



**SCHEDULE OF AMENDMENTS TO THE
APPROVED KAI TAK OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/K22/6
MADE BY THE TOWN PLANNING BOARD
UNDER THE TOWN PLANNING ORDINANCE (Chapter 131)**

I. Amendments to Matters shown on the Plan

- Item A – Revision to the stipulated building height restriction for the site zoned “Comprehensive Development Area (4)” (“CDA(4)”) on the south-eastern side of Olympic Avenue and the north-eastern side of Muk Lai Street.
- Item B – Rezoning of a site on the south-eastern side of Olympic Avenue and the south-western side of Muk Lai Street from “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) to “Residential (Group A)6” (“R(A)6”) with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item C – Rezoning of three sites situated between Olympic Avenue and Road L16 from “C(3)” to “R(A)5” with stipulation of building height restrictions and addition of two symbols on the Plan for linking up the three sites.
- Item D – Re-alignment of the areas shown as ‘Underground Shopping Street’.
- Item E1 – Rezoning of a strip of land along the north-western boundary of Kai Tak Sports Park from “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Stadium” (“OU(Stadium)”) to “Open Space” (“O”).
- Item E2 – Rezoning of a parcel of land at Shing Kai Road from an area shown as ‘Road’ to “O(2)”.
- Item E3 – Rezoning of a parcel of land at Shing Kai Road from “O(2)” to an area shown as ‘Road’.
- Item F – Rezoning of a site on the north-eastern side of Shing Fung Road and the south-eastern side of Shing King Street from “C(4)” to “Residential (Group B)8” (“R(B)8”).
- Item G – Rezoning of a site on the south-western side of Shing Fung Road and the north-western side of Shing King Street from “C(7)” to “R(B)9”.
- Item H – Rezoning of a site on the south-western side of Shing Fung Road and the south-eastern side of Shing King Street from “C(5)” to “R(B)10”.
- Item I – Rezoning of a site at the junction of To Kwa Wan Road and San Ma Tau Street from “OU” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft” (“OU(TVS)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “C(9)” with stipulation of building height restriction.

- Item J1 – Rezoning of a site to the south and southeast of the To Kwa Wan Road Pumping Station from “G/IC”, “OU” annotated “Waterfront Related Commercial, Cultural and Leisure Uses” (“OU(WRCCLU)”) and “O” to “R(A)6” with stipulation of building height restriction.
- Item J2 – Rezoning of a parcel of land to the east of the To Kwa Wan Road Pumping Station from “OU(WRCCLU)” to “O”.
- Item K – Rezoning of Kwun Tong Ferry Pier from “OU” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) to “OU(Pier)(1)”.
- Item L – Rezoning of a piece of land at Cha Kwo Ling Road from “G/IC” to “O”.

Removing the indicative alignment of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System and Station from the Plan.

Showing the road alignment for the Trunk Road T2 authorized under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Chapter 370) on 11 November 2014 by the Permanent Secretary for Transport and Housing (Transport) on the Plan for information. The authorized road scheme shall be deemed to be approved pursuant to section 13A of the Town Planning Ordinance.

II. Amendments to the Notes of the Plan

- (a) Revision to the Remarks for the “C” zone to incorporate development restrictions for the new “C(9)” sub-area and to delete the “C(3)”, “C(4)”, “C(5)” and “C(7)” sub-areas.
- (b) Revision to the “CDA” zone to replace ‘Flat (on land designated “CDA” and “CDA(5)” only)’, ‘House (on land designated “CDA” and “CDA(5)” only)’ and ‘Residential Institution (on land designated “CDA” and “CDA(5)” only)’ under Column 2 by ‘Flat’, ‘House’ and ‘Residential Institution’ respectively.
- (c) Revision to the Remarks for the “CDA” zone to update the planning intention and incorporate the revised development restrictions for the “CDA(4)” sub-area.
- (d) Revision to the Remarks for the “R(A)” zone to incorporate development restrictions and requirements for the new “R(A)5” and “R(A)6” sub-areas.
- (e) Revision to the “R(B)” zone to incorporate ‘Social Welfare Facility (on land designated “R(B)8”, “R(B)9” and “R(B)10” only)’ under Column 1 and ‘School’ under Column 2, and to correspondingly replace ‘Social Welfare Facility’ under Column 2 by ‘Social Welfare Facility (not elsewhere specified)’.
- (f) Revision to the Remarks for the “R(B)” zone to incorporate development restrictions and requirements for the new “R(B)8”, “R(B)9” and “R(B)10” sub-areas and to replace ‘Road D2’ and ‘proposed Shatin to Central Link’ by ‘Shing Kai Road’ and ‘MTR Tuen Ma Line’ respectively.

- (g) Revision to the “OU(Pier)” zone to incorporate ‘Institutional Use (on land designated “OU(Pier)(1)” only)’ and ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (on land designated “OU(Pier)(1)” only)’ under Column 1 and to incorporate the planning intention for the new “OU(Pier)(1)” sub-area.
- (h) Revision to the “OU(TVS)” zone to delete Schedule II (for existing industrial building).
- (i) Deletion of ‘Market’ from Column 1 of the “C” and Schedule I of the “OU” annotated “Mixed Use” zones and from Column 2 of the “CDA” and “OU” annotated “Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment” zones.
- (j) Revision of ‘Shop and Services’ to ‘Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)’ under Column 1 of the “OU(Stadium)” zone and under Column 2 of the “R(A)” and “G/IC” zones.

Town Planning Board

10 December 2021

List of Representatives in respect of
Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/7

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Representer
R1	Hong Kong Housing Society (香港房屋協會)
R2	Wong Man Kwan
R3	Hung Ting Wai
R4	Fu Yee Ming
R5	Cheung Yick Wang Edwin
R6	Lo Chun
R7	Leung Hon Chung
R8	Designing Hong Kong Limited (創建香港)
R9	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (香港地產建設商會)
R10	Mary Mulvihill
R11	Ko Yuen Na
R12	Cheung Ka Hei
R13	Chan Kin Ho
R14	Tsang Ka Man
R15	Kwok Pui Sum
R16	Au Wing Lam
R17	Lee Chun Yin
R18	Cheng Hei Yin
R19	Leung Chun Yin
R20	Chen Weijie
R21	Zhu Ying
R22	Wong Lung Chi Gary
R23	凌健朗
R24	Tam Siu Hong
R25	Lo Shing Fung
R26	Wong Wai Pong
R27	Wing Him Tsang
R28	Leung Fung Lin
R29	Cheng Lai Lai
R30	Yeung Chung Hang
R31	Ip Sze Man

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Representer
R32	Chan Yin Hang
R33	Lam Wang Kei
R34	Fu Pui Chu Yumi
R35	Wong Kin Wai
R36	Chan Pik Chen
R37	Tse Mei Wah
R38	Mak Wai Kwan Benjamin
R39	Lee Chi Pan
R40	蘇少婷
R41	Lee Si Nga
R42	Li Ming Yeung
R43	Worldwide Cruise Terminals (環美郵輪碼頭) ¹
R44	Lui Yat Wai
R45	NT Yung
R46	Wong Chi Hong
R47	Lee Tsoi Yan
R48	Kwong Sin Hang
R49	Ng Wai Tung
R50	Owners' Committee of Grand Waterfront (翔龍灣業主委員會)
R51	The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (香港中華煤氣有限公司)
R52	Lam Tin Wai
R53	丁義
R54	Chung Kwok Leung
R55	Wong Kwai Ying
R56	Cheungsiofai
R57	Ho Ka Kin
R58	Tsui Hei Yan
R59	Lau Wing Sing
R60	Wong Sin Man
R61	So Chun Yu

¹ Co-signed by Legislative Council Members Hon. Bill TANG Ka-piu, Hon. Frankie YICK Chi-ming, Hon. Perry YIU Pak-leung, District Council (DC) Members Mr CHEUNG King-fan and Mr. Paul ZIMMERMAN, cruise lines companies, including Celebrity Cruises International, Costa Crociere S.P.A, Genting Hong Kong, Norwegian Cruise Line Holdings, Royal Caribbean International Hong Kong and companies of travel and transport industry, including Blue Sea Ferry, Connexus Travel Limited, EGL Tours Company Limited, Goldjoy Travel Limited, Incruising Travel Asia, Jetour Holding Limited, Miramar Travel, Travel Expert, Wallem Ship Agency and Wing On Travel Service Limited

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Representer
R62	Wong Tsz Fung
R63	Choy Suk Ching
R64	Lin Mei Zhen
R65	To Yee Wah
R66	Yu Yuen Yee
R67	Lam Kwong Chung
R68	Lau Yin
R69	Mak Siu Chu
R70	Fong Fung Ki
R71	張景勛議員辦事處
R72	歐展文
R73	Fung Chiz
R74	Chu Ka Wa
R75	Chan Kam Yi
R76	Li Cho Hang
R77	Kwan Tak Yan
R78	Lau Man Kuen Apple
R79	Fung Ming Leung
R80	Yuen Yui Pong
R81	Lin Wing Kai
R82	Lee Chi Wa
R83	To Lai Ming
R84	Wong Kwok Ming
R85	Chan Chui Ting
R86	Li Wing Kit
R87	吳皓為
R88	Lui Cheuk Fai
R89	Cheung Chin Fai
R90	Tsui Hei Yan
R91	Li Yim Tung Patra
R92	Liu Cheuk Hei Terry
R93	Kong Kit Shan
R94	Ip Chun Wa
R95	Lam Hak Ming
R96	許智傑
R97	Chung Hok Leung

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Representer
R98	Mui Pui Ling
R99	Leung Pui King
R100	Chong Sui Ki
R101	Luk Ka Fai
R102	Tang Tsz Ki
R103	Shui Chi Wai
R104	陳四妹
R105	Tse Sui Ching
R106	Ken Hsu
R107	Wong Kwai Fong
R108	Yiu Yui Keung
R109	Tong Sau Ling
R110	Ip Siu Ki
R111	張楚賢
R112	邱景恆
R113	蘇華喜
R114	Lau Fai Lawrence
R115	Yan Chung Man

**List of Commenters in respect of
Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/7**

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Commenter
C1	Hong Kong Housing Society (香港房屋協會)
C2	Chan Yan Chi
C3	Lee Tsoi Yan
C4	Yuen Mei Ching
C5	Lee Hin Yeung
C6	Lui Cheuk Fai
C7	Peter Wu
C8	Yu Kai
C9	Li Si Juan
C10	Ip Alison Wai Yi
C11	Worldwide Cruise Terminals (Hong Kong) Limited
C12	Lam Wang Kei
C13	Ip Sze Man
C14	Designing Hong Kong Limited (創建香港)
C15	Maggie Lau
C16	Li Hon Yee
C17	Edmond Yew Yat Ming
C18	Yue Lit Fung Owen
C19	Hong Kong Tramways Limited (香港電車)
C20	Cheung Wai Pang
C21	Ip Chak Leung Vincent
C22	The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (香港地產建設商會)
C23	Chung Tak Lun
C24	Chan Po Ki
C25	Ho Man Long
C26	Luo Jin Ying
C27	Chak Ka Hang
C28	Chung Wai Kit
C29	Cheng Man Shan
C30	Lee Si Nga
C31	Fong Sui Kwan
C32	Chong Po Ling

Comment No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Name of Commenter
C33	Wong Shung Ka Barkey
C34	Leung Kok Yiu
C35	Chong Po Chun
C36	Yau King Hang
C37	Li Lok Yung
C38	Tsoi Yu Chung
C39	Chow Pui Ting
C40	Chan Yin Hang Kuby
C41	Lai Kit
C42	Chow Sai Hung
C43	Kwong Sin Hang
C44	Wong Shun Yee
C45	Leung Wing Wai
C46	林雙燕
C47	Mak Siu Chu
C48	Kong Hoi Lam
C49	Lau Yin
C50	Mary Mulvihill
C51	To Hon Yin Ernest
C52	Cheung Wai Pang
C53	SU YIRAN
C54	Tian Mu

**Summary of Representations and Comments and Government Bureaux/Departments' Responses
in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/7**

(1) The grounds and proposals of the representers (TPB/R/S/K22/7-R1 to R115) as well as responses are summarised below:

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R1 (Hong Kong Housing Society)	<p>Supports Amendment Items J1 and J2</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) development at Ma Tau Kok is intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/or urban renewal projects, which is in line with the Government's policy to increase housing land supply. Around 1,100 units will be provided with a population of about 3,000 residents.</p> <p>(b) The proposed maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD is optimum and compatible with the stepped height profile descending from the Grand Waterfront to the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP).</p> <p>(c) The proposed DRE development is sensitively designed with consideration of and in complement to the 'Dining Cove' concept. The integration of a public open space (POS) of not less than 2,700m² and other facilities will bring activity, vibrancy and liveliness to the waterfront and the surrounding areas.</p>	<p>(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(b) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(c) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(d) The POS will be a comprehensive green linkage that seamlessly connects the inner Ma Tau Kok area, the planned waterfront promenade of the ‘Dining Cove’ and the planned KTSP, and improves air ventilation and visual permeability.</p> <p>(e) The overall greening ratio of the proposed DRE development would achieve 30%, with greenery providing at various levels to soften the built form and help to provide a smooth transition between the proposed development and the surrounding area.</p> <p>(f) About 5% of the domestic gross floor area (GFA) of the proposed development will be provided for social welfare facilities, which could serve the need in society.</p> <p>(g) Based on the technical assessments, no insurmountable technical impacts are expected to be arisen from the proposed DRE development.</p>	<p>(d) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(e) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(f) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(g) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p>
R2 (individual)	<p>Supports Amendment Items J1 and J2</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Strongly support the rezoning of the site which could bring more than 1,100 residential units to the society.</p> <p>(b) The comfortable open space with ample greening will connect the harbourfront and inland area, forming a pleasant walking environment for the pedestrian.</p>	<p>(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(b) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(c) The building gaps between the proposed residential towers will help wind breeze to penetrate through the gaps and open space at the site then reach the inland area.	(c) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.
R3 (individual)	Supports Amendment Items J1 and J2 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed housing development at the site struck a good balance between adding new housing units and creating a pleasant neighbourhood. (b) The provision of various uses, including retail, alfresco dining and community facilities at the lower levels of the proposed development can greatly enhanced the vibrancy and vitality of the waterfront.	 (a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views. (b) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.
R4 (individual)	Supports Amendment Items J1 and J2 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Support the rezoning proposal since it will turn the land parcel into a public housing development site providing more than 1,100 flats. (b) The DRE will accommodate the residents affected by the government development/urban renewal projects in the district, hence facilitate the speedy implementation of urban renewal projects. (c) In addition to injecting new housing units and commercial uses, the proposed scheme also includes new social welfare facilities to serve those in need in our society.	 (a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views. (b) Noted the grounds of the supportive views. (c) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(d) The proposed development with similar development intensity with nearby existing residential developments, such as Grand Waterfront and Metropolitan Rise, will be well integrated with the surrounding neighbourhood and facilitate the transformation of Ma Tau Kok waterfront area into an active and vibrant development node.	(d) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.
R5 (individual)	Supports Amendment Item L <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Cha Kwo Ling Waterfront has been idle since 2008. The site should be developed for waterfront promenade as soon as possible.	(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.
R6 (individual)	Supports the Incorporation of Social Welfare Facility Use in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposal will help Hong Kong to achieve an inclusive society and diversified development, and benefit the disadvantaged groups.	(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.
R7 (individual)	Supports the Incorporation of Social Welfare Facility Use in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) It is a reasonable mean to address the deficit in the social welfare facility land use.	(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
<p>R8</p> <p>(Designing Hong Kong Limited)</p>	<p>Supports Amendment Item K</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Support for allowing a greater usage at the pier for a more vibrant waterfront.</p> <p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(b) The rezoning of three “Commercial” (“C”) sites to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) at the former runway area will adversely affect the viability and limit the opportunity of successful development of the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) and the proposed Tourism Node (TN).</p>	<p>(a) Noted the grounds of the supportive views.</p> <p>(b) The cluster of commercial and tourist-related facilities at the former runway area comprising the TN, KTCT and Kai Tak Runway Park (Plans H-11a to 11c) will not be affected by the rezoning of the three sites (Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5) (Plan H-5a), and will continue to form a tourism, entertainment and leisure hub as envisioned under the OZP. Adjacent to the KTCT, the proposed TN development, zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tourism Related Uses to include Commercial, Hotel and Entertainment” (“OU(TRU)”), which is intended for the provision of tourism-related use with commercial, hotel, retail, entertainment and leisure uses, and the Kai Tak Runway Park (KTRP) are the major components complementing the KTCT in creating a tourism, entertainment and leisure hub at the Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT) (Plans H-11a to 11c). With a total GFA of 229,400m², the scale of TN development on its own is comparable to those major commercial developments in the territory and sufficient to attract patronage and vibrancy to the KTRT and create synergy with KTCT.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) Increasing in residential developments and population will bring adverse traffic impact on Shing Fung Road. The original plan for commercial activities at the runway would result in a better balance of traffic flows.</p>	<p>Meanwhile, the Government is taking forward the study the recommendations of a planning and urban design review at KTRT (KTRT Study), which formulated an innovative design and development scheme for the developments at KTRT including the existing/planned POS and the TN. KTRP as an open space adjoining the TN development and KTCT with diverse character (Plan H-11c), will embrace and integrate with TN development to form a distinctive and appealing destination.</p> <p>A continuous retail frontage is also planned along the residential sites at former runway area fronting the Victoria Harbour with a total GFA of 22,000m² (Plan H-14), linking the Metro Park with the KTRT, enticing visitors and promoting vibrancy of the KTCT and the future tourism hub. In gist, rezoning of three sites (Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5) at the former runway area (Plan H-5a) would not affect the vision of developing the KTRT into a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction (Plan H-15).</p> <p>(c) Kai Tak Development (KTD) is well served by numerous existing and planned road networks. The major road networks within KTD including trunk roads, district distributors and local distributors. For trunk roads, the planned Route 6, comprising the Central Kowloon Route (CKR), Trunk Road T2 and Tseung Kwan O-Lam Tin Tunnel (Plan H-2), provides a convenient route linking up the West Kowloon with East Kowloon and further to Tseung Kwan O. For district distributors, KTD is served by four district distributors within KTD, namely Olympic Avenue/Concorde Road, Shing Kai Road, Shing Fung Road and Kai Tak Bridge Road, which provides connection within KTD and with surrounding areas (Plan H-2). Apart from the existing and planned road, KTD</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>is also well served by public transport services, including the MTR Tuen Ma Line with Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station at the Kai Tak City Centre (Plan H-4b) and various franchised bus routes and green minibus (GMB) routes.</p> <p>A Traffic Review Study under Further Review of Land Use in KTD (the Review Study) had been conducted to assess the traffic impacts arising from the recommended rezoning of the five sites (Sites 2A2 and 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 (Plan H-2) to residential use, and the incorporation of social welfare facilities. Based on the design traffic flows, the performance of the critical junctions and road links capacity have been assessed. The result indicated that the junctions and identified key road links within the Area of Influence (AOI) would perform satisfactorily and operate within their capacity in the design years of 2026, 2031 and 2036. As such, the traffic impact arising from the proposal is considered manageable. The Commissioner for Transport (C for T) has no objection to the rezoning proposals.</p> <p>In addition, the Civil Engineering Development Department (CEDD) is currently constructing the Road D3 (Metro Park Section) along the western part of the former runway area with a view to connecting Shing Kai Road with Shing Fung Road. With the construction works of the new road scheduled for completion in 2022, it will further improve the transport infrastructure of KTD.</p> <p>The construction works of Trunk Road T2 and Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Tunnel is expected to be completed in 2026. Upon the completion of Trunk Road T2 and CKL Tunnel, through traffic will be directed to the highways without routing to local roads in Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong, the connectivity of</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Provides Views on Amendment Items J1 and J2</p> <p>(d) The design of the development should allow alfresco dining along the open space.</p> <p>(e) The site is at a focal point of waterfront open space and can be an attractive public square.</p>	<p>KTD, particularly for the former runway area will be further enhanced.</p> <p>The “multi-modal” Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) (Plan H-16) comprising a package of green initiatives will also serve complementarily to enhance connectivity in Kowloon East (KE), including the GreenWay (Plan H-17) network for shared use by pedestrian and cyclists, the travellers network linking up the former runway area and Kwun Tong, deployment of electric buses/minibuses and provision of a water-taxi service. Meanwhile, the Government will also closely monitor the passenger demand of public transport services in KTD and liaises with the operators concerned to adjust the public transport services in meeting passenger demand as necessary.</p> <p>(d) According to the planning report submitted by Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) for the proposed DRE development, a 3m setback from the site boundary on the ground level facing the public open space outside the DRE site (Plan H-9a) will be incorporated to create active commercial frontages with alfresco dining at a waterfront setting.</p> <p>(e) The proposed DRE development will be carefully designed to integrate with the surrounding areas including the KTSP, and hence contributing to the development of an accessible and vibrant waterfront. An at-grade POS of not less than 2,700m² (including some covered areas) within the site will be designed, constructed, managed, and maintained by HKHS for public use on a 24-hour basis (Plan H-7).</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Provides Views on Amendment Item L</p> <p>(f) In order to tap into the shops and services within the planned residential development across CKL Road, an integrated planning with the residential development with a wide deck across road is proposed for better connection between the promenade and residential developments and vibrancy of the waterfront in Kowloon East. Retail, sitting-out area, look-out points, toilets, eating places, open space shall be included at the deck landing.</p>	<p>Forming part of the comprehensive open space network of KTD, the POS will serve as a pedestrian linkage between the inner part of Ma Tau Kok, KTSP, the ‘Dining Cove’^[1] and the waterfront promenade adjoining the site. As shown on Plan H-9b, a connectivity plaza serving as the major connection space linking the POS within the site and the adjoining future waterfront promenade/open space will gradually widened to 30m at the interface, which invites and helps to encourage pedestrian flow. Commercial facilities are also purposely planned on the lower floors of the proposed DRE development, including retail shops, restaurants and al-fresco dining facilities, to add variety and vibrancy to the planned waterfront promenade.</p> <p>(f) There are currently three existing at-grade pedestrian crossings across concerned section of CKL Road (Plan H-10c). Assessments on the capacities of the these existing facilities were conducted under the Feasibility Study of CEDD for CKL Tsuen Development which indicated that after the completion of the proposed developments with anticipated pedestrian growth, these at-grade crossings with minor modifications would operate at satisfactory condition from traffic point of view. Nevertheless, enhancement to the connectivity between the CKL Tsuen Development and the waterfront promenade will be explored further in the detailed design stage, with due regard to the harbourfront setting. CEDD would work with HKHS (the implementation agent of</p>

¹ The ‘Dining Cove’ with food and beverage use on its two sides overlooking the Victoria Harbour is intended to create a vibrant waterfront environment and give people a unique dining experience.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Provides General View</p> <p>(g) More landing steps should be provided along the waterfronts to allow kaito ferry services to nearby piers or landing steps such as Kai Tak Runway and across the harbour,</p>	<p>the CKL Tsuen development), and Education Bureau/Vocational Training Council (the implementation agent of the promenade) to refine the connection proposal and to further consult Harbourfront Commission (HC) in due course.</p> <p>(g) Landing steps are considered as ‘Marine Related Facilities’. Whilst the provision of marine related facilities is always permitted on land falling within the boundaries of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), ‘Pier’ use is a Column 1 use for “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “OU” annotated “Cruise Terminal to include Commercial Development with Landscaped Deck Above” and “OU annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) zones and a Column 2 use for “C”, “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “Open Space” (“O”) zones. Whilst majority of the waterfront land of KTD is zoned “O”, it is possible for the provision of landing steps at suitable locations, subject to technical feasibility and the consideration of relevant departments.</p> <p>Currently, there are eight existing public piers/landing steps maintained by CEDD falling within the Kai Tak OZP (Plan H-20), including three at Ma Tau Kok waterfront, four at the former runway area and one at the Kwun Tong Public Pier. A landing at the proposed private housing development at 1-5 Kai Hing Road for leisure and recreational purpose, is also proposed under the approved planning application No. A/K22/31.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(h) Sufficient facilities for cycling and water sports activities shall be provided.	<p>The Government is currently undergoing a preliminary engineering review to scope the technical issues regarding the provision of additional marine accesses (including landing steps) within Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and its vicinity.</p> <p>(h) An extensive GreenWay network with a total length of 13km that runs through promenades and open spaces for shared use by pedestrian and cyclists has been planned in KTD (Plan H-17). The GreenWay network also forms part of the “multi-modal” EFLS initiatives to allow better utilization of the open spaces and waterfront area. CEDD commissioned a study on the design and implementation of the GreenWay in 2021, including the review of relevant design standards, ancillary facilities, modes of management and operation as well as exploration on the feasibility of adopting smart measures to enhance the daily management and operation of GreenWay. Implementation will be carried out by phases and the whole network is expected by completion by 2025.</p> <p>To cater for water sport activities, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Water Sports/Water Recreation only)’ use has been included in the Column 1 use of “O” zone since 2017 under the Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5. Besides, various locations have been reserved or planned for water sports/recreation facilities within KTD (Plan H-20). Three locations for water sports/recreation activities have been designated around KTTS by way of Short Term Tenancy (STT), including (i) a site beneath Kwun Tong Bypass to be used by the Kwun Tong Sports Promotion Association; (ii) the Kai Tak ex-fire station site to be used by the Hong Kong Water Sports Council; and (iii) the northern end of the lower</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(i) The Government should manage the expectation of the future residents that the waterfront area is expected to be vibrant and open to public.</p>	<p>embankment of the Runway Area to be used by the Hong Kong Canoe Union. Meanwhile, several planned open space are planned to allow water sports/recreation activities, including (i) a planned district open space at the former south apron to adopt a water sports theme; (ii) KTRP Phase 2A with a proposed waterbody (the ‘River Valley’); (iii) the waterfront promenade/public OS project adjoining Road D3 (Metro Park Section), namely the ‘Kai Tak Basecamp’ and (iv) the open space to be managed by KTSP fronting To Kwa Wan Typhoon Shelter.</p> <p>(i) It has long been the Government intention to create a vibrant waterfront in KTD, with activating the harbourfront as one of the urban design and landscape framework enshrined in Kai Tak OZP, with a view to introduce a variety of activities ranging from casual strolls along a natural waterfront park, to a highly active commercial and retail-oriented waterfront lined with restaurants, cafes and bars. ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ are always permitted on the lowest two floors of building(s) within “R(B)7”, “R(B)8” and “R(B)9” zones (i.e. Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 at former runway area) (Plan H-5a) and on the lowest three floors of a building, taken to include basements, within “R(A)6” (i.e. DRE development at Ma Tau Kok) (Plan H-6b).</p> <p>The provision of retail floor space will be stipulated under lease conditions for the concerned sites. The intention for a vibrant and retail-oriented waterfront lined with restaurants, cafes and bars at the Runway Precinct as well as the ‘Dining Cove’ at Ma Tau Kok is clearly reflected in the zonings and the OZP. The intention will be implanted through lease conditions governing the development of retail frontages and the licensing mechanism on the operation of the eating places.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(j) Planning Department should have communication with relevant departments on the licence for alfresco dining and installation of kitchen exhaust features to avoid nuisance to future residents.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>(k) Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 shall not be rezoned for residential use.</p> <p>(l) ‘Eating Place’ shall be a Column 1 use for “OU(Pier)(1)” zone.</p>	<p>(j) There is administrative mechanism to allow the provision of outdoor seating accommodation in relation to food and beverage (F&B) uses not involving permanent structure. The licencing for alfresco dining and design of kitchen exhaust features will be subject to relevant departments’ requirements.</p> <p>(k) The sites are considered suitable and technically feasible for conversion to residential use having due regard to the latest economic situation, market response, the persistent acute demand for housing from the community, planning, urban design, infrastructure provision, traffic and environmental aspects.</p> <p>(l) While a broader use at piers is encouraged, the ‘Eating Place’ use is subject to more stringent requirements including loading on structure, sewerage, fire safety and electricity capacity. That said, eating place is permissible subject to application to the Board and demonstration of technical feasibility.</p>
<p>R9</p> <p>(The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong)</p>	<p>Supports Amendment Items K and L</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The “OU(Pier(1))” zone can provide flexibility for a boarder range of government, arts and cultural/institutional uses allowing for better use of valuable land resource while the proposed “O” zone at Cha Kwo Ling Road would contribute to a continuous waterfront promenade benefitting the general public.</p>	<p>(a) The supportive views are noted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Opposes Items A to C and F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(b) The proposed rezoning of commercial sites for residential use will lead to a loss in commercial GFA in KTD and jeopardise the economic role of KTD as an important component of core business district 2 (CBD2).</p>	<p>(b) Despite a reduction of 340,000m² (about 15%) in commercial GFA, the economic role of KTD as an important component of KE is still maintained with an overall commercial GFA of close to 2 million m² in three clusters (Plan H-14). They are located strategically at (i) Kai Tak City Centre near the MTR Kai Tak Station and along the two sides of Kai Tak River, comprising a landmark office and retail development, namely the AIRSIDE, an iconic gateway twin tower for commercial developments; (ii) the former south apron area, to serve as an extension and help catalyse the regeneration of the Kowloon Bay Business Area; and (iii) along the former runway with the retail frontage and the proposed TN at the tip of it, which together with the KTCT, will form the tourism, entertainment and leisure hub.</p> <p>Through revitalisation of industrial buildings and new developments, the commercial GFA in the KE has increased significantly in the past decade. KE, including KTD, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay, currently has a total of commercial GFA of about 2.9 million m², and an additional supply of about 1.0 million m² coming on-stream (including developments under construction and approved). Besides, the two action areas in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay (Plan H-15) will provide another GFA of about 0.5 million m². In gist, the total commercial GFA in KE is expected to increase to more than 4 million m², comparable to the scale of the CBD in Central. The proposed rezoning of five commercial sites</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The long-term planning vision of KTD as a tourism, leisure and business destination should not be affected by the short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(d) The rezoning of the three commercial sites at former runway area will lead to a loss of the benefits of economy of scale and affect the vibrancy of the KTCT and the proposed TN.</p> <p>(e) Property developers have reasonable expectations that the overall planning and implementation of KTD would adhere to the statutory OZP with a vibrant CBD and good environmentally friendly connections, which was formulated upon numerous rounds of public consultations, in bidding the land parcels. The rezoning negatively affects the credibility of the Government.</p>	<p>for residential use in KTD will not affect the momentum of transforming KE into CBD2.</p> <p>(c) KTD is envisioned to be developed into a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses. With the planning intention in mind and having regard to the economic situation, market response and the persistent acute demand for housing, the OZP amendments of the five commercial sites are intended to achieve optimal use of land resources to respond to the changing economic and social needs, while the overall planning intention for KTD remains unchanged.</p> <p>(d) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) The overall planning intention and vision of KTD established after rounds of public consultation has been maintained with some refinements. Planning is an on-going process and there is practical need to suitably review the OZP to meet the changing planning circumstances and social and community needs. Similar to previous rounds of OZP amendments, the current OZP amendments have undergone relevant technical assessments and due statutory process with consultations with district councils (DCs) and the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of HC (the Task Force). The rezoning of the reviewed sites are considered suitable, technically feasible and compatible with the surrounding land uses, which are mainly residential in nature. While a change</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Providing Views on Removing the Indicative Alignment and Station of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) from the OZP</p> <p>(f) The change in mode of EFLS will adversely affect the connectivity of KTD with the rest of Kowloon East (KE).</p>	<p>of land use of the five commercial sites has been recommended, the current site configurations, open space network, non-building areas, visual/air ventilation corridors and BH profiles of various sub-areas of KTD are generally maintained; and the overall planning intention of KTD, including to develop into an environmental-friendly district with ample greening and other environmental-friendly initiative and connections, such as mass transit and cycling track, remains unchanged.</p> <p>(f) The removal of the indicative alignment and station of EFLS from the OZP, which serves to reflect the Government's latest proposal and to avoid misunderstanding, is not an amendment item of the OZP.</p> <p>CEDD completed the detailed feasibility study (DFS) for the EFLS in 2021. The DFS concluded that the construction of a single elevated mode of EFLS in KE would encounter lots of technical complications and challenges, particularly for sections running through narrow road space and crowded environment as well as over existing highway and railway structures. In view of the technical complications and challenges, the construction cost and recurrent cost of providing such an elevated mode system in the area would be very costly, thus not a sustainable and pursuable option for the KTD.</p> <p>On the basis of the increasingly comprehensive road and railway infrastructures facilities and convenient public</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>transport services in the area, the DFS recommended to implement a supplementary “multi-modal” EFLS in KE, which is viable and can meet the travelling need of people and connect with the neighbouring areas conveniently and shape KTD into a green community. The “multi-modal” EFLS (Plan H-16) comprises a package of green initiatives that will serve complementarily to enhance connectivity in the area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. enhancing public transport services in KE, and deploying electric vehicles to run new bus/GMB routes in the area, which will largely cover the areas intended to be served by the elevated mode of EFLS and introducing green and smart transport initiative. ii. developing a travellers network that links up the former runway area, the Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) and the KTAA, which can enhance the flow of pedestrian and facilitate pedestrian connection between these areas; iii. providing a GreenWay network within KTD for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists, which enhance connectivity of various open spaces and improve coherence of open spaces design of KTD as a whole; iv. constructing an elevated landscaped deck to connect the MTR Kwun Tong Station to link up the Kwun Tong Town Centre Redevelopment project and a composite development at a “G/IC” site adjacent to the MTR Kwun Tong Station to enhance the connectivity and ease the

