered to have enjoyed the civil service housing</p>	

benefit when he/she became a CBS member.
<p>(b) In response to (3):</p> <p>Inevitably, urban renewal has to be taken according to priority and in phases. The proposed redevelopment has been supported by environmental assessments to assess the air quality and noise impacts during construction phases, with mitigation measures proposed (e.g. frequent water spraying for dusty construction areas and use of impervious dust screens or sheeting during demolition of buildings). The assessment revealed that with proposed mitigation measures, no adverse noise or air quality impact are anticipated. Moreover, construction and operation will be subject to compliance with relevant environmental regulations and ordinances.</p>

5.4 Representations Providing Views

Major View(s)	Representations
It appears that part of/whole DSP falls within the boundary of railway protection area. Construction works within boundary of protection area shall be carried out in compliance with relevant guidelines and requirements. Ultimate Point of Safety (“UPS”) for escape in case of fire and Emergency Vehicular Access (“EVA”) for Entrance C of MTR To Kwa Wan Station shall be maintained or re-provided during construction and at completion of the proposed redevelopment under the draft DSP. The project proponent is advised to consult MTRC and other relevant government departments in this regard.	R62
Responses	
The railway protection boundary is being updated by concerned parties. In any event, any construction works within boundary of the railway protection area by URA has to comply with relevant requirements. URA will continue to communicate with MTRC and relevant government departments to facilitate implementation of the DS. Principle Government Engineer, Railway Development Office, Highways Department (PGE, RDO, HyD) has no adverse comments on the proposed redevelopment.	

5.5 Major Grounds of Comments and PlanD’s Responses

- 5.5.1 There are 11 comments received on the DSP. All the comments (**C2 to C11**) are submitted by individuals, except **C1** is submitted by URA. It is noted that two commenters (**C3 and C9**) are also representers (**R5 and R61** respectively) themselves.
- 5.5.2 **C1 (Annex IV)** provides responses to all the representations (**R1 to R62**). Regarding supportive comments, **C2 to C7** support the DSP and provide responses to **R4, R5, R7, R8, R11, R16, R19, R20, R27, R29, R33 and R35**. The major grounds/views raised in the supportive comments are largely similar to the grounds/views of supporting representers as detailed in

paragraph 5.2 above. As for commenters opposing/providing views to the DS, **C8** objects to the DS on the grounds related to contribution made by civil servants and their rights, historical and cultural value of CBS buildings, impact on affected elderly and the justifications for the redevelopment with some suggestions provided; **C9** (also **R61**) objects to the DS on grounds related to acquisition of properties in reasonable condition and the need for private housing; **C10 and C11** express concerns regarding impacts on affected residents and compensation.

5.5.3 Major views of **C1** (URA) providing responses to all the representations are as follows:

Major Comments	Comments
<p><u>The DS</u></p> <p>(1) The DS aims to fulfil objectives of the PAs, to increase housing supply by full utilisation of the development potential of CBS Scheme sites. In addition, in response to the latest directive under the PAs, about 950 SH units will be provided to assist families who cannot afford private housing to meet their home ownership aspirations.</p> <p>(2) Through the DS, residential buildings with modern facilities/services such as lifts, sufficient lighting, and security service will be provided, while the future building design will also provide barrier-free access in accordance with relevant guidelines/regulations where applicable. Besides, POS and GIC facilities will also be provided to improve the quality of life of the residents.</p> <p>(3) The DS has been selected according to multiple factors, including number of CBS sites involved, proximity to existing public rental housing and other ancillary facilities, building age, etc. The site is considered the most suitable site as a pilot site for redevelopment of CBS buildings.</p> <p><u>Technical Aspects</u></p> <p>(4) Assessments on various technical aspects were conducted and submitted to the Board. It is demonstrated that there is no insurmountable problems arising from the DSP from environmental, drainage and sewerage impact perspectives.</p> <p>(5) The relaxation of BH restriction to 140mPD enables slimmer building blocks, smaller podia and wider building separations. The proposed redevelopment is considered visually compatible with the surrounding environment.</p>	<p>C1</p>

- (6) Two major wind enhancement features will be provided in the proposed redevelopment, as stated in the ES of the DSP. Various building and podium separations will also be provided where appropriate and practicable to enhance the local pedestrian wind environment. The impact on blockage of views and sunlight penetration is not significant with the proposed mitigation measures.

