



圖例  
NOTATION

- BOUNDARY OF DEVELOPMENT SCHEME 發展計劃範圍界線
- RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A) R(A) 住宅 (甲類)
- OTHER SPECIFIED USES OU 其他指定用途
- BUILDING HEIGHT CONTROL ZONE BOUNDARY 建築物高度管制區界線
- MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT (IN METRES ABOVE PRINCIPAL DATUM) 100 最高建築物高度 (在主水平基準上若干米)

夾附的《註釋》屬這份圖則的一部分，  
現經修訂並按照城市規劃條例第 5 條展示。  
THE ATTACHED NOTES ALSO FORM PART OF THIS PLAN  
AND HAVE BEEN AMENDED FOR EXHIBITION UNDER  
SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

核准圖編號 S/K 1 4 S/URA 1/2 的修訂  
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/K14S/URA1/2

按照城市規劃條例第 5 條展示的修訂  
AMENDMENTS EXHIBITED UNDER SECTION 5  
OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE

A 項 ITEM A

由「綜合發展區 (1)」地帶改劃作「其他指定用途」註明「混合用途」地帶  
REZONING FROM "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA(1)"  
TO "OTHER SPECIFIED USES" ANNOTATED "MIXED USE"

B 項 ITEM B

由「綜合發展區 (1)」地帶改劃作「住宅 (甲類)」地帶  
REZONING FROM "COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT AREA(1)"  
TO "RESIDENTIAL (GROUP A)"

(參看附表)  
(SEE ATTACHED SCHEDULE)

2023 年 12 月 8 日 按照城市規劃條例第 5 條展示的  
核准圖編號 S/K 1 4 S/URA 1/2 的修訂  
AMENDMENTS TO APPROVED PLAN No. S/K14S/URA1/2 EXHIBITED  
UNDER SECTION 5 OF THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE ON  
8 DECEMBER 2023

c. k. Yip

C K YIP 葉子季  
SECRETARY, TOWN PLANNING BOARD 城市規劃委員會秘書

香港城市規劃委員會依據城市規劃條例擬備的市區重建局觀塘市中心 - 主地盤發展計劃圖  
TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE, HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD  
URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY KWUN TONG TOWN CENTRE  
DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN - MAIN SITE

SCALE 1 : 2 000 比例尺  
米 METRES 40 0 40 80 120 160 METRES 米

依據市區重建局條例第 25 (3) (a) 條擬備  
PREPARED UNDER SECTION 25(3)(a) OF THE  
URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY ORDINANCE

圖則編號  
PLAN No. S/K14S/URA1/3

**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO**  
**THE URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY KWUN TONG TOWN CENTRE -**  
**MAIN SITE DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN NO. S/K14S/URA1/2**  
**MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD**  
**UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

**I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan**

- Item A – Rezoning of a site to the north of Kwun Tong Road from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) with stipulation of building height (BH) restrictions.
- Item B – Rezoning of a site to the south of Mut Wah Street from “CDA(1)” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with stipulation of BH restriction.

**II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan**

- (a) Addition of paragraphs (5), (7)(c) and (8) in the covering Notes in accordance with the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans.
- (b) Deletion of the set of Notes for the “CDA(1)” zone and the corresponding amendments to the covering Notes.
- (c) Addition of the “OU(MU)” and “R(A)” zones in the Notes with incorporation of a new set of Schedule of Uses and Remarks, with development restrictions and relaxation clauses.

Town Planning Board

8 December 2023

《市區重建局觀塘市中心一主地盤發展計劃草圖  
 編號 S/K14S/URA1/3》

**Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kwun Tong Town Centre - Main Site  
 Development Scheme Plan No. S/K14S/URA1/3**

申述人名單  
**List of Representers**

申述編號 Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K14S/URA1/3-)	提交編號 Submission No. (TPB/R/S/K14S/URA1/3-)	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
R1	S50	Urban Renewal Authority
R2	S3	黃七楊
R3	S4	黃錦秀
R4	S5	凌云霞
R5	S6	范忠東
R6	S9	蔡超英
R7	S10	Zhou Feng Xiu
R8	S11	梅耀明
R9	S12	黃秀蘭
R10	S13	何紫婷
R11	S15	Chan Chak Fai Jack
R12	S16	蘇淑琮
R13	S17	陳安珏
R14	S18	蘇潔玲
R15	S20	陳映群
R16	S21	Chui Tak Lung
R17	S22	Hui Chor Yau
R18	S7	鄧愛
R19	S14	Li Miao Na
R20	S19	陳心愛
R21	S23	曾桂芬
R22	S24	陳福
R23	S25	羅少蘭
R24	S53	陳又波
R25	S26	畢禕
R26	S27	楊志明
R27	S28	Cheung Chor Wah

申述編號 Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K14S/URA1/3-)	提交編號 Submission No. (TPB/R/S/K14S/URA1/3-)	申述人名稱 Name of Representer
R28	S8	林冰梅
R29	S29	吳淑玲
R30	S30	Wong Ho Tat Daniel
R31	S31	林尾英
R32	S32	鄭友誼
R33	S33	Tam Wing Lam
R34	S40	魏建碧
R35	S41	沈小珍
R36	S47	歐陽月玲
R37	S42	陳耀娥
R38	S43	Cheung Kai Yuen
R39	S44	張玉玲
R40	S45	姚慧萍
R41	S46	Zhang Feng Chang
R42	S48	簡燕萍
R43	S49	連小雄
R44	S55	周耀明
R45	S56	Leung Yee Foon Cecilia
R46	S39	蘇麗珍
R47	S51	Fu Yee Ming
R48	S52	Man Ka Yin
R49	S57	余邵倫
R50	S36	Lai Sho Ho Patrick
R51	S54	洪錦鉉
R52	S59	曾榮輝
R53	S34	馬軼超
R54	S58	鄧咏駿
R55	S37	陳少鄉
R56	S38	余敏
R57	S2	潘宇杰
R58	S60	Mary Mulvihill
R59	S35	MTR Corporation Limited
R60	S1	Liu Tak Ching

**Minutes of 1307<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 17.11.2023**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Engineer (Traffic Survey and Support)  
Transport Department  
Mr W.H. Poon

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Director of Lands  
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr K.L. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (a.m.)  
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (a.m.)  
Mr Kelvin K.H. Chan (p.m.)

~~21. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R1 and agreed that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reason:~~

~~“the amendment Item A is to take forward the application No. Y/TW/15 under section 12A of the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance partially agreed by the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board), on the consideration that the proposed use is not incompatible with the surrounding areas containing a temple/monastery cluster covered by various “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) subzones in Fu Yung Shan area. The “G/IC(10)” zoning of the amendment item is considered appropriate with ‘Columbarium’ use stipulated under Column 2 of the zone such that the development details and other technical aspects of the proposed columbarium would be subject to the scrutiny of the Board upon planning application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance.”~~

~~22. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) and 29(8) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.~~

### **Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Urban Renewal Authority Kwun Tong Town Centre Development Scheme Plan – Main Site No. S/K14S/URA1/2

(TPB Paper No. 10938)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

23. The Secretary reported that the Approved Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) Development Scheme Plan No. S/K14S/URA1/2 (the DSP) involved a site in Kwun Tong and the proposed amendments to the DSP were to take forward URA’s latest development proposals. The following Members had declared interests on the item:



Mr Ivan M.K. Chung ] being a non-executive director of the URA Board  
(as Director of Planning) and a member of its Committee;

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai ]  
(as Director of Lands)

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Land, Rehousing &  
Compensation Committee and Development  
Project Objection Consideration Committee of  
URA; and being a director of the Board of the  
Urban Renewal Fund (URF);

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with URA;

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being a former Vice-chairman of the Appeal Board  
Panel of URA;

Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former Executive Director of URA; and

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu ]

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung ] being a former director of the Board of URF.

Ms Lilian S.K. Law ]

24. Members noted that Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Timothy K.W. Ma were direct, Members agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members also agreed that as the interest of Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang was indirect, and Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Ben S.S. Lui and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the DSP, they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai and Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

### Presentation and Question Sessions

25. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

#### **PlanD's Representatives**

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai	- District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)
Mr Steven Y.H. Siu	- Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)
Ms Charlotte P.S. Ng	- Town Planner/Kowloon

#### **URA's Representatives**

Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak	- Director
Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan	- General Manager
Ms Y.T. Li	- Senior Manager
Ms Clarice N.S. Ho	- Manager

26. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. She then invited the representatives of PlanD and URA to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 10938 (the Paper).