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(g) The proposed ‘multi-modal’ EFLS is considered not viable nor effective, and will not provide any inter-connective transports system to serve the massive growth taking place on Kai Tak.</p> <p>(h) The EFLS will help link the two tourism destinations, namely KTSP and TN/KTCT to the Kai Tak MTR station. The fixed elevated alignment also acts a wayfinding landmark for tourists.</p>	<p>pedestrian flow in the area; and</p> <p>v. establishing a ‘water taxi’ service point in the KTD to enhance the connectivity of KTD with Central, West Kowloon, Tsim Sha Tsui East and Hung Hom.</p> <p>The “multi-modal” EFLS shall provide various environment-friendly and convenient links to different stations and public transport interchanges in KTD and encourage people to walk more and cycle within KTD.</p> <p>(g) Response (f) above is relevant.</p> <p>(h) KTSP and TN/KTCT will be well connected by (i) road and (ii) pedestrian network of KTD (Plans H-16 and H-17).</p> <p>In terms of road network, KTSP and TN/KTCT will be connected by Shing Kai Road, Road D3 (Metro Park Section) and Shing Fung Road. As mentioned above, Road D3 (Metro Park Section) is expected to complete in 2022 and connects Shing Fung Road with Shing Kai Road, which will connect the former runway area to KTSP and railway station directly via Shing Kai Road and further improve the transport infrastructure of KTD.</p> <p>As for pedestrian network, KTSP and TN/KTCT will be connected by the extensive open space network of KTD, including the planned Metro Park, waterfront promenade along the former runway area and the existing Kai Tak Sky</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(i) The traffic review, which had not compared the conditions of original zonings with EFLS against the amended zonings with multi-modal EFLS, has not provided robust justifications to establish the proposed amendments.</p> <p>(j) A shortened alignment has been proposed (Drawings H-1a and H-1b), which connects Kai Tak Station and the former runway area, and across the KTTS to the Kwun Tong waterfront side without entering the Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong inland areas, will satisfy the traffic demand generated by the growth in population and make good the Government's promise in KTD. It is premature to remove the alignment until further investigation has been carried out. The Government</p>	<p>Garden above Shing Fung Road. With seamless integration among the open spaces and KTSP, a continuous and interconnected green space to serve as a pedestrian network with pleasant walking experience is planned.</p> <p>As mentioned above, an extensive GreenWay network that runs through promenades and open spaces for shared use by pedestrian and cyclists has also been planned in KTD, which also connects KTSP and TN/KTCT. Proper design of wayfinding system will be incorporated into the pedestrian network to guide the navigation by local and visitors within KTD in accordance with the existing transport planning manual, KTD Urban Design Guidelines and Manual and the Kai Tak Brand Identity Manual and Public Creatives Guideline.</p> <p>(i) As the details and feasibility of EFLS are yet to be confirmed, the EFLS system has not been assumed in the previous TIA conducted for KTD. As mentioned in response (c) to R8 above, the traffic impact arising from the proposal is considered manageable according to the Traffic Review Study under the Review Study, even without the implementation of the EFLS. C for T has no objection to the concerned traffic review.</p> <p>(j) Technical constraints of monorail EFLS mentioned in response (f) above is relevant. The alternative shortened alignment is expected to encounter similar technical and financial difficulties.</p> <p>Currently the former runway area is connected with Kwun Tong/Kowloon Bay with Kai Tak Bridge Road, Shing Cheong Road and Cheung Yip Street. According to the Traffic</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>should put forward an interim solution connecting the runway area and Kwun Tong/Kowloon Bay possibly in the form of bridges across the water channel.</p> <p>(k) Significant investment by the Government took place in the development of KTCT and KTSP. The short-sighted rezoning and the removal of EFLS would put the planning vision of KTD to be sustainable and environmental-friendly for tourism and leisure will be at risk of failure.</p>	<p>Review Study under the Review Study, with committed junction improvement constructed under other works projects, the identified junctions and road links will operate in satisfactory conditions at design year and in the long term.</p> <p>A 600m-long pedestrian cum cyclist bridge with travellers across KTTS (Plan H-16) to provide a direct linkage between the Kwun Tong promenade and former runway are is also proposed as part of the “multi-modal” EFLS initiatives. Being located within Victoria Harbour, the bridge proposal is subject to the control of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance (PHO). CEDD plans to commence a technical study for gathering the relevant cogent and convincing materials and consulting the public, so as to comply with the requirements of the PHO.</p> <p>(k) KTD is proposed to be developed with a series of planning theme, including (i) sustainable, with a mixed land use of residential, office, retail, hotel, sports and leisure to ensure vibrancy of KTD in different time of the day and different days of the week; and (ii) environmental-friendly, with various environmentally friendly initiatives, including the possible provision of a multi-modal EFLS, roadside greening, green roof and district cooling system, and planning for mass transit, minimizing noise impact and better air ventilation built into planning framework.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(l) The incorporation of an indicative alignment of the EFLS on the OZP has provided the EFLS with a statutory status. The bids put in for land parcels by developers had expected the implementation of good environmentally friendly connections. The monorail EFLS should be reassessed and it is premature to remove the alignment until further investigation has been carried out.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>(m) A shortened alignment to be included on the OZP (Drawings H-1a and 1b).</p>	<p>While multi-modal EFLS being part of the initiatives and one of the planning themes, the overarching planning principle and planning themes of KTD have remained unchanged under the latest land use proposal on the OZP. Apart from EFLS, the implementation of other initiatives will continue to shape KTD into a sustainable and vibrant destination for living, work, as well as sports, leisure and entertainment.</p> <p>(l) The removal of the indicative alignment and station of the EFLS shown on the OZP does not form part of the OZP amendment. Kai Tak OZP and its Explanatory Statement, since its first publication in 2006, expressly state that the indicative alignment showing the proposed ‘EFLS and Station’ is for information only as it requires further investigation and feasibility study on technical and financial viabilities. As the Government will no longer pursue the originally EFLS, the removal of the indicative alignment and station of the EFLS from the OZP is to reflect the Government’s latest proposal and to avoid misunderstanding, which shall not be regarded as an amendment item for the OZP. The Town Planning Board (the Board) in statutory town planning process is not empowered to authorize transport-related works and alignments. The monorail EFLS by its nature shall be subject to the authorisation under the Railways Ordinance; and the endorsed rail alignment and station shall be deemed to be approved under the Town Planning Ordinance.</p> <p>(m) Response (j) above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(n) The sites (Sites 2A2 and 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5) should be retained for commercial use. As a comprised alternative proposal to address the acute housing demand, it is proposed to retain Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 for commercial use.	(n) Responses (b) and (c) above and (k) to R8 above are relevant.
R10 (individual)	<p>Supports Amendment Item L</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Support the rezoning at Cha Kwo Ling Road from “G/IC” to “O” for the extension of the long delayed waterfront promenade.</p> <p>Opposes Amendment Items A to C</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(b) It is a short-sighted response to the economic situation without considering long term prospects for the community and the economy.</p>	<p>(a) The supportive views are noted.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The proposed residential developments are expected to form a gated community and reduce the vibrancy of streetscape.</p> <p>(d) The increase in PR and BH will cause undesirable wall effect.</p>	<p>(c) Promoting street vibrancy is a key design element of KTD. Whilst ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ uses are always permitted on the lower three floors of a building on “R(A)5” (i.e. Sites 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10) and “R(A)6” (i.e. Site 2A3) zones under the OZP; and may be permitted subject to the approval by the Board for “CDA(4)” zone (i.e. Site 2A2), the reviewed sites at former north apron area are subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 1.0/1.5 to provide a substantial retail mass along the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC) (Plan H-4b) connecting to MTR Sung Wong Toi Station. A two-storey retail belt with a minimum PR of 0.2 to allow retail frontage facing LTSBPC will also be required at Site 2A2 to enhance the vibrancy and the walking experience of pedestrians in the area.</p> <p>(d) A Landscape and Visual Impact Study (LVIS) reviewing the landscape element and assessing the visual impact under the Review Study has been conducted. The relevant photomontages of the notional schemes for the rezoning proposals for Sites 2A2 and 2A3, and 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10 are shown at Plans H-18a and H-18b, demonstrating that the overall design and proposed change in building arrangement and BH profile within the Review study area is comparable to that in the baseline scenario.</p> <p>Having regard to the prevailing urban design principles of KTD, including creating dynamic skyline with stepped BH profile and celebrating the views with strong emphasis on views to and from the mountains, the overall visual impacts of the recommended scenario as part of the KTD are considered to be generally compatible and acceptable within the existing visual context.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(e) The proposed social welfare facilities, in particular Boys' Home (BsH) and Hostel for Severely Mentally Handicapped Persons are likely to be subject to discrimination and rejection.</p>	<p>An Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) using computational fluid dynamics (CFD) modelling had been conducted to compare the air performance of the recommended scenario and baseline scenario under the Review Study. For the former north apron area (Plan H-4b), the model assumes that the change from commercial of residential use will generally result in a smaller building footprint. The overall air ventilation performance of the recommended scenario and baseline scenario is similar with some local areas improved. The recommended scenario could also enhance the wind channeling effect at certain areas such as that between Sites 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10 and the planned public housing development at Sites 2B3 to 2B6.</p> <p>The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of the Planning Department (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) has no objection to the proposed rezoning from urban design and air ventilation perspectives.</p> <p>(e) Rehabilitation services aim to acknowledge the equal rights of people with disabilities to be full members of the community by assisting them in developing their physical, mental and social capabilities to the fullest possible extent and by promoting their integration into the community. To achieve this objective, the Social Welfare Department (SWD) all along adopts a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable accommodation for the provision of rehabilitation service facilities in various districts. Considering the convenient location of KTD, the complete transportation network and the barrier-free access for persons with disabilities, various rehabilitation service facilities are proposed in KTD. As indicated by the average waiting time for residential rehabilitation services ranged from 6 to 13 years in 2020-21,</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Opposes Amendment Item E1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(f) It is a trick to boost the open space provision and the narrow strip of land is not genuine open space.</p>	<p>there is a need to incorporate rehabilitation facilities to meet the pressing service demand in the district and the community.</p> <p>As for BsH, it is neither a correctional nor compulsory rehabilitation facility catered for youth delinquents. The majority of boys living in BsH are school students of ordinary primary and secondary schools in the mainstream, who cannot be adequately cared for by their families or being mal-treated and are admitted to BsH on voluntary basis with the parental consent. Boys receiving residential care service at the existing BsHs do not encounter discrimination or rejection in their neighbourhood. On a contrary, the boys always earn positive feedback and recognition from their neighbourhood or general public on their participation in volunteer work and serving the community. While the boys in BsH are also valued members of the society, an understanding, accepting and caring community would provide strong support to them, and echoes the Government's policy to build a caring and inclusive society.</p> <p>(f) The zoning boundary of the "OU" annotated "Stadium" ("OU(Stadium)") zone covering KTSP is adjusted to accord with the latest boundaries of the permanent government land allocation (PGLA) for the KTSP and the adjoining open space. The rezoned strip of land will form part of a large open space for the proposed Kai Tak Station Square.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(g) Commercial buildings have extensive F&B facilities on ground floor but not residential buildings. The rezoning of these sites would deprive the community of the opportunity to enjoy waterfront.</p> <p>(h) The proposed residential developments are not compatible with KTCT and are unlikely to utilise the economic potential brought by cruise travellers.</p> <p>(i) The past experiences in Hung Hom and North Point waterfront show that there is no guarantee to the intended provision of retail frontage along the harbour in residential developments.</p>	<p>(g) The waterfront along the two sides of former runway area is zoned “O”, on which a continuous waterfront promenade extending from the proposed Metro Park to the KTRT will be provided for public enjoyment. Meanwhile, a continuous retail frontage will be provided along the residential sites at former runway area fronting the Victoria Harbour with a total GFA of 22,000m², to create a vibrant and active waterfront as well as to serve the local residents. Similar to other residential sites with retail provision at the former runway area, the developers of Sites 4B5 and 4C4 will be required to provide 24-hour barrier-free pedestrian access (including vertical connections) between Kai Tak Sky Garden and waterfront promenade/street level (Plan H-5b) through the retail portions under lease conditions to enhance the vibrancy and pedestrian connectivity of the waterfront promenade former runway area.</p> <p>(h) The concerned sites for residential use are generally located in the vicinity of other planned residential developments, and are considered not incompatible with the surrounding land uses. Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(i) The retail frontage will be required under lease, similar to other sold sites for private housing developments along the former runway area.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(j) The proposed social welfare facilities will not be welcomed by the developers.</p> <p>Opposes to Amendment Items J1 and J2</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(k) The proposed DRE development is in vicinity of KTSP which will be subject to noise and disturbances from the stadium.</p> <p>(l) The intended low-rise commercial, cultural and leisure uses providing vibrant and holistic waterfront will be discarded. The proposed retails and F&B facilities at lower levels may have conflict with the residents.</p>	<p>(j) The proposed social welfare facilities will be required under lease, subject to the confirmation of the relevant departments.</p> <p>(k) KTSP is to the northeast of the DRE site. Statutory Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) study was conducted for the KTSP and the EIA report for KTSP (Plan H-6b) was approved under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO). The EIA study has assessed the potential noise impacts due to the operation of KTSP (including the stadium) and proposed necessary design, operational arrangements and measures to mitigate the potential noise impacts. The Environmental Permit (EP) for constructing and operating the KTSP has imposed conditions to require the implementation of the noise mitigation measures, including adopting soundproof materials and incorporating a retractable roof at the Main Stadium, constructing a cover over the spectator stand of Public Sports Ground as well as restrictions on night time operation. With the implementation of noise mitigation measures at KTSP, the proposed DRE development will not be subject to adverse and unacceptable noise impacts from the KTSP.</p> <p>(l) According to the planning report submitted by HKHS for the proposed DRE development, commercial, cultural and leisure elements have been strategically introduced at the lower levels (i.e. G/F, 1/F and part of 2/F) of the proposed development, aiming to create a focal point for enhancing street vitality and attracting pedestrian flows. The commercial facilities of the proposed development with active retail/dining frontages will</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(m) The proposed development will introduce a wall effect to a zone that was intended to be low rise and well ventilated recreational zone.</p> <p>Provides Views on Amendment Item D</p> <p>(n) The long narrow low-ceiling corridor has limited appeal and it would takes a long time to implement the USS eventually generating construction difficulties.</p>	<p>become an activity node to enhance vibrancy and vitality of the waterfront. Response (e) to R8 is relevant.</p> <p>(m) The AVA Initial Study using CFD modelling for the proposed DRE development has been carried out, which indicated that comparing to the baseline scheme, the proposed scheme maintains a comparable wind performance at the pedestrian level of the surrounding area. A building separation of 15m and 11m within the site has been proposed to serve as view and air corridor to enhance northeastern wind penetration from the harbourfront into the inner area of Ma Tau Kok (Plans H-9a and H-9b). With the building separations and building setback of 3m at the southern boundary, the ventilation performance along Sung Wong Toi Road and Ma Tau Kok Road would be enhanced under annual and summer winds. No adverse air ventilation impact is therefore envisaged. The CTP/UD&L, PlanD has no adverse comment on the AVA.</p> <p>(n) The USS system (Plan H-4e) has been planned at Kai Tak City Centre for connecting Kai Tak City Centre and its two MTR stations (viz. Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station) with Kowloon City and San Po Kong to enhance connectivity with the surrounding districts, with a total width of 15m to 20m and sufficient headroom with shops on the two sides of the pedestrian walkway. More importantly, it will integrate with commercial/retail uses at the basement floors of development sites en route to enhance its attractiveness and achieve more spacious design. To ensure a comfortable pedestrian experience along the USS, design requirement, including alignment, width, minimum headroom, etc., will be</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Provide Views on Amendment Items E2 and E3</p> <p>(o) The area rezoned to 'Road' is larger and the provision of "O" is reduced.</p> <p>Provide Views on Amendment Item I</p> <p>(p) The authority should ensure no structural safety would be affected by the commercial development to be built above CKR.</p>	<p>stipulated in lease conditions. Assignment of sections of USS within lots will ensure timely completion of the USS thereat by the respective developers. In the subject amendments, the former north apron sites are bundled for land sale to minimise the number of developers involved and the interfacing issues.</p> <p>(o) The amendments under Amendment Items E2 and E3 are to adjust the zoning boundaries to accord with the latest boundaries of the PGLA for KTSP. There will be an overall increase of about 0.42 ha of open space in view of the boundary adjustment. The overall provision of POS on the Kai Tak OZP is still close to 100 ha.</p> <p>(p) A preliminary foundation and structural design feasibility study in support of the section 12A application No. Y/K22/3 concluded that the development would introduce loading variation within the acceptable limit of CKR tunnel and would be technically safe. Highways Department (HyD) had no objection from the CKR project point of view.</p> <p>Lease modification will be required to effect the redevelopment of the existing industrial buildings. Appropriate clauses could be imposed to require the developer will to carry out detailed geotechnical and structural assessments to demonstrate that the impacts of the development to the CKR are acceptable and obtain agreements from the relevant authorities including but not</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Provide Views on Amendment Item K</p> <p>(q) Open air refreshment facilities with various price points should be provided.</p> <p>Provide General Views</p> <p>(r) Kai Tak is a long strip that will be overrun with vehicles and roadside pollution. To restrict vehicular traffic, a tram or electric bus services if not monorail should be introduced.</p>	<p>limited to the HyD, Geotechnical Engineering Office of CEDD and Buildings Department (BD).</p> <p>(q) Response (l) to R8 is relevant.</p> <p>(r) Regarding the traffic impact, response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>Developing KTD into an environmental-friendly district through possible provision of a “multi-modal” EFLS, roadside greening, and planning for mass transit is part of the planning themes of KTD. The planning and urban design framework of KTD, with extensive open space network and planned cycling track, strike to encourage people to walk more and cycle within Kai Tak, thereby relying less on vehicles and roads.</p> <p>Most of the local distributors within KTD are designed for single 2-lane configuration and are non-through roads, in form of cul-de-sac, to discourage by-pass traffic in order to minimize the traffic and environmental impacts as well as to achieve green city.</p> <p>The possible future provision of a “multi-modal” EFLS aims to provide people with various environmental-friendly and convenient links to different railway stations and public transport interchanges in Kai Tak. Deploying electric vehicles to run new bus/GMB routes in the area will be one of the “multi-modal” EFLS packages, which will largely cover</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(s) It brings to a concern that about 10% of employment opportunity is reduced. Effort should be made to ensure job positions are generated.</p> <p>(t) The rezoning proposal turns Kai Tak into a boring clusters of residential towers on podium with little or no street life.</p>	<p>the areas intended to be served by the elevated mode of EFLS and introducing green and smart transport initiative.</p> <p>(s) An overall commercial GFA of close to 2 million m², with a total employment of about 90,000, will still be provided within KTD.</p> <p>(t) The intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. The development intensity recommended for the amendment items has been considered with due regard to the established planning theme and urban design principles of KTD. Urban design control measures will continue to be applied to shape KTD into a pedestrian friendly environment with active nodes and harbourfront celebrating dynamic skylines and views, with provision of retail frontage at suitable locations to enhance the street and harbourfront vibrancy.</p>