Planning and Design

- (7) The proposed domestic PR and non-domestic PR of 8 and 1 respectively allows better urban design and contributes to provision of more housing units. Under the proposed PR of 8, the housing supply could be increased to five times the existing units.
- (8) In view of community's need for more GIC facilities and in response to Board members' comments for more GIC provisions at the meeting for consideration of the DSP, the GIC GFA is proposed to increase from the original proposal of "not less than 2,500m²" to "not less than 4,500m²", subject to no additional technical assessments required and the practical feasibility in the future development, confirmation of funding and Schedule of Accommodation availability from relevant government departments who would take up the GIC GFA within specified time after the approval of the draft DSP. The proposed GIC provision shall also be subject to exemption of GFA for implementation.

Acquisition, Compensation and Relhousing

- (9) Subject to the approval of the DSP, URA's prevailing compensation and rehousing policies would be applicable to the affected residents and operators in this redevelopment project. URA would issue acquisition offers to the affected property owners based on prevailing compensation policy and offer rehousing or ex-gratia allowances to eligible tenants.
- (10) URA will continue to liaise with relevant stakeholders to understand their concerns and provide assistance.

Responses

The views of C1 is noted. The suggestion of increasing GFA for GIC facilities from "not less than 2,500m²" to "not less than 4,500m²" to meet community needs is supported and will be set out in the ES upon approval of the DSP (**Annex VII**). There is provision under the Notes of the DSP to exempt floor space for government requested GIC facilities from GFA calculation to cater for increase in GIC use in detailed design stage. Any technical assessments for the additional

GIC facilities will be addressed in accordance with established procedures.

- 5.5.4 The major views/concerns raised in the remaining comments are largely similar to the grounds of objections/views of representers as detailed in paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 above. Other major comments which have not been covered in the representations are summarised below:

5.5.4.1 Planning for Redevelopment

Major Comments	Comments
The Government should develop brownfield sites which are now used for car park/open storage/agricultural land by owners for their self-interest. It is not necessary to resume the subject site for development. URA should redevelop dilapidated buildings instead of CBS buildings which are in reasonable conditions and without serious environmental issues.	C8
Responses	
Response (a) under paragraph 5.3.1 above is relevant.	
To meet acute housing demand, the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach. Various land supply options including brownfield development mentioned by the commenter have been vigorously pursued by the Government concurrently in a comprehensive manner.	

5.5.4.2 Preservation of CBS Buildings

Major Comments	Comments
The area could be developed as a tourist attraction like the “Blue House” in Wan Chai. This could bring revenue to the Government.	C8
Responses	
Responses under paragraph 5.3.4 above is relevant.	
The “Blue House” in Wan Chai is a Grade 1 historic building and included in the Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme for heritage preservation purpose. However, the policy initiative for the subject redevelopment is to redevelop CBS Scheme sites to maximise development potential for more housing supply.	

6. DEPARTMENTAL CONSULTATION

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

- (a) SDEV;

- (b) Secretary for the Civil Service;
- (c) Executive Secretary (Antiquities and Monuments), AMO;
- (d) DEP;
- (e) Commissioner for Transport;
- (f) CE/MS, DSD;
- (g) Chief Building Surveyor/ Kowloon, Buildings Department;
- (h) CTP/UD&L, PlanD;
- (i) DSW; and
- (j) PGE, RDO, HyD.