#### *Draft DSP*

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the approved DSP as detailed in the Paper, including the background of the KTTC redevelopment project, the development progress of the five development areas (DAs) (i.e. DAs 1 to 5) of KTTC, the proposed development at DAs 4 and 5 (the Site), as well as the proposed zonings and key development parameters for DAs 2 to 5. The proposed amendments were as follows:

- (a) Amendment Item A – to rezone a site (about 2.46 ha) to the north of Kwun Tong Road (i.e. the Site) from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) with building height (BH) restrictions of 30/100/360mPD to facilitate a mixed development; and

- (b) Amendment Item B – to rezone a site (about 2.18 ha) to the south of Mut Wah Street from “CDA(1)” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with BH restriction of 180mPD to reflect the completed development.

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA’s representative, explained that the purpose of the proposed amendments to the DSP was to enhance the development proposals for the Site. URA had been repackaging the development concept for the Site from a purely commercial development towards a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development, notably to introduce domestic use in the development mix with a view to optimising the development potential of the Site in response to changing market needs (the Proposed Scheme). The “Vertical City” development would not only strengthen the role of the Site as the town centre of Kwun Tong, but also bring about planning gains to the community. The concept had gained increasing global attention and there were examples of vertical cities worldwide. Hong Kong, being an international city, should have its “Vertical City” development to promote an international living/working/playing lifestyle that was on par with other major cities. KTTC was considered suitable for the pilot development of such kind in view of its strategic location.

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the KTTC, also known as Project K7, was the largest and most complicated redevelopment project ever undertaken by URA to date. It comprised five DAs. Developments at DAs 1 to 3 had been completed while developments at DAs 4 and 5, i.e. the Site, had yet to commence. The Site was the subject of the proposed amendments to the DSP under consideration;
- (b) a residential development, namely Park Metropolitan, and a public clinic complex, namely Kwun Tong Community Health Centre Building, were completed at DA 1. A composite development comprising a residential development cum commercial facilities, namely Grand Central, with a two-level public transport interchange, a hawker bazaar and a refuse collection point, was completed at DAs 2 and 3. For the Site, a s.16 application (No.

A/K14/819) submitted by URA was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) in September 2022 to allow built-in flexibility over the actual non-domestic gross floor areas (GFAs) within specified ranges (i.e. “floating parameters”) for office, hotel and retail uses (the Approved Scheme) while maintaining the development parameters (i.e. a maximum total GFA of 201,220m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 285mPD) in previous approved schemes. However, since the unsuccessful tendering of the commercial development at the Site in early 2023, URA had been exploring ways to enhance the development proposals for the Site;

- (c) URA had been repackaging the development concept for the Site from a purely commercial development towards a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development. “Vertical City” was a development concept where different land-use functions of a city such as living, working, playing, wellness, community, connectivity, etc. were amalgamated and developed vertically through high-rise buildings. The objectives of “Vertical City” development were:
  - (i) promoting flexible land uses to meet changing circumstances/needs for visionary planning;
  - (ii) advancing ‘single site, multiple use’ to enhance resilience to market changes;
  - (iii) creating a modern and international living/working/playing lifestyle that was on par with other major cities; and
  - (iv) bringing environmental enhancement to the community;
- (d) the concept of “Vertical City” development had gained increasing global attention. There were examples of “Vertical City” developments in both developed and developing countries around the world, such as Burj Khalifa in Dubai (BH of 828m and built in 2010), Lotte World Tower in Seoul (BH

of 555m and built in 2017), Landmark 81 in Ho Chi Minh City (BH of 470m and built in 2018), Autograph Tower in Jakarta (BH of 383m and built in 2022), MahaNakhon in Bangkok (BH of 314m and built in 2016), The Shard in London (BH of 310m and built in 2012) and 35 Hudson Yards in New York (BH of 305m and built in 2019). Those developments showcased a mix of land uses such as residential, retail, office, hotel and community facilities, and observation decks were often provided. In the early days, “Vertical City” developments were mainly found in North American countries for purely office use, with steel as the most popular construction material for such high-rise buildings. In recent decades, “Vertical City” developments were becoming more prevalent in Asian countries for mixed uses with composite as the most frequently used construction material. While there was currently no “Vertical City” development in the Greater Bay Area, ‘composite developments’ with high-rise commercial/office tower cum a high-rise residential tower within the same site were found in Guangzhou and Zhuhai. Piloting the concept of “Vertical City” development in Hong Kong could help catch up with the international development trend;

- (e) the proposed “Vertical City” development at the Site could strengthen KTTC’s role in supporting Kowloon East as the second Core Business District (CBD2) of Hong Kong. The proposed development in the form of a landmark tower could denote the significance of KTTC, and contribute as part of the notable landmarks visible across the Victoria Harbour, together with International Finance Centre in Central and International Commerce Centre in West Kowloon, to enhance the cityscape of Hong Kong;
- (f) while not all sites were suitable for “Vertical City” development, the Site possessed the following elements which made it a suitable one:
  - (i) the Site was strategically located within the centre of KTTC, with Kwun Tong residential area located to its north and Kwun Tong business area located to its south. The Site, situated in the transition area, was suitable for high-density, vertically-integrated and mixed-use development;

- (ii) the Site was highly accessible to public transport services. It was located adjacent to the Kwun Tong MTR Station and there were over 80 bus routes to/from different parts of Hong Kong serving KTTC; and
  - (iii) the Site with an area of about 25,000m<sup>2</sup> was sizable enough for a landmark and high-density mixed-use development. Considerable area could also be allocated for providing at-grade public open space (POS) and multi-level outdoor communal spaces for public enjoyment;
- (g) with a view to developing the Site for a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development, it was proposed to rezone the Site from “CDA(1)” to “OU(MU)” and introduce domestic use in the proposed development. The key development parameters under the Proposed Scheme were as follows:
- (i) the maximum total GFA for the Site would be increased by about 33% from 201,220m<sup>2</sup> under the Approved Scheme to 268,300m<sup>2</sup> (accountable GFA of about 251,100m<sup>2</sup>) under the Proposed Scheme;
  - (ii) the maximum GFA for domestic use was 110,100m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (iii) the maximum GFA for non-domestic uses was 153,700m<sup>2</sup>;
  - (iv) the maximum BH would be increased by about 25% from 285mPD under the Approved Scheme to 360mPD under the Proposed Scheme; and
  - (v) in keeping with the Approved Scheme, about 8,600m<sup>2</sup> of GFA for government, institution and community (GIC) facilities would be provided within the Site including a district office, an early education and training centre, a post office, government offices and the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)’s air quality monitoring station. With a view to enhancing the planning gains, URA had been

exploring the possibility of providing additional GFA for provision of new GIC facilities, with the aim to double the provision to a total GFA of up to 17,200m<sup>2</sup> to meet the acute demand for GIC facilities in the local community. The additional GIC facilities, such as health/medical and social welfare facilities, would be timely confirmed subject to liaison/agreement with and confirmation of usage and funding from the relevant bureaux/departments (B/Ds) for subsequent land grant preparation;

- (h) key planning and design merits committed under the Approved Scheme would be retained, for example, the iconic egg-shaped GIC building at the southwestern corner of the Site, provision of a landmark tower, provision of an observation deck at the top floor of the landmark tower, and provision of at-grade POS of not less than 7,200m<sup>2</sup>, etc.;
- (i) in addition to the provision of at-grade POS of not less than 7,200m<sup>2</sup> as an additional planning gain and to embrace the “Vertical City” concept, multi-level outdoor communal spaces of not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> would be introduced under the Proposed Scheme. The outdoor communal spaces would comprise a mix of uncovered and open-sided spaces, with a combination of hard and soft landscaping elements, as well as passive and active features, providing a wide range of experiences for visitors, from quiet contemplation areas to more active recreational spaces, to promote dynamic and vibrant environment and create opportunities for social interaction, recreation and community engagement. The various forms of the outdoor communal spaces, including cascading landscaped terraces, sky gardens and amenity areas situated across different levels, would create a network that would integrate the indoor uses and outdoor environment seamlessly. Reference had been made to the vertically-integrated multi-level communal spaces in Parco Shibuya in Japan and Pan Pacific Orchard in Singapore;
- (j) to accommodate the additional GFA, the committed BHs of 285mPD in the high zone and 75mPD in the mid zone under the Approved Scheme would need to be increased. To maintain the stepped BH profile, three height bands

were proposed under the Proposed Scheme, including a BH of 360mPD in the high zone for the landmark tower at the southeastern corner of the Site, a BH of 100mPD in the mid zone for the cascading GIC-cum-commercial block along the southern boundary of the Site and a BH of 30mPD in the low zone to maintain reasonable distance from DAs 2 and 3 (i.e. Grand Central) along the northern boundary of the Site;

- (k) URA consulted the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) on the Proposed Scheme on 7.3.2023 and 4.7.2023. KTDC members generally welcomed the Proposed Scheme and urged for early implementation of the redevelopment project. URA also consulted the Panel on Development of Legislative Council (LegCo) on 25.7.2023. LegCo members generally supported the introduction of domestic use and the development of the landmark tower with a BH of 360mPD to strengthen the positioning of KTTC as the town centre of Kwun Tong; and
- (l) subject to the approval of the Chief Executive in Council of the proposed amendments to the DSP in the second quarter of 2024, land grant preparation would be carried out accordingly. It was targeted to restart the tendering exercise for the proposed development of the Site in end 2024. Since “Vertical City” development was a relatively new development concept in Hong Kong, a cautious and pragmatic implementation approach should be adopted and hence, the proposed development of the Site was targeted for completion in 2033.