<p>R11</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items A to C and F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The rezoning proposal deviates from the planning of developing Kai Tak as part of the CBD2 and is not line with public expectation.</p> <p>(b) Social welfare facilities are not compatible with the CBD development.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 are relevant.</p> <p>(b) The incorporation of social welfare facilities at the five sites (Sites 2A2 and 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5) (Plan H-2a) is intended to serve the nearby residential neighbourhood and the increasing demand for welfare facilities at a wider district basis, which also echoes the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>Government's policy to build a caring and inclusive society. It is considered not incompatible with the planned use of KTD.</p> <p>Social welfare facilities are in general compatible with residential use and should be located at a convenient location to serve the community, and hence it is a Column 1 use for all "R(A)" zones (including the rezoned i.e. Site 2A3 and Sites 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10) (Plan H-4a). The inclusion of 'Social Welfare Facility' as Column 1 use for the "R(B)8", "R(B)9" and "R(B)10" zones (i.e. Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 at the former runway area) (Plan H-5a) would facilitate wider and increased provision in KTD to meet the acute demand of the community and serve the residential neighbourhood at convenient location.</p> <p>The technical assessments under the Review Study have confirmed that the social welfare facilities are technically feasible in these sites without generating adverse impacts on the surrounding areas. The planning intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. The incorporation of social welfare facilities at the reviewed sites is not contradictory to the planning intention of KTD.</p> <p>It is worth noting that it is neither uncommon nor incompatible for locating welfare facilities in commercial and residential developments in KTD and other parts of the territory. For example, social welfare facilities were planned to provide at Sites 4A1 and 4A2 (Plan H-2) at former runway area of KTD via section 16 applications. Another example is the provision of welfare facilities at a commercial development at Caroline Hill Road in Causeway Bay.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) High density residential developments bring adverse impact to local residents.</p> <p>(d) Should not rezone the sites due to short-term housing demand.</p>	<p>(c) The technical assessments concluded that the proposed residential developments at the five reviewed sites under the Review Study are technically feasible with no insurmountable technical problem in terms of traffic, landscape, visual, environment, air ventilation and infrastructural aspects.</p> <p>(d) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 are relevant.</p> <p>Inadequate housing supply is an issue of great public concern. Increasing overall housing land supply is the fundamental solution to the housing supply problem. According to the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) Annual Progress Report 2020, the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach progressively to identify and form land based on the eight priority land supply options recommended by the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS), including developing brownfield sites and Fanling Golf Course in the short to medium term and NDAs and reclamation outside Victoria Harbour in the medium to long term. Other measures to increase housing land supply will continue to be explored and pursued concurrently by the Government. That said, the Government still has to press ahead with the various ongoing land supply initiatives to increase and expedite housing land supply in the short-to-medium term. Amongst others, the Review Study is to explore the feasibility of converting five commercial sites in KTD for private residential use taken into account the latest economic situation, market response, the persistent acute demand for housing. The amendment sites are considered suitable and technically feasible for conversion to residential use having due regard to the planning, urban design, infrastructure provision, traffic and environmental aspects.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(e) The local residents have not been consulted on the rezoning proposal.</p> <p>(f) The sites should be used for library, sports ground and recreational facilities.</p>	<p>(e) Prior to the submission of the proposed amendments to the approved OZP for consideration by the Metro Planning Committee of the Board, PlanD and CEDD jointly consulted the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) on the Review Study and the proposed amendments to the Kai Tak OZP on 4.11.2021. An information note on the subject was also submitted to the Housing, Planning, Lands, Development and Redevelopment Committee of the Kwun Tong DC for circulation in November 2021.</p> <p>(f) The existing and planned provision of GIC facilities, including library and sports ground as well as open space are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and concerned bureau/department's (B/D's) assessment (Annex VIII).</p> <p>In planning recreational facilities, the Government makes reference to not only the HKPSG but also other relevant considerations including the current provision of facilities at the territory-wide and district levels, the policy objective, utilisation rates of existing facilities, demographic changes, the advice of DCs, site availability and technical feasibility, etc.</p> <p>A library and a public sports ground are planned at Site 1J3 near the Grid Neighbourhood of Kai Tak City Centre (Plan H-13a) and the KTSP (Plan H-6b) respectively.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R12, R18 and R100 (individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items A to C and F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Kai Tak has a long planning history to be part of the CBD2 with tourism and commercial developments. Rezoning the sites to residential use and incorporating social welfare facilities will undermine the past effort in establishing Kai Tak as commercial district and tourism hub.</p> <p>(b) Commercial developments are essential for the successful development of Kai Tak. Residential developments and social welfare facilities are not compatible with the CBD development and adversely affect the image of KTD.</p> <p>(c) The increase in residential developments will bring additional burden to traffic network.</p> <p>(d) Residential developments and social welfare facilities should be located in other districts than KTD, for example To Kwa Wan.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b), (c) and (e) to R9, and (b) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b), (c) and (e) to R9, and (b) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (b) to R11 above is relevant. In addition to KTD, welfare facilities are also planned in various types of developments in different districts, including To Kwa Wan, San Po Kong, Kowloon Bay, Sham Shui Po, Anderson Road Quarry, the North District, etc., to meet the ongoing and potential welfare service needs of the community.</p>
R13 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items A to C and F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) There is a huge demand for commercial sites in Kai Tak.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(b) There are excessive residential developments with high density.	(b) The development intensities recommended for the reviewed sites are comparable with the original development parameters or other residential developments in their vicinity, with the established planning theme and urban design principles of KTD, the recommended development intensity under the HKPSG and infrastructural capacity taken into account. The technical assessments concluded that the proposed residential developments at the five reviewed sites under the Review Study are technically feasible with no insurmountable technical problem in terms of traffic, landscape, visual, environment, air ventilation and infrastructural aspects.
R14 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items A, B and F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The properties of Kai Tak are of high value due to the vision to be CBD and the EFLS proposal. It is unfair on developers and residents to make them pay for higher prices on land and property in Kai Tak if the proposals are not implemented.</p> <p>(b) It is public expectation that the Government will implement the KTD in accordance with the original planning. The rezoning negatively affects the credibility of the Government.</p>	<p>(a) Response (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The proposed social welfare facilities are not necessary in KTD.</p> <p>(d) The sites should not be developed as public housings and social welfare facilities.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>(e) The monorail EFLS should be reassessed and at least to serve the KTD.</p>	<p>(c) There has been a shortage of welfare premises, resulting in long waiting time for different types of services (particularly elderly and rehabilitation services) and area shortfall for some existing services. At the same time, there is an increasing demand for welfare facilities as a result of ageing population, the keen community demand for child care services, the need for more population-based or district-based welfare facilities, as well as new service requirements or enhancement arising from the promulgation of new initiatives in response to changing societal needs, etc. In this regard, 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. The identification of suitable sites in KTD and other development areas in the territory to provide welfare facilities is one of the medium-term strategies to address the problem of acute shortfall of welfare facilities and to meet the ongoing and potential welfare service needs of the community.</p> <p>(d) The sites are proposed for private residential use. ‘Social Welfare Facility’ use, in general, is not incompatible with residential use.</p> <p>(e) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R15 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items B, C and F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The rezoning proposal deviates from the planning of developing Kai Tak as part of the CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The existing transport network, including MTR services and road network cannot cope with the increase in population arisen from the rezoning proposal, in particular with the cancellation of monorail.</p> <p>(c) The KTCT would be adversely affected without the support of the three commercial sites at the former runway area.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b), (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant. The Government will also closely monitor the passenger demand of public transport services in KTD and liaises with the operators concerned to adjust the public transport services in meeting passenger demand as necessary.</p> <p>(c) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p>
R16 and R17 (individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items A to C and F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) There is a huge demand for commercial sites in Kai Tak.</p> <p>(b) There are excessive residential developments with high density.</p> <p>(c) The existing transport network cannot cope with the increase in population arisen from the rezoning proposal.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R13 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Proposal</p> <p>(d) To retain Sites 2A2, 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B), 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 for commercial use.</p>	<p>(d) Responses (k) to R8 and (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
<p>R19 and R21 (individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Items A to C and F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Kai Tak has a long planning history to be part of the CBD2 with commercial and tourism developments. Rezoning the sites to residential use and incorporating social welfare facilities will undermine the past effort in building Kai Tak as commercial district and tourism hub.</p> <p>(b) The increase in residential developments will bring additional burden to traffic network.</p> <p>(c) Commercial developments are essential for the successful development of Kai Tak. There is a huge demand for commercial sites in Kai Tak.</p> <p>(d) Residential developments and social welfare facilities should be located in other districts than KTD, for example, To Kwa Wan.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8, (b), (c) and (e) to R9, and (b) to R11 above are relevant. Whilst the overarching theme of KTD has been respected and the planning principles and major urban design concepts for various sub-areas of KTD as enshrined in the Kai Tak OZP has been taken into account, appropriate refinements are required in response to changing planning circumstances, economic situations and societal needs.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses (b) and (d) to R11, and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(e) Residential developments and social welfare facilities are not compatible with the CBD development and adversely affect the image of KTD.</p> <p>(f) There are excessive residential developments with high density.</p>	<p>(e) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 and (b) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(f) Response (b) to R13 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R20 (individual)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Items A to C and F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Rezoning the sites to residential use, with significant reduction in commercial GFA turns Kai Tak into a mere residential district and deviates from the planning vision of Kai Tak as an important part of the CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The rezoning negatively affects the credibility of the Government.</p> <p>(c) Social welfare facilities should be provided in area where land value is lower and not business district, for example, Sung Won Toi and To Kwa Wan.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>(d) To retain Sites 2A2, 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B), 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 for commercial use.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b), (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (e) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses (k) to R8 and (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R22, R24 to R28 (individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities in the developments within KTD are incompatible with planning theme of KTD to be a regional commercial and tourism hub, which will adversely affect the profile and image of KTD, and is not in line with public expectation.</p> <p>(b) The existing transport network is insufficient to support the proposed residential developments and social welfare facilities, which may delay the emergency service for the users of social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p>
R23 (individual)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The development for Kai Tak should focus on tourism, housing, commercial and improvement in community. The sites at former runway area should be used for commercial development, including hotel and shopping mall, which are beneficial in boosting the economy and raising the profile of Hong Kong.</p> <p>(b) It is a waste of land resource to locate social welfare facilities at the former runway area.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8 and, (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) The inclusion of social welfare facilities contributes to the building a caring and inclusive community along the former runway. The incorporation of social welfare facilities is</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(c) The authority should take into account the original planning and local residents' views.	<p>compatible with the planned residential use of the three reviewed sites at the former runway area. It is not expected to bring adverse impact on achieving the intended tourism hub at the runway tip where there is a distinctive cluster of KTCT, runway park and TN. The maximum development potential of the reviewed sites would not be compromised as the floor space required for the social welfare facilities would be exempted from PR/GFA calculation. In fact, there are other precedent cases along the former runway area, for example, social welfare facilities were planned to provide at Sites 4A1 and 4A2 at former runway area of KTD via section 16 applications (Plan H-2).</p> <p>(c) Responses (e) to R9 and (e) to R11 are relevant. The established planning theme and urban design principles of KTD have been taken into account in formulating the recommendation of the rezoning proposal.</p>
R29 (individual)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Social welfare facilities are not compatible with the CBD development.</p> <p>(b) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located in other new development areas, for example North District, or remote district such that the users can enjoy a tranquil environment.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) There have been many changes in the planning of Kai Tak. The Government should focus on providing sufficient community facilities to support local residents' daily life, instead of changing the planning.</p>	<p>(c) Response (e) to R9 is relevant.</p> <p>Taking into account the amendments, the planned population of the Kai Tak planning area is estimated to be about 158,000. As shown in the summary of provision (Annex VIII), the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned B/D's assessment except the followings.</p> <p>Regarding the shortfall in the provision of primary school and secondary school places, as provision is planned on a district basis and a territory-wide basis respectively, the deficits in Kai Tak can be met by the surplus provision of primary and secondary school places in the Kowloon City District. For the shortfall in kindergarten, there is a surplus of planned kindergarten classrooms in the Kowloon City District to address the demand in the Kai Tai Area. Kindergarten is mainly a premise-based facility for which flexibility to allow such use has been incorporated in various residential zones of the OZP, including the "R(B)" zone under this round of OZP amendments (Plan H-1).</p> <p>Regarding shortfall in child care centre (CCC), the provision of CCC is a long-term goal which would be adjusted progressively. To address the rising demand for social welfare facilities, SWD has proposed various types of social welfare services for children, youth, elderly and people with rehabilitation needs to be incorporated in the proposed residential developments under the this round of OZP amendments.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(d) The prime sites with magnificent view in Kai Tak should be used for commercial and tourism developments to activate economy and tourism of Hong Kong.	(d) Response (d) to R11 is relevant. The proposed TN (Plan H-11a) situated at the runway tip is intended primarily for the provision of tourism-related use with commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities as well as a public observation gallery. This development will incorporate a public observation gallery to enable the general public to view this part of the Victoria Harbour, as well as the Kai Tak site and the surrounding areas.
R30 (individual)	<p>Oppose Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Social welfare facilities are not necessary in prime landmark area.</p> <p>(b) Social welfare facilities should be provided in old district, like Sham Shui Po.</p>	<p>(a) Response (c) to R14 is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.</p>
R31 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) It is considered that the excellent potential of the former runway area, to be developed into an attractive world-class tourism hub at a prime landmark location for both local residents and overseas visitors, should not be wasted. The harbourfront at the former runway area should be enhanced to develop as a tourism destination that allow visitors to enjoy the magnificent view of Victoria Harbour.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8, (g) and (h) to R10 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The long-term planning vision of KTD should not be affected by the short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(c) Various tourist attractions including iconic landmark, observation tower, markets, library, exhibition hall, performance venue, museums, and other recreation facilities, are proposed at the runway area as a tourism hub for local and oversea visitors.</p>	<p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Suitable sites with appropriate zonings have been reserved in KTD for accommodating various tourist attractions and facilities.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of library, response (f) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>Art venues including exhibition halls and performance venues are planned and provided on a territory-wide basis and according to HKPSG, are determined on the basis of need. The Government will take into account various factors in the planning of new performance venues, including the availability and usage of the existing and planned facilities in the territory, the overall planning of the district and overall demand.</p> <p>As for museum, the provision will be determined on the basis of need and the Government will consider a series of factors, including the overall policy objectives, available resources, overall demand and long-term sustainability.</p> <p>The proposed TN development at the KTRT (Plan H-11a) is intended for tourism-related use with commercial, hotel and entertainment facilities as well as a public observation gallery to enable the general public to view this part of Victoria Harbour. With a total GFA of 229,400m², the proposed TN development can accommodate various use, including exhibition convention hall, library, place of entertainment, place of recreation, sports or culture, hotel,</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(d) The proposed social welfare facilities are suggested to be located in Kowloon Bay, Ngau Tau Kok, Kwun Tong and Anderson Road, which is more accessible.	<p>eating place and shop and services, subject to the application to the Board.</p> <p>(d) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.</p>
R32 (individual)	<p>Opposes Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The sites should be retained for commercial use to support the development of CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The proposed social welfare facilities are not necessary for the middle or above class residents in such prime area of Hong Kong.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (k) to R8 and (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R14 is relevant.</p>
R33 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The long-term planning vision of KTD should not be affected by the short-term economic situation. The rezoning proposal is short-sighted.</p> <p>(b) The rezoning proposal neglected the importance and synergistic effects of the three commercial sites at the former runway area with the world class KTCT and the development of the proposed tourism hub.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R8 and (h) to R10 above are relevant. The vision to create a tourism and leisure hub at the KTRT has remained unchanged.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) KTD shall not turn into another residential property development project.</p> <p>(d) The incorporation of proposed social welfare facilities at the former runway area is contradictory to the planning theme of the area, which shall be an iconic symbol of Hong Kong and a tourism point. The proposed social welfare facilities should be located in areas with tranquil environment and high accessibility.</p>	<p>(c) Responses (b) to R9 and (d) to R11 are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.</p>
<p>R34 (individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The long-term planning vision of KTD should be adhered to and not be affected by the short-term economic situation and housing supply.</p> <p>(b) Sufficient commercial and hotel developments within KTD are essential to generate synergy with the proposed TN development for the successful development of a vibrant and active tourism hub at the runway tip.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 and (d) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>In terms of hotel provision, adequate provision has been planned to support the operation of KTCT and other tourism initiatives. According to the endorsed development brief for the TN (Plan H-11a), 15% to 20% of the total GFA of the TN should be developed for hotel, providing about 700 to 900 rooms. Another hotel under construction at the KTSP provides more than 400 rooms. In KE as a whole, the existing provision is over 10,000 rooms, and should be able to support the operation of KTCT and other tourism initiatives.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) Rezoning the sites to residential use will turn Kai Tak into a mere luxury residential district.</p> <p>(d) The original planning of KTD is based on consensus built from rounds of public consultations and should not be deviated.</p> <p>(e) The incorporation of proposed social welfare facilities at the former runway area is incompatible with the planning theme of the area.</p> <p>(f) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located in areas with tranquil environment. The proposed social welfare facilities are not necessary for the residents in the former runway area.</p>	<p>(c) Responses (b) to R9 and (d) to R11 are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses to (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(e) Responses (b) to R11 is relevant.</p> <p>(f) Response (c) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>Under the existing mechanism, when a site in a development area (as in KTD) is identified as having potential for social welfare facilities, SWD may at the early planning stage explore comprehensively the provision of suitable welfare facilities (including family and child, elderly, youth, rehabilitation, etc.) in the development projects.</p> <p>In general, SWD will take into account the planning standards and guidelines for welfare facilities set out in the HKPSG, the needs of the local or nearby community, the overall demand for welfare services, the floor area requirements of different welfare facilities, the location and accessibility of the site, as well as the advice received on site constraints, development potential and limitations (including environmental issues such as noise and air quality) in drawing up appropriate proposed welfare facilities to meet the service demand arising from the population profile in the development projects and to address the community demand at large.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