6.2 The following B/Ds have been consulted and have no comments on the representations and comments:

- (a) District Lands Officer / Kowloon West, Lands Department (LandsD);
- (b) Chief Estate Surveyor / Valuation Section, LandsD;
- (c) Chief Estate Surveyor / Urban Renewal, LandsD;
- (d) Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services;
- (e) Project Manager (East), Civil Engineering and Development Department ;
- (f) Chief Engineer/Construction, Water Supplies Department;
- (g) Chief Highway Engineer/Kowloon, HyD;
- (h) Director of Fire Services;
- (i) Commissioner of Police; and
- (j) District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department.

7. **PLANNING DEPARTMENT'S VIEWS**

7.1. The supportive views of **R1 to R36, R37 (part) and R38** as well as general views of **R62** are noted.

7.2. Based on the assessments in paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 above and for the following reasons, PlanD does not support representations **R37 (part), R39 to R61** and considers that the DSP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) The proposed redevelopment is a pilot project by URA under the PAs to redevelop low-density CBS Scheme sites in the urban area to fully utilise their development potential to increase housing supply. The proposed redevelopment is in line with the URS and could bring about district-wide planning benefits. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply to meet the acute housing demand for different types of housing. The subject DSP is one of the pilot projects undertaken by URA to increase private housing supply. The provision of SH units and private housing meets the market demand of different tiers of income groups (**R44, R58 to R61**);
- (b) There are no insurmountable technical problems arising from the DSP on environmental, air ventilation and visual aspects. The CBS buildings within the DS are not declared monuments or graded buildings. Relevant guidelines, requirements and ordinances will be observed by URA during detailed design

and implementation (**R40 to R43**);

- (c) The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of GIC facilities. The proposed redevelopment will provide not less than 4,500m² GFA for the needed social welfare facilities (**R58 and R61**);
- (d) The public consultation procedures for processing DSP have been duly followed. URA will continue to communicate with local stakeholders and residents on the redevelopment (**R40, R58 and R61**);
- (e) The dissolution arrangement of CBSs, acquisition, compensation and relocation arrangements as well as assistance to the affected residents will be dealt with separately by URA and concerned parties under the prevailing policies and established mechanism (**R37 (part), R40, R42, R45 to R61**); and
- (f) The CBS Scheme is a discretionary housing benefit where the provision is subject to resource availability. The proposed redevelopment could optimise land resources for more housing supply and provide a better living environment for the community (**R39, R42, R57, R58 and R60**).

8. **DECISION SOUGHT**

- 8.1. Members are invited to give consideration to the representations and comments taking into consideration the points raised in the hearing session, and decide whether to propose/not to propose any amendment to the draft DSP to meet/partially meet the representations. Members are also invited to agree to the proposed amendment to the ES of the DSP as described in 5.5.3 above and set out in **Annex VII**.
- 8.2. Should the Board decide that no amendment should be made to the draft DSP to meet the representations, Members are also invited to agree that the draft DSP, together with their respective Notes and updated ES, are suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) and 29(8) of the Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

9. **ATTACHMENTS**

Annex I	Draft Kau Pui Lung Road/Chi Kiang Street DSP No. S/K10/URA2/1
Annex II	Approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/30 (reduced size)
Annex III	Lists of Representers and Commenters
Annex IV	Comment No. TPB/R/S/K10/URA2/1-C1
Annex V	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Ma Tau Kok OZP
Annex VI	Extract of Minutes of Board Meeting held on 24.3.2023
Annex VII	Proposed Revision to the ES of the DSP
Annex VIII	Provision of Major Community Facilities and Open Space in Kowloon City District Council Area

Drawing H-1	Indicative Block Plan
Drawing H-2	Potential Open Space and Pedestrian Connection
Drawings H-3a to 3c	Schematic Section
Drawing H-4	Multi-level Pedestrian Linkages
Drawing H-5	Proposed Design Measures in the AVA-IS
Drawings H-6a to H-6e	Photomontages in the VIA
Plans H-1a to 1c	Location Plan, Site Plan, Aerial Photo of Representation Site
Plan H-1d	Location of Kai Tak DRE Site
Plans H-2a to 2d	Site Photos of Representation Site
Plan H-3	Building Completion Year Plan
Plan H-4	Building Height Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
NOVEMBER 2023