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD continued to brief Members on the planning considerations and technical assessments for the Site as well as the proposed amendments to the DSP in respect of the Site and DAs 2 and 3, as detailed in paragraphs 5 and 6 of the Paper respectively.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

31. As the presentations of the representatives of PlanD and URA had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer session. The Chairperson reminded



Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29C, the Board's decision on the DSP would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting at which the DSP was considered under the provisions of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance and would be released when the DSP was published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members were reminded to exercise due care when asking questions in the open session of the meeting so as to avoid inadvertent divulgence of their views on the proposed amendments to the DSP to the public. She then invited questions from Members.

*Proposed Increase in GFA and BH*

32. The Vice-chairperson and some Members asked about the considerations and reasons for increasing the maximum total GFA from 201,220m<sup>2</sup> to 268,300m<sup>2</sup> (+ 67,080m<sup>2</sup>) and the maximum BH from 285mPD to 360mPD in the Proposed Scheme.

33. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) with a view to optimising the development potential of the Site and having taken into account the infrastructural capacity, in particular the traffic and sewerage capacities, it was considered technically feasible to increase the maximum total GFA by about 67,000m<sup>2</sup> to 268,300m<sup>2</sup>, i.e. a plot ratio of about 11.8, under the Proposed Scheme. The increase in total GFA could create a critical mass to sustain the proposed development from the economic and financial viability points of view; and
- (b) to accommodate the additional GFA, the BHs of 285mPD and 75mPD under the Approved Scheme would need to be increased correspondingly. Notwithstanding the increase, to respect the BH profile of the previously approved Master Layout Plans, three height bands, including a high zone with a BH of 360mPD (increased from 285mPD), a mid zone with a BH of 100mPD (increased from 70mPD) and a low zone with a BH of 30mPD, were proposed in the Proposed Scheme. The magnitude of the proposed increase in maximum BHs of the landmark tower in the high zone (about +26%) and the GIC-cum-commercial block in the mid zone (about +33%) was generally

in proportion to the proposed increase in the total GFA. Besides, for the proposed BH of the landmark tower, reference had been made to the standard floor-to-floor heights (FTFHs) commonly adopted in developments in Hong Kong, including 3.5m for residential/hotel floors, 4.2m to 5m for office/commercial uses, 4.5m for GIC uses and 5m for communal spaces/refuge floors. The proposed FTFHs were considered reasonable and appropriate. Different BH scenarios such as 320mPD, 360mPD and 400mPD had been considered and examined in the study process and the proposed BH of 360mPD was considered most appropriate having balanced the considerations on urban design and visual impacts and functional requirements.

34. To supplement, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD said that, as stated in Footnote [7] on page 6 of the Paper, the maximum GFA was determined based on various factors including infrastructural (such as traffic and sewerage) capacities, findings of the noise impact assessment, as well as other urban design considerations such as provision of at-grade POS and BH profile of the surrounding areas.

#### *POS and Multi-level Outdoor Communal Spaces*

35. While noting that not less than 7,200m<sup>2</sup> of at-grade POS and not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> of multi-level outdoor communal spaces would be provided under the Proposed Scheme, some Members considered that the provision of POS and communal spaces might not be adequate and some of those spaces were exposed to railway/traffic noise and dust from MTR Kwun Tong Line and Kwun Tong Road, which was undesirable. In that regard, the Vice-chairperson and some Members asked whether it was possible to provide more POS and communal spaces and enhance/refine the design of the POS and multi-level outdoor communal spaces in the Proposed Scheme, and whether the 4,000m<sup>2</sup> multi-level outdoor communal spaces would be merely an aggregate of many piecemeal and scattered communal spaces.

36. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) in keeping with the design elements of the Approved Scheme including a landmark tower at the southeastern corner of the Site, an iconic egg-shaped building at the southwestern corner of the Site and the cascading design of the GIC-cum-commercial block along the southern boundary of the Site, and having regard to the site coverage and BH of the proposed building bulks as well as other relevant considerations on visual and air ventilation perspectives, the provision of not less than 7,200m<sup>2</sup> at-grade POS and not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> outdoor communal spaces was considered appropriate;

#### At-grade POS

- (b) with the proposed at-grade POS of 7,200m<sup>2</sup> and the existing at-grade POS of about 2,400 m<sup>2</sup> in DAs 2 and 3, a total of about 9,600m<sup>2</sup> at-grade POS would be provided in KTTC as a whole;
- (c) part of the proposed at-grade POS in the Proposed Scheme would be dedicated for re-provisioning part of the Yue Man Square Rest Garden (YMSRG). When compared with the original YMSRG, which was located at the roadside and exposed to railway/traffic noise and dust, the re-provisioned YMSRG would be located in the northern part of the Site which was further away from Kwun Tong Road, and hence the re-provisioned YMSRG would be in a more desirable setting;

#### Multi-level Outdoor Communal Spaces

- (d) to embrace the “Vertical City” concept, due regard had been given to maximising the opportunity to provide multi-level outdoor communal spaces. Not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> of outdoor communal spaces would be provided at different levels of the proposed development. According to the air quality impact assessment conducted for the Proposed Scheme, air quality would be better at higher levels, and hence outdoor communal spaces were proposed at the mid-to-high levels at about 100mPD or above;

- (e) some podiums/roof areas at the landmark tower would be required for provision of local open spaces for the future residents in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), and the roof area of the egg-shaped building would be required for EPD's air quality monitoring station, Hence, podium/roof areas available for the purpose of communal space would be limited;
- (f) each outdoor communal space was of considerable size, making it functionally viable. The largest outdoor communal space was proposed on the podium deck of the landmark tower; and
- (g) notwithstanding the above, Members' suggestion of providing more open spaces or communal spaces would be further explored at the detailed design stage.

#### *Air Ventilation Aspect*

37. A Member noted that an air ventilation assessment – initial study using computational fluid dynamics modelling (AVA-IS) was conducted to compare the pedestrian wind environment in the surroundings of the Proposed Scheme with that of the Approved Scheme. The results of the AVA-IS indicated that some civic squares/open spaces nearby would have lower wind velocity ratios under the Proposed Scheme when compared with that of the Approved Scheme, though some mitigation measures such as urban windows design along the Kwun Tong Road façade were proposed under the Proposed Scheme. The Member invited URA to provide more explanations on the results of the AVA-IS and enquired whether it was possible to incorporate more wind enhancement features.

38. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the simulation results of the AVA-IS concluded that with the proposed wind enhancement measures/design elements including setback from adjoining roads, building separations and urban windows design along the Kwun Tong Road façade, the pedestrian wind environment in the surrounding areas was

generally comparable between the Approved Scheme and the Proposed Scheme under annual and summer wind conditions. Slightly higher wind velocity ratios were recorded at the immediate vicinity while slightly lower wind velocity ratios were recorded in a few surrounding areas under the Proposed Scheme; and

- (b) as stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP, in the event that the proposed wind enhancement features were not adopted in the future design scheme, further AVA study should be conducted by the project proponent(s) to demonstrate that the wind performance of the eventual development would not be worse than the Proposed Scheme adopted in the AVA-IS conducted in 2023. More and better wind enhancement measures would be further explored at the detailed design stage.

#### *Pedestrian Connectivity*

39. Some Members considered that some existing pedestrian connections were already congested and the additional 4,000 population brought by the proposed development might further exacerbate the over-crowded situation. While noting that pedestrian connections between the Site and the surrounding areas were proposed, Members invited URA to provide more details of the proposed measures to enhance pedestrian connectivity.

40. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) existing and anticipated pedestrian routings had been thoroughly studied in formulating the pedestrian circulation plan for the proposed development, and it was anticipated that pedestrian flows would come from all directions;
- (b) to enhance accessibility, the following main pedestrian connections would be provided at multi-levels to establish a comprehensive pedestrian system:
  - (i) to the north, multi-level pedestrian connections would be provided between the Site and the retail portions of DAs 2 and 3 (Grand

Central), which would further link to existing footbridges connecting with DA 1 (Park Metropolitan) and Mut Wah Street;

- (ii) to the west, there would be a possible subway connection at the Site to connect with the planned subway across Hong Ning Road near Ngau Tau Kok Road. The subway outside the Site would be constructed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department and the design and location(s) of the connection point(s) at the Site would be subject to liaison and agreement with relevant government department(s) at implementation stage; and
- (iii) to the south, elevated connections linking to the two existing footbridges on Kwun Tong Road, i.e. the APM Millennium City footbridge and the Tsun Yip Lane footbridge, were proposed. To improve pedestrian circulation and alleviate the congestion at Exit A of Kwun Tong Station connecting to APM Millennium City, URA had been actively liaising with MTR Corporation Limited on a proposed landscaped deck for replacing the two existing footbridges connecting the station concourse with the Site with a view to providing more direct and effective pedestrian routes and pleasant pedestrian entrance point for the proposed development, and facilitating the diversion of pedestrian flow from Exit A to the less-congested Exit C of Kwun Tong Station.

#### *Traffic Condition and Parking Space Provision*

41. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the traffic condition in the surrounding areas would be worsened with the proposed development; and
- (b) noting that the Site was located in close proximity to MTR Kwun Tong Station and fewer car parking spaces (i.e. 850) were proposed under the

Proposed Scheme when compared with the Approved Scheme (i.e. 900), the considerations for such provision under the Proposed Scheme.

42. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the traffic impact assessment conducted, major road junctions surrounding the Site, including Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout, would operate at or near capacity in the design year of 2036. A sensitivity test was conducted to compare the junction performance under the Approved Scheme and the different scenarios under the Proposed Scheme, including the worst-case scenario of mixed-use development, in the design year of 2036. Under the Approved Scheme scenario (with more commercial use and no residential use), the design flow to capacity (DFC) at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would reach 0.97. Under the Proposed Scheme scenario (with the introduction of residential use and lesser commercial use), the DFC at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would slightly be reduced to 0.95. The difference was mainly due to different trip generation patterns of commercial and residential uses. It revealed that the traffic condition at Hoi Yuen Road Roundabout would be slightly better under the Proposed Scheme scenario; and
- (b) car parking provision was specified in a range (about 800 to 900 parking spaces) under the Approved Scheme. The provision of 850 car parking spaces under the Proposed Scheme would generally meet the requirements of HKPSG. The actual provision of car parking spaces would be determined subject to agreement with the Transport Department at the detailed design stage.

*Population and Planning Gains for the Community*

43. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the number of residential flats under the Proposed Scheme, and the estimated population and the targeted occupants of the proposed residential development;
- (b) noting the changed socio-economic context of Kwun Tong, whether there was any information about the projected demographic composition in the Kwun Tong district and whether the proposed development could bring benefits to the community and meet the needs of its population particularly those with special needs; and
- (c) the planning gains of the proposed “Vertical City” or the redevelopment project itself.

44. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed residential development at the Site would provide about 1,750 flats, contributing to the overall 4,000 flats planned for the entire KTTC redevelopment project. The whole project would accommodate a total population of about 9,000, compared to a population of about 3,000 before redevelopment. The proposed residential development at the Site was for private housing and the property price of which would be determined by the market; and
- (b) apart from the provision of at-grade POS and multi-level outdoor communal spaces as well as the provision of/improvement to pedestrian connections, as an additional planning gain, URA had explored doubling the GFA for provision of GIC facilities to meet the acute local demand. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) had preliminarily confirmed that funding had been secured for the provision of a day care centre for the elderly, a neighbourhood elderly centre, an outreaching programme centre and a co-parenting support centre at the Site. URA would continue to liaise with SWD and other concerned B/Ds on the provision of more social welfare facilities at the Site. Being situated at the central location, the GIC facilities



to be provided at the Site would be more accessible to the public and serve the broader spectrum of users.

45. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) there was no information on hand regarding the projected demographic composition. As for the overall provision of GIC facilities in the Kwun Tong South Planning Scheme Area, based on a planned population of about 300,000, including the population of the planned residential development at the Site, the existing and planned provisions of major GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the demand of the existing and future population, except for some elderly, child care and rehabilitation services/facilities. SWD had adopted a multi-pronged approach with short to long-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services to meet the needs in the district. Opportunities would also be taken to provide appropriate social welfare facilities within suitable redevelopment projects;
- (b) about 8,600 m<sup>2</sup> GFA was reserved for reprovisioning of certain GIC and public transport facilities within the Site to compensate for those affected by the KTTC redevelopment. Apart from the reprovisioning, URA had been exploring the possibility of providing additional GIC facilities at the Site, aiming to double the provision to a total GFA of up to 17,200 m<sup>2</sup>;
- (c) together with about 22,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA for GIC and public transport facilities provided within DAs 1 to 3, the whole KTTC redevelopment would provide up to 40,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA for GIC and public transport facilities to serve the community, which was more than the allocation of about 20,000 m<sup>2</sup> GFA for such facilities at the redevelopment of Sai Ying Street site in Mong Kok;
- (d) the redevelopment project provided a good opportunity to restructure KTTC by consolidating dispersed, obsolete or substandard GIC and public transport facilities in a convenient location with modern/upgraded standards and in a

desirable setting that could bring benefits to the community; and

- (e) before redevelopment, there was about 4,000m<sup>2</sup> planned POS in KTTC, of which only half had been implemented. The proposed development would provide not less than 7,200m<sup>2</sup> at-grade POS and not less than 4,000m<sup>2</sup> outdoor communal spaces. Together with the 2,400m<sup>2</sup> at-grade POS and the 4,000m<sup>2</sup> outdoor communal spaces provided in DAs 2 and 3, the whole redevelopment project would provide about 9,600 m<sup>2</sup> at-grade POS and 8,000 m<sup>2</sup> outdoor communal spaces. This could greatly enhance the environment of KTTC for public enjoyment.

46. The Chairperson remarked that future occupants of the proposed 1,800 flats would likely be middle-class households with higher consumption power, who could help boost the local economy, such as catering and retail sectors, and in return bring more local employment opportunities. This was also a planning gain for the local community.

47. Noting from paragraph 4.10 of the Paper that a multi-purpose activity centre for community use and floor space designated for social enterprise use for providing a platform to foster social entrepreneurship would be provided at the Site, a Member enquired about the details of such provision.

48. In response, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, said that in keeping with the Approved Scheme, a multi-purpose activity centre for community use (with GFA of not less than 1,500m<sup>2</sup>) and floor space designated for social enterprise use (with GFA of not less than 1,300m<sup>2</sup>) would be provided at the Site. Such proposal was first advocated in 2007 when drafting the DSP. The multi-purpose activity centre would serve as a hub for community gatherings, cultural events and other community-oriented programs, and the designated floor space for social enterprise would provide a platform to foster social entrepreneurship and for social enterprises to carry out their activities.

49. A Member asked whether the proposed development could fulfill the original aspiration of URA to carry out urban renewal project with emphasis on people-oriented approach and promoting social inclusiveness.

50. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, said that the whole redevelopment project aimed to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment and restructuring of KTTC to enhance vitality, improve environmental and traffic conditions, restructure the street pattern, promote efficient land uses and provide fit-for-purpose GIC facilities and POS. It would bring along significant benefits to the community and this was the original aspiration of URA in carrying out urban renewal projects.

*Mixed Uses on the Same Floor*

51. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting from paragraph 4.3 of the Paper that domestic and non-domestic uses would be allowed to be placed on the same floor and appropriate means would be adopted to physically segregate the domestic and non-domestic uses from each other, the reason and necessity for placing domestic and non-domestic uses on the same floor given the considerable number of levels in the "Vertical City" development; and
- (b) noting from Remarks (6) under the "OU(MU)" zone of the Notes of the DSP (Attachment IV of the Paper) that 'Upon development/redevelopment/conversion of a building to a mixed use development, the residential and non-residential portions within a building shall be physically segregated through appropriate building design. Under exceptional circumstances, relaxation of the requirement for physical segregation may be considered by the Town Planning Board on application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance', the rationales of incorporating this clause in the Notes and what the term 'exceptional circumstances' referred to.

52. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the Proposed Scheme was notional and indicative in nature, and URA had prepared different notional schemes to ascertain various worst-case scenarios for the purpose of technical assessments;

- (b) the southern part of the Site facing the elevated MTR Kwun Tong Line on Kwun Tong Road was subject to severe railway noise problem. According to the railway noise impact assessment conducted, it would not be feasible to have residential use in that south-facing portion below 150mPD of the landmark tower in accordance with the noise control criteria under relevant statutory requirements. Hence, residential use was proposed at the mid-to-high levels of the landmark tower as illustrated in the Proposed Scheme, and a higher BH of 360mPD could allow the accommodation of the intended residential use; and
- (c) it was desirable to allow flexibility in the combination of various types of compatible uses, such as commercial and residential uses, either vertically within a building or horizontally on the same floor to meet changing market needs. For example, residential use could be placed in the landmark tower below 150mPD on the portions not facing the MTR Kwun Tong Line. In any case, physical segregation would be provided between the non-domestic and domestic portions on the same floor to prevent any potential nuisance from the non-domestic uses that might be caused to the residents in the domestic portion.