<p>R35</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The incorporation of proposed social welfare facilities at the former runway area is incompatible with the planning theme of the area and a waste of valuable land resource.</p> <p>(b) The existing transport network which is already insufficient, cannot cope with the increase in population arisen from the rezoning proposal, in particular with the cancellation of monorail.</p> <p>(c) There is insufficient retail facilities to serve the local residents at the former runway area.</p> <p>Provide General View</p> <p>(d) Transport and retail facilities should be provided at the former runway area. The monorail EFLS shall be reassessed by the Government.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R23 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) A total retail GFA of about 22,000m² will be provided at the former runway area (Plan H-14). Furthermore, at the former runway tip the proposed TN development (Plan H-11a) is intended to provide a total GFA of 229,400m² for commercial, hotel, entertainment and leisure, retail and office uses. The scale of TN development on its own is comparable to those of major commercial developments in the territory and sufficient to serve district-wide demand.</p> <p>(d) Regarding retail facilities, response (c) above is relevant.</p> <p>The former runway area is currently served by franchised bus and GMB services. The Government will also closely monitor the passenger demand of public transport services in KTD and liaises with the operators concerned to adjust the public transport services in meeting passenger demand as necessary.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>A public transport interchange to accommodate bus and green minibus bays is planned on the ground level of the TN development (Plan H-11a). Together with the existing bus stops within KTCT and other public transport facilities such as the KTRP Pier and taxi stand at the basement level of the TN development, convenient public access to various destinations in the runway area will be provided.</p> <p>Regarding the assessment of monorail EFLS, responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
R36 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed social welfare facilities are not necessary at the former runway area.</p> <p>(b) The sites should be reserved for commercial and hotel developments to utilize the harbour view and boost the profile of Hong Kong.</p>	<p>(a) Response (c) to R14 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R8 and (b) to R34 above are relevant.</p>
R37 and R38 (individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Item F and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Item</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) At a landmark location, the former runway area should be developed for commercial use, high value-added tourism facilities to serve visitors and private housing, instead of incompatible social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8 and (b) to R23 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) It is a waste of land resource to locate social welfare facilities at the former runway area. The proposed social welfare facilities will bring negative image to the visitors of the KTCT.</p> <p>(c) The existing transport facilities cannot support the proposed social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(b) Response (b) to R23 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p>
<p>R39 (individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) It is a waste of land resource to locate social welfare facilities at the former runway area, which is of high land value.</p> <p>(b) The sites should be developed into a mixed development comprising shopping mall, hotel and housing for a more efficient use of land.</p> <p>Provide General View</p> <p>(c) The monorail shall be reassessed with a shorten alignment that serves only between the KTCT and MTR Kai Tak Station.</p> <p>(d) The monorail alignment of EFLS should be revised to across the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter near the Site 4B3, continue along Wan Chiu Road via a proposed station at Zero Carbon Building to Richland Gardens and Kai Ching Estate and connect to MTR Kai Tak Station. A new underground MTR station at Site 4B5, with topside development of shopping mall and hotel, is proposed to connect Whampoa and Yau</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R23 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R8 and (b) to R34 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (j) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (j) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>Provision of additional railway services within KTD, which involves a territory-wide catchment review on rail mode transportation, is beyond the scope of the technical assessments conducted for the amendments to the OZP.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	Tong to form a circuit for Kwun Tong Line such that a synergy between Yau Tong Bay development and KTD can be formed and tourists from Tsim Sha Tsui can be diverted to KTCT.	
R40 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Items F to H and Amendments to the Notes of the Concerned Amendment Items</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities at the former runway area is incompatible with the harbourfront and landmark position, which will bring a negative image to the area. They should be located at areas with needs, such as To Kwa Wan and San Po Kong.</p> <p>(b) Retail shop and commercial developments are essential to serve the visitors and residents of the former runway area. Commercial uses, including retail shops and eating places are insufficient to serve the needs of the increased population at the former runway area.</p> <p>(c) The existing transport network and infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the increase in population at the former runway area.</p> <p>Provide General View</p> <p>(d) The monorail EFLs is a core element to facilitate KTD to be CBD2 and is the most effective and irreplaceable transportation system, which can improve the traffic condition and connectivity of KTD and KE.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11, (d) to R12, R18 and R100 and (b) to R23 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R35 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Upon implementation of relevant traffic improvement measures and completion of major transport infrastructure, the proposed multi-modal EFLS shall strengthen transportation system within KE as a whole and facilitate the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(e) The monorail EFLS shall be reassessed by the Government.	transformation of KE into the second CBD. Response (f) to R9 above is relevant. (e) Response (j) to R9 above is relevant.
R41 (individual)	Opposes Amendment Items F to H <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The sites should be retained for hotel developments to meet the demand in view of the shortage in the surrounding areas and international events to be held at KTSP. It is expected the demand for hotel rooms will also surge after the epidemic. (b) Social welfare facilities could be located everywhere, in particular areas with convenient transport connection for emergency situations, but the former runway area is unique for its harbourfront location and better for tourism development.	(a) Responses (b) to R8 and (b) to R34 above are relevant. (b) Responses (b) to R11 , (d) to R12, R18 and R100 and (b) to R34 above are relevant.
R42 (individual)	Opposes Amendment Items F to H <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The rezoning proposal will make the land use pattern monotonous along the former runway. (b) There is insufficient community facilities to support the daily necessity of the planned population along the former runway. (c) The cumulative traffic impact to the road network in the surrounding area is underestimated.	(a) Responses (b) to R9 and (d) to R11 above are relevant. (b) Response (c) to R29 above is relevant. (c) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(d) The building height restriction (BHR) of 108mPD of Site 4B5 (i.e. representation site under Amendment Item F) is considered excessive for it is higher than the adjacent developments, which are subject to BHRs of 95mPD and 100mPD, and undesirable from urban design point of view given its harbourfront location.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>(e) These three pieces of precious harbourfront sites (Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5) should be rezoned to lower density land uses such as “G/IC” or open space for public enjoyment.</p>	<p>(d) The amendments for the three former runway sites do not involve any change in BH. The undulating and varied BH profile, with the tallest band of developments in the middle portion and BHs of the developments stepping down on the two sides towards the Metro Park and the KTRT (Plans H-5a, H-18c and H-18d) is maintained.</p> <p>Within individual sites, the prevailing design concept for residential sites at the former runway area to create visual variety and to better blend in with the adjoining waterfront promenade will be retained. Through the creation of some low-rise blocks fronting the waterfront promenade, it can provide a more diversified building mass and a more intimate scale of development for the pedestrians along the promenade.</p> <p>According to HKPSG, residential sites in new development areas of the urban area are subject to a maximum domestic PR of 6.5, which has been generally adopted for the residential sites in former north apron and runway area. The average domestic PR of 6.5 for Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 is consistent with this standard and proven technically feasible, as well as could achieve optimal site utilization to meet actual housing demand of the community.</p> <p>(e) Considering an ample provision of open space with a total of about 100ha is provided in KTD, among which a total of about 7.2 ha of harbourfront area is already zoned “O” on two sides of the former runway area to form a continuous public waterfront promenade, further rezoning the sites to “O” is considered not necessary.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(f) Given the visually sensitive location at Victoria Harbour, the development density of Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5, such as PR and BHR should be limited to not more than that for the adjacent R(B)4 sites, i.e. maximum plot ratio 5.5 and BH not exceed 95mPD.</p>	<p>As for the provision of GIC facilities, response (c) to R29 above is relevant. The existing and planned provision of GIC facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned B/D's assessment (Annex VIII).</p> <p>(f) Response (d) above is relevant.</p>
<p>R43</p> <p>(Worldwide Cruise Terminals co-signed by (i) three Legislative Council Members, (ii) a Southern DC Member and a Kowloon City DC Member, (iii) five cruise companies, and (iv) ten companies of travel and transport industry)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item H</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) A hotel should be provided in the proximity of KTCT to realise the potential of KTCT, providing convenient connection for passengers. This will reduce traffic load on the nearby road network.</p>	<p>(a) Regarding the hotel provision, Sites 4C4 and 4C5 (Plan H-5a) were tendered for sale during 2018 to 2019 for commercial use with a minimum hotel GFA of 24,057m² and 17,064m² respectively. However, due to weak market sentiment, the tenders were cancelled. As advised by Tourism Commission (TC), cruise passengers' demand for hotel accommodation near KTCT is not high. Non-local cruise passengers normally have their accommodation arranged on-board and travel to different places in Hong Kong upon arrival at KTCT for sightseeing and shopping etc. For those who choose to start or finish their voyages in Hong Kong, they may opt for other accommodation experience around the city instead of just staying around KTCT. Response (b) to R34 above is relevant. As for the capacity of the nearby road network of KTCT, response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The residential development at Site 4C5, which is expected to be low-rise and upmarket, will not address the pressing housing demand and issues in Hong Kong.</p> <p>(c) Parking facilities should be provided at Site 4C5 and 4D2 (i.e. the TN) for “park and cruise” travels. In the short term, Site 4C5, which can provide approximately 500 parking spaces at ground level, should be as a park and cruise car park until Site 4D2 is sold for hotel development. If Site 4D2 cannot be sold by 2023, Site 4D2 should be made a long term park and cruise facility providing 3,150 parking spaces and Site 4C5 shall be developed as a hotel. If Site 4D2 can be sold for development with a hotel component by 2023, Site 4C5 can be re-evaluated for hotel or residential, but with a multi-storey park and cruise facility beneath.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>(d) Site 4C5 should be retained for commercial/hotel use, (at least until Site 4D2 (i.e. the proposed TN) is successful tendered).</p> <p>(e) Additional ferry landing steps closer to KTCT to connect to North Point, Kwun Tong, Kwun Tong Promenade and Lai Yip Street.</p>	<p>(b) Response (d) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) The TN, located adjacent to the KTCT (Plan H-5a) is planned for tourism related use, including hotel, retail, entertainment and leisure, office and public transport facilities. About 1,000 car parking spaces and 53 public coach parking spaces will be provided at the TN. Majority of the planned parking spaces will be open to the public, including the cruise users, and could be used for ‘park and cruise’ purpose by concerned parties if needed.</p> <p>In any case, the established planning theme and urban design framework for the runway tip should be respected to activate the waterfront with a variety of activities and to create a dynamic skyline with an undulating BH profile and pedestrian friendly environment with podium-free development.</p> <p>(d) The responses (a) on hotel use above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) Response (g) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
<p>R44 and R45</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item I</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Rezoning of site would defeat the original purpose of provision of an outlet for breathing space for the general public in the nearby area.</p> <p>(b) The proposed 100m high commercial building at the site will adversely affect the landscape amenity of the harbourfront area and the scenic value treasured by the general public as well as the landscape of the inner built-up cluster of To Kwa Wan looking towards the shoreline.</p>	<p>(a) Item I is to take forward a section 12A application No. Y/K22/3 to rezone the site for proposed commercial redevelopment of Lucky Building at San Ma Tau Street (Plan H-6b) that was partially agreed by MPC of the Board on 1.2.2019. Item I has also covered the adjacent small piece of land currently covered by Kapok Industrial Building. According to the MPC Paper No. Y/K22/3, the site was original zoned “OU(TVS)” to reserve the area for a tunnel ventilation shaft for the underground section of the CKR. Subsequently, HyD confirmed that the “OU(TVS)” zone was no longer required for the reserved use given that the other proposed tunnel ventilation shaft at Kai Tak was already sufficient to serve the purpose. An AVA has been conducted for the section 12A application No. Y/K22/3. Whilst the proposed commercial development at San Ma Tau Street does not fall within any identified air path, there is no specific site circumstances that warrant air ventilation concerns related to the site and the proposed development. CTP/UD&L, PlanD had no adverse comment from air ventilation perspective.</p> <p>(b) A VIA has been conducted for the section 12A application No. Y/K22/3. The relevant photomontages of the proposed commercial development are at Plans H-18e and H-18f. Given the surrounding context and the intended BH profile, the proposed development is not expected to present any major issue on visual impact. The proposed BH restriction of 100mPD is also compatible with the surrounding areas with a general BH restriction at 100mPD at the waterfront and progressively ascending to 120mPD at the inner area of Ma</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The proposed commercial development at the site would block the air flow from the seaward side, reducing ventilation into the built-up cluster of To Kwa Wan.</p> <p>(d) Further influx of working population arisen from the rezoning of the site would worsen the road and pedestrian traffic. There has been coaches for tourists parking and dropping off in the area, causing congestion. The proposed development would further worsen the frequent congestions and delaying the emergency service when needed.</p>	<p>Tau Kok (Plan H-19). CTP/UD&L of PlanD had no adverse comment from urban design perspective.</p> <p>(c) Response (a) above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been conducted for the section 12A application No. Y/K22/3. The site at San Ma Tau Street is well served by various public transport services, including franchised bus, GMB and public light bus. The KCFP and its PTI is in close proximity. Operational performance of the critical junctions will be operated within their capacities in design year. The assessment result indicated that the proposed commercial development at San Ma Tau Street would not incur significant adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding areas. C for T had no adverse comment on the section 12A application and the rezoning proposal to rezone the site (covering Lucky Building and Kapok Industrial Building) to “C” (Plan H-6a).</p>
<p>R46</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item I</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Given its harbourfront location, the BHR of the site should not be easily relaxed and should be in line with the BHs along Mei King Street.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R44 and R45 above is relevant. The proposed BH restriction of 100mPD is also compatible with the surrounding areas, including Wyler Garden at Mei King Street with a general BH restriction at 100mPD.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(b) The proposed development maybe subject to the noise impact from KTSP.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development will bring adverse impact on overall planning of the KTSP</p> <p>(d) There should be more suitable sites for housing development. Limited flat production and nano flats are anticipated at the site, which is undesirable.</p>	<p>(b) Responses (k) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant. In general, the proposed development would complement the KTSP in term of enhancing the connectivity and bring vibrancy to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>(d) According to the latest Annual Progress Report of LTHS released in December 2020, the supply target of private housing will continue to be met through various land supply sources, including projects of the URA and private development/redevelopment projects. Redevelopment of existing developments was also announced in the Policy Address 2020 as one of the measures for forming land to further boost land supply. The proposed DRE development with a site area of about 8,500m² is intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/ or urban renewal projects.</p> <p>The development proposal is in-line with the Government's policy to increase housing land supply. With the provision of rehousing options in the current locality and the timely provision of the subsidized housing units, the proposed DRE would help to facilitate implementation of the redevelopment projects. According to the proposed scheme prepared by</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(e) The increase in population arisen from the proposed development will bring adverse traffic impact on the existing transport network and worsen the frequent congestion on To Kwa Wan Road.</p> <p>(f) The proposed development will bring adverse impact on air ventilation to the 5-street and 13-street areas.</p>	<p>HKHS, about 1,100 flats could be provided, with an average of about 50 m².</p> <p>(e) A TIA has been conducted for the proposed DRE development. The DRE site is well-served by various public transport services, including franchised bus, GMB and public light bus, which operate along Mok Cheong Street, Ma Tau Kok Road and To Kwa Wan Road (Plan H-6b). In addition, the KCFP and its PTI are located within 500m or equivalent to around 8-minute walk from the proposed development (Plan H-6d). The analysed junctions under the TIA are expected to operate with capacities during the peak hours at the design year, with sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected traffic growth and the traffic generated by the proposed DRE development. Regarding the pedestrian volume generated from the proposed DRE development, the TIA has indicated that the level of service of the assessed footpaths is expected to have sufficient capacity to cater for the additional pedestrian flow arising from the proposed DRE development. In gist, no insurmountable adverse traffic impact has been expected. C for T has no objection to the subject proposal.</p> <p>(f) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R47 to R49 (individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendment Item I</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Same as R44 and R45</p>	<p>(a) Responses to R44 and R45 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>Oppose Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(b) The proposed rezoning undermine the overall planning of the KTSP and the surrounding areas as a leisure and sports destination.</p> <p>(c) This key waterfront area should be used as open space for enjoyment of the general public.</p> <p>(d) Harbourfront area is precious in Hong Kong and the Government should safeguard it from encroachment by urban tall buildings. The proposed development will affect the visual amenity and the established BH profile of the area.</p>	<p>(b) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant. In general, the proposed development would complement the KTSP in term of enhancing the connectivity and bring vibrancy to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>(c) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>The waterfront POS zoned “O” between the DRE site and KTSP and intended to be developed as a POS complementing the ‘Dining Cove’ (green area on Plan H-7) will also be designed and constructed by HKHS and handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for management and maintenance upon completion for early public enjoyment.</p> <p>(d) The proposed maximum BH of 100mPD for the DRE development is considered compatible with the surrounding planned/existing residential developments in Ma Tau Kok. In the hinterland, the sites along Mok Cheong Street falling within various “CDA” sub-zones and the “R(A)” zones to the northwest and southwest of the DRE site respectively on the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/28 across To Kwa Wan Road are all subject to a maximum BH of 100mPD. Along the waterfront, the stepped BH profile gradually descends from Grand Waterfront of 176mPD to the DRE</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(e) The proposed development will block the air flow from the seaward side, reducing ventilation into the built-up cluster of To Kwa Wan.</p>	<p>development of 100mPD and the KTSP of 70mPD^[2] (Plan H-19).</p> <p>An overall greening ratio of the proposed DRE development (Plan H-9b) will be not less than 30% to maximize the greening provision for softening the built form and providing a smooth transition between the proposed development and the adjacent neighbourhood.</p> <p>A VIA has been conducted to assess the visual impact brought by the proposed development. The relevant photomontages of the proposed DRE development are at Plans H-18g and H-18h. Due to the prominence of the location of the site, the proposed DRE development would inevitably result in some visual impacts in particular to the pedestrians and visitors to the waterfront promenade in close proximity. Taking into account the recommended mitigation measures, including a building separation of 15m and 11m within the site as view and air corridor, provision of at-grade open space and multi-level greening/landscape treatment (Plans H-9a and H9b), CTP/UD&L, PlanD had no adverse comment on the VIA.</p> <p>(e) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p>

² The KTSP falls within an area zoned “OU(Stadium)”, which is subject to a maximum BH of 55mPD. A planning application for minor relation of BHR for the proposed main stadium at the southern portion of the KTSP from 55mPD to 70mPD; and proposed hotel and eating at KTSP was approved by the MPC of the Board on 17.3.2017.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(f) Traffic along the To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road are very congested during rush hours. Further increase in population arisen from the proposed development would worsen the situation. It will also delay the emergency services when needed.</p> <p>(g) There are inadequate essential supportive facilities such as market, kindergartens, primary and secondary schools, etc. in the nearby area of the proposed development.</p> <p>(h) The proposed DRE development could be relocated to Harmony Garden and a site at Ma Tau Chung Road and Pau Chung Street, which have been vacant for many years. The redevelopment of the 13-Street can create a synergistic effect on the development of To Kwa Wan and KTSP and bring greater development potential and return.</p>	<p>(f) Response (e) to R46 above is relevant.</p> <p>(g) The existing and planned provision of GIC facilities and open space are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population of Kai Tak OZP in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned B/D's assessment (Annex VIII). Response (c) to R29 above is relevant.</p> <p>(h) The DRE site with a site area of about 8,500m² on the readily available government site will provide about 1,100 flats for timely rehousing to facilitate the government development and/or urban renewal projects. The site is considered suitable and technical feasible for residential development irrespective of whether other sites are available. If considered appropriate, other possible sites will be separately considered subject to the availability and technical feasibility.</p>
<p>R50</p> <p>(Owners' Committee of Grand Waterfront)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) To Kwa Wan and Ma Tau Wai is a crowded district with more than 150,000 population. Further increase in population will bring additional demand for public transport.</p>	<p>(a) The DRE site is well-served by various public transport services, including franchised bus, green minibus and public light bus. Apart from the road-based public transport services, the MTR Sung Wong Toi Station of Tuen Ma Line was commissioned in late June 2021 and is located in the vicinity of the DRE Site, which is about 700m or equivalent to within 10-minute walk from the site. Currently, there are sufficient public transport services with MTR connection. TD will</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The proposed development will block the view, sunlight and air ventilation of the existing residential developments in the area.</p> <p>(c) Residents of the To Kwa Wan district is already subject to the nuisance, noise and poor air quality brought by public infrastructure (including Central Kowloon Route project) and urban renewal works projects. The authority should consider the impact to the residents by the proposed development.</p>	<p>continue to monitor the demand arisen from the future developments of the area when planning transport services.</p> <p>Response (e) to R46 above is also relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (m) to R10 and (d) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p> <p>According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB PG No. 41B), in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it is not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it is far more important to protect public views.</p> <p>(c) An Environmental Assessment (EA) to assess the potential environmental impact arising from the proposed DRE development has been conducted. Good practices, including water spraying and hoarding and closing monitoring by the resident engineers, and compliance with the Air Pollution Control (Construction Dust) Regulations, emission of construction dust can be kept at an acceptable level. Disposal of waste generated by the construction works will also be appropriated handled and in compliance with relevant statutory and non-statutory regulations. Also, the noise from construction activities is subject to the Noise Control Ordinance. In addition, the project proponents and their contractors will be required by EPD to implement necessary pollution control measures during construction to prevent and control any potential environmental nuisances/impacts arising from construction works/activities and to observe and comply</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>with relevant pollution control ordinances. As such, no significant construction phase nuisance arisen from the proposed development is therefore anticipated under current statutory and regulatory practice. DEP has no objection to the proposed development.</p>
<p>R51</p> <p>(The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) There is insufficient information, including quantitative figures or details, in the submission to address the gas safety concern arisen from the proposed DRE development in view of its proximity to the Ma Tau Kok Gas Works (MTKGW).</p>	<p>(a) A quantitative risk assessment (QRA) to assess the risk levels associated with the MTKGW arising from developments in the consultation zone, which covers the DRE site, was considered by the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations (CCPHI) in 2021. As assessed in the 2021 QRA report, the individual risk level arising from the proposed development covered in the QRA report is considered acceptable and the societal risk falls within the ‘as low as reasonably practicable’ (ALARP) region. The 2021 QRA report has been endorsed by CCPHI.</p> <p>The planned population of the proposed DRE development is less than that adopted in the endorsed QRA report, hence the DRE development would not adversely affect the risk level as compared with that assessed in the endorsed QRA report. DEMS considers that there is no insurmountable issue in respect of the gas risk for the proposed DRE development.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) According to the HKPSG, sizeable developments are normally not approved within the consultation zone of a PHI. Developments within the consultation zone should be assessed against the Government risk guidelines and necessary mitigation measures should be considered to reduce the risk level. No information is provided in the submission to address the requirements imposed by HKPSG.</p> <p>(c) Determination of acceptable risk levels should not be based solely on the risk guidelines but also that the project would not generate substantial increase in potential loss of life (PLL). There is no detailed safety risk analysis to address the concern.</p>	<p>(b) According to Section 4.3.1 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG, “the Government’s policy is to minimise the potential risks associated risks associated with a PHI to internationally acceptable levels by controlling the siting of PHIs and the land use in the vicinity, and by requiring the installation to be constructed and operated to specified standards”. Development proposals in the consultation zone of a PHI are assessed against the Risk Guidelines (“RG”) (Section 4.4 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG) to ensure that risks to the public are confined to within acceptable limits. According to Section 4.4 of Chapter 12 of the HKPSG, the risk levels of PHIs are expressed in terms of individual risk and societal risk. For societal risk, Section 4.4.3 states that “an intermediate region is also incorporated in the societal RG in which the acceptability of societal risk is borderline and should be reduced to a level which is “as low as reasonably practicable” (ALARP). In other words, the societal risk falling within the ALARP region is also considered compliance with the HKPSG.</p> <p>As mentioned in response (a) above, the individual risk level arising from the proposed development covered in the QRA report is considered acceptable and the societal risk falls within the ALARP region.</p> <p>(c) As assessed in the endorsed QRA report, the individual risk level arising from the proposed development covered in the QRA report is considered acceptable and the societal risk falls within the ALARP region. This assessment has been endorsed by CCPHI. The increase in PLL has been considered in the endorsed QRA and reflected in the societal risk. The assumption and assessment have been endorsed by CCPHI.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(d) Additional hazard posed to the consultation zone is substantial with PLL increased by over 25%. Taking into account the increasing risk of vandalism/sabotage to the gas plant, the societal risk will fall into the unacceptable zone.</p> <p>Proposals</p> <p>(e) A note should be added under “R(A)6” zone that The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited shall be consulted.</p>	<p>(d) Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) had been consulted on the assessment of vandalism/sabotage in the endorsed QRA report. In light of HKPF’s advice, CCPHI considered that the risk of terrorist attack/vandalism/sabotage is not as substantive as to render incompliance with the HKPSG, and that the societal risk assessed should fall within ALARP region.</p> <p>(e) The Project proponent will consult relevant B/Ds at the implementation stage in accordance with the prevailing practice. It is considered not necessary to specify under the Notes of the “R(A)6” zone.</p>
<p>R52</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The site is not suitable for housing development as the small site area would limit the flat production and it is in proximity of sewerage pumping station, which brings an undesirable living environment for future residents.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development will cause wall effect and block the wind penetration to the surrounding developments.</p>	<p>(a) Response (d) to R46 above is relevant. The existing To Kwa Wan Road Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) (Plan H-6b) has installed necessary at-source measures/devices (such as deodorizers and acoustic enclosures) to control and alleviate the potential environmental impacts such as odour and noise. The EA for the DRE development also assessed the potential environmental impacts on the development due to various nearby sources including the adjacent SPS, and revealed that the proposed DRE development will not be subject to adverse and unacceptable impacts from the SPS. DEP has no objection to the proposed DRE development.</p> <p>(b) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(c) The site is proposed to be children playground and pet garden to connect the waterfront promenade for public enjoyment.	(c) Response (d) to R46 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant. Actual provision of facilities at the POS within the DRE site will be subject to refinement at detailed design stage.
R53 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The site is not suitable for housing development as the small site area would limit the flat production and encourage the construction of nano flats.</p> <p>(b) There are other sites suitable for housing development in the district, including a vacant land at the junction of Ma Hang Chung Road and Pau Chung Street and the redevelopment of 13-street, which bring greater development potential and return.</p> <p>(c) The development in To Kwa Wan should take into account the potential for redevelopment and the position of the area.</p>	<p>(a) Response (d) to R46 above is relevant</p> <p>(b) Response (h) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) The “Urban Renewal Plan (“URP”) for Kowloon City” prepared under the District Urban Renewal Forum (“DURF”) study provides the blueprint for the urban renewal work in Kowloon City District. It also aims to guide and facilitate the urban renewal works of the district. The URP for Kowloon City has identified the need for redevelopment for certain areas in To Kwa Wan/Kowloon City which are mostly occupied by aged buildings in dilapidated conditions. The recommendation of the URP is respected and the proposed DRE development aims to provide rehousing options in the current locality to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/ or urban renewal projects. The timely provision of the subsidized housing units in the</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(d) The proposed DRE development would block the view and affect the property price of other residential developments.</p> <p>(e) It will be a waste of resource for developing a public housing at a unique harbourfront site in proximity of KTSP.</p> <p>(f) The proposed rezoning undermine the overall planning of the KTSP and the surrounding areas as a leisure and sports destination. This key waterfront area should be used as open space for enjoyment of the general public.</p> <p>(g) The proposed development will bring adverse impact on the harbourfront amenity and the connection between To Kwa Wan and KTD. Retaining the original zoning can enhance the quality of the waterfront promenade and facilitate the revitalisation of the area.</p> <p>(h) The proposed development is not in proximity to any railway station and the existing street will not be sufficient to cope with the additional pedestrian flow.</p> <p>(i) There is insufficient essential supportive facilities in the nearby area of the proposed development.</p> <p>(j) More resource should be considered for the revitalisation of the To Kwa Wan area, taking into account its locational advantage of being a city centre and harbourfront area, as well as its local cultural and heritage value.</p>	<p>proposed DRE would help to facilitate implementation of the development projects.</p> <p>(d) Responses to (m) to R10 and (b) to R50 above are relevant.</p> <p>(e) Response (d) to R46 above is relevant.</p> <p>(f) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant. In general, the proposed development would complement the KTSP in term of enhancing the connectivity and bring vibrancy to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>(g) Responses (e) to R8 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p> <p>(h) Responses (e) to R46 and (a) to R50 above are relevant.</p> <p>(i) Response (g) to R47 to R49 is relevant.</p> <p>(j) The URP for Kowloon City” prepared under the DURF study provides the blueprint for the urban renewal work in Kowloon City District. It also aims to guide and facilitate the urban renewal works of the district. The URP for Kowloon City has identified the need for redevelopment for certain areas in To Kwa Wan/Kowloon City which are mostly occupied by aged</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		<p>buildings in dilapidated conditions. Amongst the recommendations of the URP for Kowloon City, the historic and cultural resources of Kowloon City are recognised and it is recommended to strengthen and highlight the historic and cultural characters of the district through revitalisation of heritage buildings and designation of a themed walking trail, hence creating a distinctive image for the district. Meanwhile, waterfront enhancement proposals are also recommended with a view to connect the segmented waterfront areas and enhancing promenade environment.</p>
<p>R54 (individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The rezoning proposal will lead to a reduction in the provision of open space.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development with a BH of more than 100m will bring adverse impact on air ventilation and visual amenity of ridgeline.</p> <p><u>Proposal</u></p> <p>(c) The original planning of the site as open space should be remained for public enjoyment.</p>	<p>(a) Despite an area original zoned “O” (about 2,450m²) was rezoned to “R(A)6”, an at-grade POS of not less than 2,700m² (including some covered areas) will be reprovisioned within the site for public use on a 24-hour basis. There is no reduction in the overall provision of open space.</p> <p>(b) Responses (m) to R10 and (d) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (d) to R46 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R55 and R56 (individuals)	<p>Oppose Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed development will cause wall effect and adverse impact on air ventilation.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>(b) The site should be zoned as “Green Belt”.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (m) to R10 and (d) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) The proposed DRE development is intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/or renewal projects, and will in turn facilitate urban renewal.</p>
R57 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The rezoning proposal will bring adverse impact to the residents of the existing housing estates in the surroundings, who will be deterred from the use of waterfront open space.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>(b) It is suggested to retain the original use.</p>	<p>(a) Response (c) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R55 and R56 above is relevant.</p>
R58 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed development will cause wall effect and adverse impact on air ventilation.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (m) to R10 and (d) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(b) It is not cost effective for housing development at the site as the small site area would limit the flat production, with a lack of integrated planning with the surrounding developments.	(b) Response (d) to R46 above is relevant.
R59 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed development will bring adverse visual impact on the view from Kai Tak to To Kwa Wan and is not in line with the existing BH profile ascending from 65mPD to 110mPD at Ming Lun Street and 176mPD at Grand Waterfront. The BHR of the proposed development should be not more than 50m.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development will cause wall effect and adverse impact on air ventilation to 5-street.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development will bring adverse impact on overall planning of the KTSP.</p> <p>(d) An integrated development with the site at Ming Lun Street will be more cost effective.</p>	<p>(a) Response (d) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant. In general, the proposed development would complement the KTSP in term of enhancing the connectivity and bring vibrancy to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>(d) The site at Ming Lun Street (also known as 5-street site), albeit adjacent to the DRE site, is under multiple ownership and subject to the development restriction under “CDA”. Response (h) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R60, R61, R64 to R68 (individuals)	Oppose Amendment Item J1 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Same as R47 to R49 's views on Amendment Item J1	(a) Responses (b) to (h) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.
R62 (individual)	Opposes Amendment Item J1 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed development will cause wall effect and adverse impact on air ventilation. (b) The proposed development would bring adverse impact to the security of the area.	(a) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant. (b) HKPF has been consulted and has no adverse comment on the proposed development.
R63 (individual)	Opposes Amendment Item J1 <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed rezoning undermine the overall planning of the KTSP and the surrounding areas as leisure and sports destination. This key waterfront area should be used as open space for enjoyment of the general public and safeguard it from encroachment by high-rise buildings. (b) The proposed development will affect the visual amenity and is not in line with the established BH profile of the area, which ascends from 65mPD to 110mPD at Ming Lun Street and 176mPD at Grand Waterfront.	(a) Responses (e) to R8 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant. (b) Response (d) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) The proposed development will bring adverse air ventilation impact on the existing residential developments in the surrounding area.</p> <p>(d) There are inadequate essential supportive facilities such as market, kindergartens, primary and secondary schools, etc. in the nearby area of the proposed development.</p> <p>Proposal</p> <p>(e) The site should be used as open space or recreational use for public enjoyment.</p>	<p>(c) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (c) to R29 above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) Responses (d) to R46 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant</p>
<p>R69</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed development, which is not compatible from visual perspective, will bring adverse impact on overall planning of the KTSP</p>	<p>(a) Responses (d) to R46 and (d) to R47 to R49 are relevant.</p>
<p>R70</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendment Item J1</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The original land use of the site should be retained such that the public can enjoy the waterfront open space and organise cultural exchange events.</p>	<p>(a) Response (d) to R46 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant. As stated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, cultural and leisure uses are also encouraged to be provided at the development to promote diversity at the waterfront.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