53. In response, Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) in preparing/drafting the Notes for the “OU(MU)” zone of the DSP, reference had been made to the Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans (MSN) and the Town Planning Board Planning Guidelines No. 42 for Designation of “OU(MU)” Zone and Application for Development within “OU(MU)” Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 42);
- (b) according to the MSN for the “OU(MU)” zone, ‘The “OU(MU)” zone is intended primarily for high-density mixed-use developments. Flexibility for the development/redevelopment/conversion of commercial/residential or other uses, or a combination of various types of compatible uses..... is allowed to meet changing market needs. Physical segregation has to be

provided between the non-residential and residential portions within a new/converted building to prevent non-residential uses from causing nuisance to the residents.’; and

- (c) should there be a proposed mixed-use development in the “OU(MU)” zone that could not fulfill the requirement for physical segregation, a s.16 application would be required. The Board would consider each planning application on its individual merits, and due regard would be given to whether the proposed building design, such as the provision of entrances/lift lobbies/staircases, could avoid the possible nuisance and interface problem.

#### *“Vertical City” Development*

54. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the need for a “Vertical City” development in Hong Kong and whether the major consideration for developing “Vertical City” in Hong Kong was simply intended to compete with other world cities; and
- (b) noting that “Vertical City” was a relatively new development concept in Hong Kong, whether the proposed “Vertical City” development at the Site would become the pilot scheme for reference of the Government in considering proposed mixed-use developments in other zonings such as “CDA”.

55. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) it was not URA’s intention to compete with other major cities with the proposed “Vertical City” development. Indeed, it was a visionary objective to promote an international living/working/playing lifestyle in Hong Kong that was on par with other major cities, catching up with the global development trend; and

- (b) although Hong Kong was well-known for its skyscrapers and bustling urban landscape, implementing the “Vertical City” concept in Hong Kong would still require careful planning and considerations. One of the key challenges would be identifying suitable locations for “Vertical City” development. The Site was considered suitable for the pilot development of “Vertical City” in view of its strategic location with good accessibility to public transport and sizable site area for a high-density landmark development, which could in turn strengthen KTTC’s positioning as a multi-purpose town centre to support the development of CBD2 in Kowloon East.

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

- (a) during the development process, the public had generally accepted the major design elements in the proposed development including the provision of an iconic egg-shaped GIC building at the southwestern corner of the Site, cascading building design of the GIC-cum-commercial block along the southern boundary of the Site, the provision of a landmark tower at the southeastern corner of the Site and the provision of at-grade POS along the northern boundary of the Site. With those design commitments, there was limited scope to redistribute the additional GFA horizontally over the Site or in a number of buildings within the Site. The most possible option was to increase the BH of the landmark tower to accommodate the additional GFA; and
- (b) the proposed high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development at the Site would be a pilot scheme in Hong Kong. In fact, Hong Kong was a compact city and it was common to find mixtures of uses juxtaposing with one another in developments. The Board had issued TPB PG-No. 42 which set out the main planning criteria for the designation of “OU(MU)” zone, which included (i) land use compatibility and existing site conditions; (ii) accessibility and transport capacity; (iii) provision of other infrastructures; and (iv) provision of community facilities. Those planning criteria were applicable when considering whether a site was suitable for mixed-use developments.

57. A Member said that the concept of “Vertical City” development originated in the post-industrialisation era to combat rapid and uncontrollable urban sprawl. There had been suggestion of promoting mixed-use development within a high-rise building in an urbanised area. Some conventional “Vertical City” developments had the problem of incompatible land uses being located together without proper planning control. In view of that, the Member enquired whether the proposed “Vertical City” development had incorporated any smart and sustainable elements in respect of energy conservation, public health, mental well-being and social interaction.

58. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site was strategically located at the centre of Kwun Tong and easily accessible by public transport. With the provision of a wide range of community and retail facilities as well as POS/communal spaces at one location, people could access those facilities within a short period of time, which helped minimise the number of commuting trips;
- (b) utility facilities would be installed and concentrated within the Site, reducing the need for extensive land excavation for laying utility facilities over a spatial area;
- (c) emphasis was put on wellness living. POS/communal spaces would create shared space open for the public from all walks of life, encouraging place-making and social gathering; and
- (d) energy-saving elements would be adopted in the proposed development, such as the use of the potential energy of the escalators for other purposes.

59. Noting that the introduction of domestic use into the high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development was a response to meet the changing market needs, the Vice-chairperson asked whether the proposed amendments to the Approved Scheme would further delay the implementation programme of the redevelopment project.

60. In response, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, said that since the unsuccessful tendering for the development of the Site in early 2023, URA had studied the reasons behind and some developers were of the view that the lack of domestic element had made the project less attractive. Hence, to response to the changing market needs and to optimise the development potential of the Site, it was proposed to introduce residential use in the proposed development. It was hoped that with the new development elements and concept, the retendering would be successful to facilitate the early implementation of the project.

### *Design Details*

61. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) there was concern on the building façade design of the residential portion of the landmark tower, for example, supporting frames for air conditioners and drying racks on the external walls might affect the outlook of the landmark tower and whether there were any measures to avoid that problem;
- (b) noting that different uses would be placed in different vertical zones within the high-rise building, whether there were any proposals about vertical transportation system; and
- (c) whether there would be more than one landmark tower on the Site.

62. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) it was believed that the future developers would be capable of designing and constructing an architecturally aesthetic landmark tower, such as with the use of special building materials like Low-E glass;
- (b) vertical transportation system for the proposed landmark building had been explored. Different lift zones for different vertical zones of uses would be arranged with considerations of passengers' travel pattern, peak hour patterns,



capacity handling, average waiting time, etc. The need for double-deck shuttle lifts would also be explored. Reference had been made to the vertical transportation arrangements in high-rise buildings in other cities, e.g. Shanghai Tower; and

- (c) it was clearly stated in paragraph 7.20 of the ES of the DSP that ‘a landmark tower’ with a maximum BH of 360mPD should be provided at the southeastern corner of the Site. URA had no intention to erect more than one landmark tower at the Site.

63. Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD and Mr Steven Y.H. Siu, STP/K, PlanD supplemented that development agreements would be signed between URA and the future developers under which URA could scrutinise and monitor the design and development of the Site, including the landmark tower.

64. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

65. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:10 p.m.]

**CONFIDENTIAL**

**(Downgraded on 8.12.2023)**

**Minutes of 1307<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 17.11.2023**

**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 4**

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Urban Renewal Authority Kwun Tong Town Centre Development Scheme Plan – Main Site No. S/K14S/URA1/2  
(TPB Paper No. 10938)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Deliberation Session**

1. The Chairperson invited Members to consider whether the proposed amendments (i.e. Items A and B) to the approved Development Scheme Plan (DSP) were acceptable and the draft DSP could be deemed suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance.
2. Members generally supported or had no objection to the proposed amendments, and some Members had the following observations/suggestions on Item A:

**“Vertical City” Development**

- (a) the proposed “Vertical City” development at Development Areas (DAs) 4 and 5 (the Site) of Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) was supported. KTTC was strategically located in the centre of Kwun Tong with good accessibility to major public transport. The proposed “Vertical City” development at the Site would provide a wide variety of uses, including residential, office, hotel, retail, government, institution and community (GIC) facilities and public

open spaces (POS)/communal spaces at one place, bringing benefits to the community and demonstrating a good model in urban renewal;

- (b) the concept of “Vertical City” development had actually been reflected in the previous scheme under the s.16 application (No. A/K14/819) submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) and approved by the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board) in September 2022 (the Approved Scheme), which comprised a landmark tower for office, hotel and retail uses with a building height (BH) of 285mPD at the southeastern corner of the Site;
- (c) in response to the unsuccessful tendering for the development of the Site in early 2023 and the changing market needs, URA repackaged the Site from a purely commercial development towards a high-density mixed-use “Vertical City” development with the introduction of residential use in the development mix by increasing the total gross floor area (GFA) to 268,300 m<sup>2</sup> (accountable GFA of 251,100 m<sup>2</sup>) and the BH of the landmark tower to 360mPD. It was agreed that the proposed amendments could make the redevelopment project more attractive for the market and hence, a successful tendering;
- (d) the need for developing “Vertical City” in Hong Kong should not be justified simply by the intention to be on par with other major cities and catch up the global development trend. URA should provide more justifications on planning and community grounds;

*BH and GFA*

- (e) the proposed maximum GFA of 251,100 m<sup>2</sup> and maximum BH of 360mPD for the Site, as specified on the Notes of the DSP, were supported, and based on the individual merits of the future development proposal, flexibility should be allowed for relaxation of the GFA/BH restrictions;

*Air Ventilation, Pedestrian Connections and POS/Outdoor Communal Spaces*

- (f) there might be air ventilation impact brought by the proposed development on the surrounding areas. Consideration should be given to refining/enhancing the building design, such as providing wider urban windows along the building façade facing Kwun Tong Road, to create better wind environment in the surrounding areas;
- (g) the pedestrian connectivity between the Site and the surrounding areas should be improved. While URA's good intention to enhance pedestrian connectivity was noted, consideration should be given to investigating the effectiveness of the proposed pedestrian connection measures, such as the proposal of diverting pedestrians to use MTR Kwun Tong Station Exit C, which might probably be less preferred by pedestrians;
- (h) consideration should be given to enhancing the design of the at-grade POS and multi-level outdoor communal spaces in particular to address the traffic/railway noise and dust problem from MTR Kwun Tong Line and Kwun Tong Road;

#### Planning Gains

- (i) while the provision of POS/communal outdoor spaces and various GIC facilities was the main planning gains URA adopted to justify the proposed development, it would be helpful if URA could provide more relevant information/details in that respect;
- (j) the merit of injecting middle-class households in the old urban area, which could bring along benefits to the local economy as mentioned by the Chairperson, was noted;

#### Mixed Uses

- (k) while noting the intention to allow domestic and non-domestic uses to be located on the same floor with appropriate physical segregation measures, the

operational efficiency and management issue for such arrangement should be addressed;

- (l) since a wide variety of uses, including residential, office, hotel, retail, GIC facilities and POS/communal spaces, would be provided in the landmark tower and there might be a possibility of co-existence of a high-class residential development/a 5-star hotel with POS/communal spaces, due regard should be given to the distribution and design of the various uses/facilities with a view to achieving the planning objective of social inclusiveness; and

Others

- (m) the design of the local open spaces for future residents and the interface problem between the local open spaces and the POS/communal spaces should be enhanced/addressed.

3. A Member enquired whether the proposed amendments to the approved DSP mainly involved the rezoning of the Site from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) and whether there were any specifications on the BH of the Site. In response, the Secretary said that the Site was proposed to be rezoned from “CDA(1)” to “OU(MU)” which was intended for high-density mixed-use developments. According to the Notes of the DSP for the “OU(MU)” zone, the Site was subject to stepped height restrictions, i.e. BH restrictions of 360mPD at the southeastern portion for development of the landmark tower (high zone), 100mPD (mid zone) at the southern portion of the Site for development of the GIC-cum-commercial block, and 30mPD (low zone) along the northern boundary of the Site to facilitate podium connection(s) between DAs 2 & 3 and DAs 4 & 5. Besides, the maximum total, domestic and non-domestic GFAs would be specified, and a clause on minor relaxation of GFA/BH restrictions would be incorporated in the Notes of the “OU(MU)” zone.

4. Two Members enquired whether more detailed explanation could be given on how the maximum BH of 360mPD was determined and opined that URA’s justification for the proposed increase in BH from 285mPD to 360mPD was mainly related to the need to

accommodate additional GFA and URA should provide more justifications for such an exceptionally tall BH for the Site.

5. In response to Members' enquiry on how the maximum BH of 360mPD for the landmark tower was determined, the Secretary made the following main points:

- (a) the determination of an appropriate BH for the landmark tower had taken into account the BH profile of the surrounding areas and the characteristics and constraints of the Site;

*BH Profile of the Surrounding Areas*

- (b) there was a stepped BH profile in the Kwun Tong area with BH gradually ascending from the harbourfront area (i.e. Kwun Tong business area) with BHs of 100/130/160mPD to the inland area (i.e. KTTC) with a BH of 200mPD (i.e. APM Millennium City) and further to the uphill area (Kwun Tong residential area) with various BHs. The BH of 360mPD for the landmark tower was proposed after taking into account the stepped BH profile in the area, among other considerations;

*Characteristics and Constraints of the Site*

- (c) the Site was originally zoned "CDA(1)". Under the "CDA(1)" zone, only GFA restrictions were specified, but not the BH restrictions. Any proposed development under the "CDA" zoning required planning permission from the Board. The applicant had to submit a Master Layout Plan with key development parameters, design concepts and relevant technical assessments/proposals to the Board for consideration;
- (d) in the past years, URA had demonstrated efforts to submit various planning proposals to the Board for consideration and the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) had been consulted on the planning proposals. Under the latest Approved Scheme, major design elements including the provision of an iconic egg-shaped GIC building at the southwestern corner of the Site,

cascading building design of the GIC-cum-commercial block along the southern boundary of the Site, the provision of a landmark tower at the southeastern corner of the Site and the provision of at-grade POS of not less than 7,200 m<sup>2</sup> (including the re-provisioning of the Yue Man Square Rest Garden) had been incorporated. Those design elements had been generally accepted by the public/KTDC. With those design commitments, there was limited scope of redistributing the additional GFA horizontally over the Site and the most possible option was to increase the BH of the landmark tower to accommodate the additional GFA; and

- (e) the proposed increase in GFA and BH had also taken into account the infrastructural (such as traffic and sewerage) capacities, findings of the noise impact assessment as well as other urban design/visual/air ventilation considerations while optimising the development potential of the Site. A high-rise tower at the southeastern corner of the Site was accepted in approving the previous schemes, and the proposed increase in BH was mainly to accommodate the increased GFA in a proportional manner. After testing and comparing of different BH options, the proposed maximum BH of 360mPD was considered as appropriate by URA.

6. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the proposed amendments to the approved DSP as set out in the Paper, and remarked that Members' observations/suggestions, including those on justifications for the increase in GFA/BH, details of planning gains, air ventilation/wind environment, pedestrian connectivity, provision of POS/communal spaces and GIC facilities as well as local open spaces for the future residents would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting for URA's consideration and follow-up actions, as appropriate. The Chairperson remarked that the Town Planning Board could further scrutinise the proposed redevelopment project during the consideration of representations in respect of the draft DSP, and it was believed that URA would be able to provide more details of the layout design, planning gains/design merits, etc. to address Members' concerns at that juncture.

7. After deliberation, Members decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) – Main Site Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K14S/URA1/2 and that the draft URA KTTC – Main Site DSP No. S/K14S/URA1/2A at Attachment II of TPB Paper No. 10938 (the Paper) (to be renumbered as S/K14S/URA1/3 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment IV of the Paper being suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance; and
- (b) adopt the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) at Attachment VI of the Paper for the draft URA KTTC – Main Site DSP No. S/K14S/URA1/3 as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of Town Planning Board for various land use zonings of the DSP and agree the revised ES being suitable for publication together with the DSP.

8. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft DSP including its Notes and ES, if appropriate, before its publication under the Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revisions would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

9. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29C, the Board's decision on the DSP would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting and would be released when the draft DSP was exhibited for public inspection. Members should exercise due care so as to avoid inadvertent divulgence of their views on the proposed amendments to the DSP to the public before its publication.



**Extract of Minutes of Kwun Tong District Council Meeting**

(Translation)

**Minutes of the 23rd Meeting of the  
6th Term Kwun Tong District Council (Full Council)**

**Date:** 4 July 2023 (Tuesday)  
**Time:** 9:30 a.m. – 12:25 p.m.  
**Venue:** Conference Room, Kwun Tong District Office,  
Unit 05-07, 20/F, Millennium City 6, 392 Kwun Tong Road,  
Kwun Tong, Kowloon

<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Arrival Time</u></b>	<b><u>Leaving Time</u></b>
Mr OR Chong-shing Wilson, MH (Chairman)	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr LUI Tung-hai, MH (Vice-chairman)	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr CHAN Yiu-hung Jimmy, MH	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Ms FU Pik-chun, MH	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr HSU Yau-wai	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr KAN Ming-tung, MH	9:35 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Ms LAI Po-kwai	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr LAM Wai	9:33 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr LEUNG Tang-fung	9:33 a.m.	11:30 a.m.
Dr NGAN Man-yu	9:40 a.m.	11:20 a.m.
Mr PANG Chi-sang	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mrs POON YAM Wai-chun Winnie, BBS, MH	9:40 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr SO Koon-chung Kevin	10:11 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Mr TAM Siu-cheuk	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.
Ms TSE Suk-chun	9:30 a.m.	12:25 p.m.