<p>R71, R72 and R108</p> <p>(R71: 張景勛議員辦事處)</p> <p>R72 and R108: individuals)</p>	<p>Oppose Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The existing transport network is insufficient to support the proposed social welfare facilities. (R71 and R108)</p> <p>(b) Miscommunication between the proposed social welfare facilities users and tourists may create a negative impression on Hong Kong. (R71, R72 and R108) Considering the cruise passengers will generally spend their days near the KTCT, the proposed social welfare facilities will create a negative impression to them. (R71 and R72) The hustle environment of former runway area as a tourist destination is not suitable for the proposed social welfare facilities. The proposed social welfare facilities are suggested to be located on land zoned “C” or “G/IC” in proximity of the New Acute Hospital, which is more accessible or Kowloon Bay, Ngau Tau Kok, Kwun Tong and Anderson Road Ex-Quarry, where the image of Hong Kong will not be affected.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>The planning intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will serve the social need, support residential neighbourhood, and achieve balanced community, which would not contradictory to the planning intention of KTD.</p> <p>It is not expected to bring adverse impact on achieving the intended tourism hub at the KTRT where there is a distinctive cluster of KTCT, runway park and TN. Through layout design and operation management, the interface, if any, could be addressed.</p> <p>As for the suggested alternative sites, the “G/IC” sites in proximity of the New Acute Hospital are designated for the development of New Acute Hospital, Hong Kong Children’s Hospital and Animal Management and Animal Welfare Building Complex. The “C” sites in proximity of the New Acute Hospital are generally for commercial development, subject to the completion of the construction of T2 Trunk Road. The provision of social welfare facilities at the “C” sites, though may be explored in future land sale and subject to the consideration of relevant departments, would not be in</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(c) Various tourist attractions including library, exhibition hall, performance venue, museums, other recreation facilities, and hotel with special themes, are proposed at the runway area to create synergy with the proposed TN development. (R71 and R72)</p> <p>(d) The harbourfront at the former runway area should be enhanced to develop as a tourism destination that allow visitors to enjoy the magnificent view of Victoria Harbour. (R71 and R72)</p> <p>(e) The planning vision of the runway should not be affected by the short-term economic situation and its potential to be world class tourism destination should not be wasted. (R71 and R72)</p>	<p>sync with the development of the former runway, hence is unable to meet the existing and forthcoming demand of KTD.</p> <p>(c) Responses (b) to R8 and (c) to R31 above are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Responses (b) to R8 and (g) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) Responses (b) to R8 and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
<p>R73</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) BsH in Sites 2A2 and 2A3 is not suitable to be accommodated in residential and commercial area.</p>	<p>(a) BsH is a residential child care service subvented by the Government and operated by the non-government organisations, with social workers or trained staff on-site round-the-clock. BsH provides out-of-home care in the form of small group living for boys aged 11 to 21 who cannot be adequately cared for by their families or being mal-treated, such that they can continue to stay in the community while learning to overcome their life challenges. Like other children or teenagers living with their families in the community, they</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The credibility of the Government is in doubt for not developing Kai Tak into a CBD.</p> <p>Provide General View</p> <p>(c) Site 1B3 is intended for school use and the proposed transitional housing would hinder the implementation of school.</p>	<p>will go to school or work while living in the BsH. As a matter of fact, most of the residents are school-aged, hence KTD, being close to the nearby areas with many schools, is considered suitable for a BsH as it can facilitate the schooling of the boys and keeping their connections with the community at large.</p> <p>(b) Response (e) to R9 above are relevant</p> <p>(c) The reserved school site (Site 1B3) (Plan H-13a), which is not part of the amendment item, has been reserved for school development in the medium to long run. Given that the strong demand for temporary housing for low-income families, EDB does not object to the proposed temporary use of the sites on the condition that it will not affect the future school building programme in the KTD.</p>
<p>R74</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) BsH in Sites 2A2 and 2A3 should be located near correctional institutions or remote area, such as islands, for a tranquil environment.</p>	<p>(a) Response (a) to R73 above is relevant. BsH is neither a correctional nor compulsory rehabilitation facility catered for youth delinquents. The majority of boys living in BsH are school students of ordinary primary and secondary schools in the mainstream, who are admitted to BsH on voluntary basis with the parental consent.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) It is more cost effective to develop the land in city centre taking into account economic development and land sale revenue for financial income and redistribute income to social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>Existing BsHs are mostly located in urban area, which facilitate the boys in attending schools, integrating in the community and keeping closer connections with their parents. Placing the BsH in remote area is not conducive to their development and family reunion.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>The maximum development potential of the reviewed sites would not be compromised as the floorspace required for the social welfare facilities will be exempted from PR/GFA calculation. With not less than 5% of domestic GFA of the concerned sites reserved for social welfare facilities, the provision is considered commensurate to the developments.</p>
<p>R75 (individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) BsH in Sites 2A2 and 2A3 should be located near correctional institutions or remote area, such as islands and New Territories, for a tranquil environment.</p> <p>(b) KTD as part of the CBD2 should be dominated by commercial, art, cultural, sports and private residential developments to raise Government's income.</p> <p>(c) The site (Sites 2A2 and 2A3) should be sold for private housing to increase Government's income and housing supply.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (a) to R73 and (a) to R74 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) The site is proposed for private housing development.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R76 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) BsH (Sites 2A2 and 2A3) should be located at remote area for a tranquil environment.	(a) Responses (a) to R73 and (a) to R74 above are relevant.
R77 and R78 (individual)	Oppose Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Support the Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 to be zoned for residential use but oppose the incorporation of social welfare facilities (b) The proposed social welfare facilities are incompatible with the tourism hub development at the former runway area and will bring negative impression to tourists.	(a) The supportive view is noted. (b) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.
R79 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed social welfare facilities are incompatible with and adversely affect the position of the tourism hub development at the former runway area.	(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R80 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located near hospitals to allow convenient access to medical service.	(a) Responses (f) to R34 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.
R81 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Developing social welfare facilities on land with high land sale value is not cost effective. (b) The proposed social welfare facilities are not in line with the position of tourism and commercial hub of KTD. Large scale social welfare facilities could be planned in Northern Metropolis.	(a) Response (b) to R74 above is relevant. (b) Responses (b) to R11 , (d) to R12, R18 and R100 are relevant.
R82 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) Support the Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 to be zoned for residential use but oppose the incorporation of social welfare facilities. (b) The incorporation of social welfare facilities will distort the planning intention and jeopardise the completeness and consistency of the whole KTD.	(a) The supportive view is noted. (b) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R83 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed social welfare facilities are incompatible with the tourism hub development at the former runway area and will bring negative impression to tourists.	(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.
R84 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed social welfare facilities should not be located within CBD and prime areas, which will jeopardise the positioning of KTD as CBD, interest of stakeholders and image of Hong Kong.	(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.
R85 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) No objection to rezoning Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 for residential use but oppose the incorporation of social welfare facilities. (b) The proposed social welfare facilities will jeopardise the unique landmark commercial district position and image of KTD and can be located in other districts.	(a) The supportive view is noted. (b) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R86 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Kai Tak has a long planning history to be part of the CBD2. It is not cost effective to incorporate social welfare facilities at the prime and harbourfront former runway area.</p> <p>(b) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located in other districts than KTD, for example, To Kwa Wan, which are more accessible.</p>	<p>(a) The intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R23 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above is relevant.</p>
R87 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The existing road network (Shing Fung Road) cannot cope with the increase in traffic flow arisen from the proposed social welfare facilities and residential developments.</p> <p>(b) The hustle environment of former runway area as a tourist destination is not suitable for the proposed social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R11 and (f) to R34 above are relevant.</p>
R88 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Given the acute housing supply, the rezoning of the Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 for residential use is considered acceptable.</p>	<p>(a) No objection view is noted.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>(b) The incorporation of social welfare facilities at the former runway area undermines the position of tourism hub.</p> <p>(c) There are already sites with social welfare facilities within KTD, for example Site 4A1. Additional provision is considered not necessary.</p>	<p>(b) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R14 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R89</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The former runway area is a unique project for promoting the profile of Hong Kong as international city. The incorporation of social welfare facilities is not in line with such vision.</p> <p>(b) The position of the former runway area should be similar to the landmark art and cultural developments in the vicinity of Kowloon station. Support the rezoning of Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 to residential use and suggest to incorporate leisure and cultural facilities, such as museum, to promote the profile of Hong Kong as international city.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(b) The supportive view is noted. The rezoning proposal does not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT. As for the provision of leisure and cultural facilities, response (c) to R31 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R90</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The existing road network (Shing Fung Road) is insufficient to support the proposed social welfare facilities, which may delay the emergency service for the users of social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R91 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed social welfare facilities in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 are not compatible with the position of tourism hub and KTCT.</p> <p>(b) The hustle environment of former runway area as a tourist destination is not suitable for the proposed social welfare facilities.</p> <p>(c) The existing road network is insufficient to support the proposed residential developments and social welfare facilities, which may delay the emergency service for the users of social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT. Response (f) to R34 above is also relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 are relevant</p>
R92 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The planning theme of KTD should be characterised as commercial, residential and landmark tourism destination. The past investment in KTD was to promote the profile of Hong Kong and facilitate economic development.</p> <p>(b) The incorporation of social welfare facilities in Sites 2A2, 2A3, 2A4 2A5(B), 2A10, 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 will create a negative image on Kai Tak to tourists and undermine the market appeal of the area.</p>	<p>(a) The intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. Response (c) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R93 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed social welfare facilities will undermine the impression to tourists on KTCT as a world class infrastructure and Victoria Harbour as a landmark of Hong Kong, as well as the attractiveness of Hong Kong to potential investors.</p> <p>(b) The existing road network (Shing Fung Road) is insufficient to support the proposed residential developments and social welfare facilities.</p> <p>(c) A world class library can be developed at the former runway area to attract tourists.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R31 above is relevant.</p>
R94 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The former runway area is of poor accessibility and its waterfront location is not suitable for residential care home for elderly.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R15, (f) to R34 and (d) to R35 above are relevant.</p>
R95 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities will create a negative image on KTD, which shall be the CBD2 with vibrant business activities, to business travellers and tourists.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
R96 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) Support the Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 to be zoned for residential use but oppose the incorporation of social welfare facilities.</p> <p>(b) The former runway area is a unique project for promoting the profile of Hong Kong as international city. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will create a negative image on Kai Tak to tourists and jeopardise the positioning of the former runway area.</p>	<p>(a) The supportive view is noted.</p> <p>(b) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p>
R97 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The proposed social welfare facilities are incompatible with the positioning of KTD with a mixed characters of commercial, residential and landmark tourism destination.</p> <p>(b) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located near the subsidised housing estates, for example Kai Ching Estate, Tak Long Estate and Richland Gardens.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant. The intention of developing KTD as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses has remained unchanged.</p> <p>(b) GIC facilities have been provided and planned in public housing developments in Kai Tak. There are a neighbourhood elderly centre (NEC) and a children and youth integrated service centre at Kai Ching Estate. Furthermore, GIC facilities including a NEC, a child care centre, an outreaching team for ethnic minorities centre, an integrated home care services team, a day care centre for the elderly, a special child</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
		care centre, an early education and training centre, a residential care home for the elderly cum day care unit are planned at the proposed public housing developments at Site 1E1, zoned “OU(Mixed Use)(3)” (Plan H-13a).
R98 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The former runway area is a unique project for promoting the profile of Hong Kong as international travel city. The incorporation of social welfare facilities in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 will undermine the long planning history and outlook of KTD.	(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government’s intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.
R99 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities is incompatible with the tourism development at the former runway area. (b) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located at areas the densely populated area.	(a) Response (b) to R11 above is relevant. (b) Response (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above is relevant.
R101 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) KTD as part of the CBD2 should be dominated by commercial and tourism development. The rezoning proposal and incorporation of social welfare facilities in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 will undermine the function of CBD2.	(a) Responses (b) and (d) to R11 , and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government’s intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(b) Existing transport network and community facilities are insufficient for the proposed residential developments.	(b) For transport network, responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant; for the provision of community facilities, response (c) to R29 above is relevant.
R102 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities at the former runway area jeopardise the position of KTCT as tourism and leisure hub. (b) The proposed social welfare facilities will bring additional traffic flow to the area and bring adverse traffic impact.	 (a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT. (b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant
R103 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) More resources should be invested to improve the attractiveness of the KTCT and its surrounding areas. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will weaken the attractiveness of the KTCT. (b) The rezoning proposal, with significant reduction in commercial GFA, and incorporation of social welfare facilities undermine the planning vision of Kai Tak as an important part of the CBD2.	 (a) For the attractiveness of the KTCT and its surrounding areas, response (b) to R8 is relevant. For the incorporation of social welfare facilities, responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. (b) Responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant to the reduction in commercial GFA and implementation of the vision of CBD2. For the incorporation of social welfare facilities, responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(c) The proposed social welfare facilities should be located in To Kwa Wan, Kowloon Bay, Ngau Tau Kok and Kwun Tong.	(c) Responses (b) to R11 and (d) to R12, R18 and R100 above are relevant.
R104 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The proposed social welfare facilities in Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 are not suitable for the sites whilst retail and tourism facilities are necessary.	(a) For incorporation of social welfare facilities, responses (c) to R14 and (b) to R23 above are relevant. For retail and tourism facilities, response (b) to R8 above is relevant. The intention of developing KTD is to developed as a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses. Different land uses will be essential for the implementation of intention.
R105 and R106 (individuals)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) The former runway area is a unique landmark with historical value, which is more suitable for commercial, hotel, tourism and residential use and not suitable for social welfare facilities (R105). The incorporation of social welfare facilities is incompatible with the planning of KTD and create a negative first impression on Hong Kong.	(a) For the development at former runway area, response (b) to R8 above is relevant. For the incorporation of social welfare facilities, responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.
R107 (individual)	Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e) <u>Grounds of Representation</u> (a) It is not suitable and cost effective to incorporate social welfare facilities at the former runway area, as an area being	(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>a unique landmark with historical value and prime geographical advantage.</p> <p>(b) It is expected the former runway area will be targeting residents with high spending power and accommodating high-end commercial and tourism activities. There is no demand for the proposed social welfare facilities.</p>	<p>not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R14 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R109</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP (e)</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The former runway area as a tourism destination should be developed with tourist attractions. Social welfare facilities can be located anywhere.</p> <p>(b) Various tourist attractions including iconic landmark, observation tower, markets, museums, are proposed for local and oversea visitors.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R31 above is relevant.</p>
<p>R110</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The former runway area as a tourism destination should be developed with tourist attractions. Social welfare facilities can be located anywhere.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	(b) Various tourist attractions including museums and cycling hub, are proposed at the runway area as a tourism hub for local and oversea visitors.	(b) Response (c) to R31 above is relevant.
R111 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) BsH in Sites 2A2 and 2A3 should be located near correctional institutions or remote area, such as islands, for a tranquil environment.</p> <p>(b) KTD as part of the CBD2 should be dominated by commercial, art, cultural, sports and private residential developments to raise Government's income.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (a) to R73 and (a) to R74 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R9 above is relevant. A diversity of land use with specific sites for sports, art and cultural, are identified within KTD.</p>
R112 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) BsH in Sites 2A2 and 2A3 is not compatible with the vision of KTD as part of the CBD2.</p>	<p>(a) Response (a) to R73 above is relevant. Considering BsH is of residential nature, it is considered not incompatible with the planning vision of KTD, which is to be developed with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses.</p>
R113 (individual)	<p>Opposes Amendments to the Notes of the OZP</p> <p><u>Grounds of Representation</u></p> <p>(a) The incorporation of social welfare facilities in former runway area is not compatible with the unique character of the former</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant.</p>