**In attendance**

Mr LAM Siu-hong, Andy, JP	District Officer (Kwun Tong)
Mr LAM Fuk-leong, Jack	Assistant District Officer (Kwun Tong)2
Ms CHIN Tsang-lo, Jennifer	District Commander (Kwun Tong), Hong Kong Police Force
Ms TSE Tsui-yan	District Commander (Sau Mau Ping), Hong Kong Police Force
Mr WONG Joen-peng	Police Community Relations Officer, Kwun Tong District, Hong Kong Police Force
Mr TAM Man-hoi, Jack	Police Community Relations Officer, Sau Mau Ping District,

	Hong Kong Police Force	
Mr LEUNG Chi-foon	Chief Engineer/East 2, Civil Engineering and Development Department	
Mr CHU Cheuk-king	Senior Transport Officer/Kwun Tong 2, Transport Department	
Mr CHEUK Cheung-kei, Cheuky	Senior Property Service Manager/Kowloon East / Acting Chief Manager/Management (Kowloon East), Housing Department	
Mr YEUNG Wun-ming	Acting District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Kwun Tong), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	
Ms OR Ying-ying	Acting District Environmental Hygiene Superintendent (Kwun Tong), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	
Mr LEUNG Po-wah, Taddy	District Social Welfare Officer (Kwun Tong), Social Welfare Department	
Ms CHEUNG Yee-mei, May	Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon), Leisure and Cultural Services Department	
Mr LUI Chi-chung	District Leisure Manager (Kwun Tong), Leisure and Cultural Services Department	
Ms SIU Sau-king, Michelle	Deputy District Leisure Manager (District Support) Kwun Tong, Leisure and Cultural Services Department	
Miss CHOW Tak-sum, Amy	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Kwun Tong District Office	
Miss IP Wai-ming, Phoebe	Senior Liaison Officer (1), Kwun Tong District Office	
Ms WONG Yuet-ngo, Joey	Senior Liaison Officer (2), Kwun Tong District Office	
Mr CHAN Hoi-ming, Peter	Senior Liaison Officer (3), Kwun Tong District Office	
Miss HUI Po-yu, Bowie	Executive Officer I (District Council), Kwun Tong District Office	

**Secretary**

Mr CHOW Lap-kan, Douglas	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Kwun Tong District Office
--------------------------	---

**Attendance by Invitation**

Ms YOUNG Bick-kwan, Irene, JP	Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene	<b>Item II</b>
Mr TSOI Ka-wai	Assistant Director (Operations)2, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department	

Mr CHAN Siu-wing, Andy	Assistant Director (Environmental Compliance), Environmental Protection Department	<b>Item III</b>
Dr CHENG Kin-wui	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional East), Environmental Protection Department	
Mr NG Kai-ming, Alfred	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional East) <sup>3</sup> Environmental Protection Department	
Mr CHAN Muk-keung, Ringo	Senior Estate Surveyor/Kwun Tong, District Lands Office, Kowloon East, Lands Department	
Mr FUNG Man-hon	Structural Engineer/C1-4, Buildings Department	
Mr NG Lap-hay, Andrew	Marine Manager/Harbour Patrol Section (1), Marine Department	
Mr HO Chung-hong, Alfonso	Engineer/Kowloon (Customer Services) Inspection, Water Supplies Department	
Mr Mike KWAN	General Manager, Planning and Design, Urban Renewal Authority	<b>Item IV</b>
Ms LI Yee-ting	Senior Manager, Planning and Design, Urban Renewal Authority	
Ms Loretta FONG	General Manager, Community Development, Urban Renewal Authority	
Ms Esther LAI	Senior Manager, Community Development, Urban Renewal Authority	

~~The Chairman welcomed all the Members and government representatives to the 23rd meeting of the Full Council ("FC") under the 6th Term Kwun Tong District Council ("KTDC"). He especially welcomed Ms May CHEUNG, the successive Chief Leisure Manager (Kowloon) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department ("LCSD"), for attending the meeting for the first time.~~

#### **Item I — Confirmation of Minutes of Last Meeting**

2. Members raised no other comments. The minutes of the 22nd meeting were confirmed.

#### **Item II — Meeting with the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene**

- ~~3. The Chairman welcomed the Director of Food and Environmental Hygiene ("DFEH"),~~

and 22 Tung Yuen Street in Yau Tong”

18. After voting, the extempore motion was carried with 16 votes in favour, zero vote against, and zero abstention.

19. The Chairman once again urged the departments concerned to continue to follow up on the ~~environmental pollution problems of the CBPs in Yau Tong.~~

**Item IV — Urban Renewal Authority: Progress Report on Kwun Tong Redevelopment Project**  
**(KTDC Paper No. 17/2023)**

20. The Chairman reported that the Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) would present to KTDC the latest progress of the Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment Project (Development Area 4 and 5). He welcomed General Manager, Planning and Design, Senior Manager, Planning and Design, General Manager, Community Development, and Senior Manager, Community Development of URA, for attending the meeting.

21. The representatives of URA presented the paper.

22. Members raised views and enquiries as follows:

22.1 Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong (i) commended URA for its proactive attitude in communicating with district personalities and addressing their enquiries; (ii) estimated that the works would be completed in around 2036 if progressed smoothly. However, in the event of any delays, it was possible that the time of completion would further postpone for a few more years, meaning that the whole project would only be completed after over ten years. In the meantime, the population of Kwun Tong and the entire Hong Kong, as well as the number of drivers, would continue to increase. Hence, he enquired with URA if the relevant increase in population and the number of vehicles had been considered in the project design; (iii) believed that the improvement in the illegal parking problem in Kwun Tong in recent years hinged on the stringent enforcement actions by the police. He said that the project’s fee-charging rooftop observation deck and the free public open space on the lower floors would indeed attract residents from Kwun Tong, other parts of Hong Kong, as well as tourists to visit. However, he was concerned that there were insufficient coach and private car parking spaces, which might eventually lead to vehicles parking at the roadside and obstructing the traffic. Also, he opined that the over 700 parking spaces provided by URA were inadequate. He hoped that URA would take up more social responsibilities in the

redevelopment project, such as adjusting the parking fees to be lower than that of the nearby car parks, and adopting smart parking to further increase the number of parking spaces, thus attracting drivers to park their vehicles in the car park instead of at the roadside.

- 22.2 Mr PANG Chi-sang said that URA mentioned earlier that the amount of space provided to government departments in the redevelopment project would be doubled, and it was expected that services such as Chinese medicine and dental care would be offered. He added that the redevelopment area included some demolished government offices. Therefore, the relevant government departments would have to re-establish their offices in Development Areas 4 and 5 after the completion of the redevelopment. He hoped that government departments would take this opportunity to coordinate the swapping of offices between some of the administrative and service departments, so as to maximise the use of the space by service departments, bringing convenience to Kwun Tong residents using government services and enhancing their sense of belonging to the district. For example, he said that the Labour Department could set up an office providing employment support services at the said location for residents' easy access.
- 22.3 Mr KAN Ming-tung hoped that URA could seize the opportunity to properly plan and supervise the relevant project, especially in terms of pedestrian flow. He was concerned that the increase in pedestrian flow arising from the project might affect residents' smooth commute to and from the MTR station. Lastly, he urged URA to closely monitor the safety problems that might arise from the demolition of the government platform by the contractors.
- 22.4 Mr TAM Siu-cheuk opined that the time needed to complete the project, which was nearly 30 years, was too long. This also reflected that URA had apparently missed the appropriate timing to a certain extent. Hence, he urged URA to compress the procedures in the project as far as possible, otherwise, with its current efficiency, future redevelopment projects in other locations would be unable to commence. He reiterated that the current work efficiency of URA was unsatisfactory and could not catch up with urban decay. Hence, he asked URA to have a better grasp of the market development to avoid missing the right timing again. Otherwise, no matter how much views were raised by Members, it would all become empty talk.
- 22.5 Mr Kevin SO (i) said that it had been frequently reported in the news that URA was facing financial constraints. He believed that it was due to URA spending most of its funds on land resumption, but the funds could not be recycled in time due to

unsuccessful tendering; (ii) said that Members had been continuously discussing the project in the past decade but had not anticipated that the commercial floor area in Kwun Tong would have a vacancy rate of over 10%. He expressed his support for URA to continue to complete the project, but said that all parties could only predict the public's demand for residential area in 2036 at present. He opined that while the public had a genuine demand for housing, the prices of the residential flats of other URA projects in the past had been relatively high. He was worried that the results would fall short of expectation. He hoped that the redevelopment project could be successfully planned, tendered and commenced, and be completed in 2036 as planned; (iii) regarding the suggestion of swapping offices between government departments, he understood that URA did not have the power to control the choice of site for government department relocation. He merely hoped that the problem concerning the public's convenience in accessing government services could be rationalised and resolved through district administration in the future; (iv) said that the project site had been left vacant for a long time. From his observation during site inspections, the effect of using the site as a temporary site was unsatisfactory. Hence, he hoped that URA could compress the procedures and take forward the redevelopment project, and that URA's new planning proposal could be successfully endorsed in the Town Planning Board.

22.6 Mr LAM Wai (i) expressed his concern about URA's claim that the new planning proposal might not be able to bring significant improvements to the traffic in the district when compared to the approved proposal. He had made reference to similar buildings in other countries and pointed out that they were all built with multi-storey underground structures. He added that the redevelopment project was an opportunity for improving the traffic in the district. He opined that even with excellent buildings and facilities, new problems would arise if the supporting transport facilities were not simultaneously in place. Hence, he hoped that URA would properly plan the relevant traffic arrangements.

22.7 Mrs Winnie POON (i) said that she had been involved in the back and forth discussions of the redevelopment project in the past 40 years and the project had only officially commenced in the recent decade. Changes in the society and the world had been unpredictable in recent years. She opined that URA could only try its best to make changes and find a way out at this difficult time, and all parties would have to actively face the difficulties in the redevelopment project and seek ways to make it happen; (ii) said that she did not have much opinion regarding the project at present and believed that there was no need to worry too much about the future; (iii) opined that the current environment of the project site was unsatisfactory, with uneven topography and the

presence of mosquito breeding. Hence, she requested that URA should make rectifications and transform it into a useful site.

23. The representative of URA responded to Members' views and enquiries as follows:

- 23.1 Technical assessment: URA had appointed a consultant to prepare various technical assessments for the new planning proposal. In conducting the traffic assessment, apart from conducting traffic surveys and calculating the actual traffic flow in the project area at present, the consultant would also take into consideration the projected increase in vehicular flow arising from the new developments within Kwun Tong District in the future, including the estimated population increase in future, in order to conduct a comprehensive assessment. At the same time, the relevant government departments would also review the technical assessments submitted by URA to ensure that the estimation of future population and commercial activities data had been included in the technical assessments.
- 23.2 Admission fees for the rooftop observation deck: in view of the expenses required for daily operation, management and maintenance, URA reiterated that there would be an admission fee for the observation deck at the building rooftop. As for the diversified public space of over 4 000 square metres on the lower floors, it would be opened to the public daily during appropriate time slots for free.
- 23.3 Specific number of parking spaces: a five-storey underground car park with around 850 parking spaces would be provided in the project. URA would also discuss with TD the specific number of parking spaces.
- 23.4 Adopting smart parking: URA was actively exploring different modes of smart parking. However, as the project was still at the planning stage, URA was unable to respond with details for the time being.
- 23.5 Bringing in service departments: regarding the coordination of swapping offices between government departments, the departments would have to communicate with the Government Property Agency on their own. URA agreed with this suggestion for the convenience of the public and would explore the feasibility of the suggestion with government departments.
- 23.6 Expediting the works progress of the project: URA had considered various ways to expedite the project and shorten the overall time required for the works, including the feasibility for URA to follow up on part of the works, such as diversion of underground

pipelines, before awarding the project to contractors.

23.7 Improving traffic situation under the new planning proposal: when conducting the study for the new planning proposal, URA had considered the capacity of the infrastructures in the district to ensure that it would not bring insurmountable problems in aspects such as traffic and environment. In terms of traffic, the commuting patterns of residential and office/commercial uses were different. Even if the residential population had increased, URA would at the same time reduce the commercial floor area to avoid significant increase in the overall traffic flow. Therefore, the figures of the traffic impact assessment for the new planning proposal were comparable to the figures of the impact assessment of the “floating planning parameters” scheme on nearby major road junctions. URA expected that both the existing and future road networks would be able to cope with the traffic flow arising from the increase in the gross floor area.

23.8 Underground structures in vertical city development: URA said that there would be a five-storey basement in the redevelopment project. After conducting basic ground investigation works, URA was informed that there was a rock layer located approximately half to one storey below the ground surface at the site of Kwun Tong Town Centre, i.e. north of Kwun Tong Road. URA said that it was already difficult to conduct underground excavations for five storeys for the redevelopment project. Further increasing the number of basement levels would entail massive financial costs, time and resources, and therefore would not be cost-effective. URA had tried its best to provide around 850 parking spaces for the project.

23.9 Beautification of the temporary site during the construction period: URA said that it would mainly focus on explaining the design concept of “vertical city” in this meeting, and would discuss the temporary uses of the site in the relevant committee.

24. The Chairman said that KTDC was very concerned about the Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment project and would respect and understand URA’s arrangements for the new planning proposal. KTDC hoped that URA could improve its planning after listening to Members’ views, so as to benefit Kwun Tong residents and all members of the public in Hong Kong.

~~Item V — (A) Reports by Chairman of the District Management Committee  
(KTDC Paper No. 18/2023)~~

~~25. Mr CHEUNG Pui-kong was concerned about the works progress of the East Kowloon~~



**Provision of Open Space and Major Government, Institution or Community Facilities  
in Kwun Tong (South) Planning Area**

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	30.96 ha	18.26 ha	29.77 ha	-1.19 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons <sup>#</sup>	30.96 ha	57.38 ha	59.19 ha	+28.23 ha
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	4	4	4	0
Sports Ground/ Sports Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	1	0	0	-1
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	1	1	1	0
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	0	2	2	+2
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	1	1	1	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons  (assessed on a regional basis)	0	0	0	0
Community Hall	No set standard	N.A.	4	4	N.A.
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons <sup>π</sup>  (assessed on a district basis)	1	4	4	+3

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to under 6 <sup>#</sup>	141 classrooms	166 classrooms	166 classrooms	+25 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a district/school network basis)	429 classrooms	467 classrooms	467 classrooms	+38 classrooms
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by EDB on a territorial-wide basis)	389 classrooms	550 classrooms	550 classrooms	+161classrooms
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons <sup>^</sup>  (assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional/cluster basis)	1,781 beds	1,574 beds	2,134 beds	+353 beds
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons  (assessed on a district basis)	3	3	3	0
Child Care Centre	100 aided places per 25,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	1,239 places	272 places	472 places	-767 places <sup>@</sup>  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD <sup>@</sup> )
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a local basis)	4	7	7	+3
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a service boundary basis)	2	3	3	+1

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
District Elderly Community Centres	One in each new development area with a population of around 170,000 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	1	1	N.A.
Neighbourhood Elderly Centres	One in a cluster of new and redeveloped housing areas with a population of 15,000 to 20,000 persons, including both public and private housing <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD)	N.A.	8	8	N.A.
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#*</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1,768 places	995 places	1,193 places	-575 places <sup>@</sup>  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD <sup>@</sup> )
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	2,190 beds	951 beds	1,161 beds	-1,029 beds <sup>@</sup>  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD <sup>@</sup> )
Pre-school Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented places per 1,000 children aged 0 – 6 <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	216 places	0 places	240 places	+24 places
Day Rehabilitation Services	23 subvented places per 10,000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	629 places	712 places	892 places	+263 places

Type of Facilities	Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG)	HKPSG Requirement (based on planned population)	Provision		Surplus/ Shortfall (against planned provision)
			Existing Provision	Planned Provision (including Existing Provision)	
Residential Care Services	36 subvented places per 10,000 persons aged 15 or above <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a cluster basis)	985 places	690 places	940 places	-45 places <sup>@</sup>  (A long-term target assessed on a wider spatial context by SWD <sup>@</sup> )
Community Rehabilitation Day Centre	1 centre per 420,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1	1	1	0
District Support Centre for Persons with Disabilities	1 centre per 280,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1	1	1	0
Integrated Community Centre for Mental Wellness	1 standard scale centre per 310,000 persons <sup>#</sup>  (assessed by SWD on a district basis)	1	2	2	+1

Note:

The planned resident population is 309,694. If including transients, the overall planned population is about 323,870. The population figures have been adjusted downwards to the nearest hundred for assessment purpose.

# The requirements exclude planned population of transients.

^ The deficit in provision is based on OZP planned population while the Hospital Authority plans its services on a cluster basis, and takes into account a number of factors in planning and developing various public healthcare services. The Kowloon East Cluster provides services for residents in Kwun Tong and Sai Kung districts.

\* Consisting of 40% centre-based CCS and 60% home-based CCS.

@ The deficit in provision is based on OZP planned population while the Social Welfare Department (SWD) adopts a wider spatial context/cluster in the assessment of provision for such facility. In applying the population-based planning standards, the distribution of welfare facilities, supply in different districts, service demand as a result of the population growth and demographic changes as well as the provision of different welfare facilities have to be considered. As the HKPSG requirements for these facilities are a long-term goal, the actual provision will be subject to consideration of the SWD in the planning and development process as appropriate. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long-, medium- and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand.

π Small libraries are counted towards meeting the HKPSG requirement.

**April 2024**