Representation No. (TPB/R/S/K22/7-)	Subject of Representation	Responses to Representation
	<p>runway area, which is suitable for housing, office, tourism facilities and shopping centre.</p> <p>Provide General View</p> <p>(b) There is no measure proposed to improve transport connection.</p>	<p>(b) Response (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the possible provision of “multi-modal” EFLS in KE, including KTD, shall provide various environment-friendly and convenient links to different stations and public transport interchanges in KTD and encourage people to walk more and cycle within KTD.</p>
<p>R114</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Provide General View</p> <p>(a) The existing road network is not sufficient to support the increase in population and traffic flow.</p>	<p>(a) Technical assessments have been conducted for the proposed developments in relation to the amendment items. No insurmountable traffic problems have been identified.</p> <p>Responses (c) to R8, (b) to R15, (e) to R46 and (d) to R44 and R45 above on relevant traffic impact assessments for respective amendment items are relevant.</p>
<p>R115</p> <p>(individual)</p>	<p>Provide General View</p> <p>(a) The proposed residential development will bring adverse impact on air quality and traffic aspect.</p>	<p>(a) Technical assessments have been conducted for the proposed developments in relation to the amendment items. No insurmountable air quality and traffic problems have been identified.</p>

- (2) The 54 comments on representations were submitted by some of the representers themselves (**R1, R8 to R10, R31, R33, R41, R43, R47, R48, R68, R69 and R88**) and by the Hong Kong Tramways Limited and individuals.

Supportive Comments

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C1 (Hong Kong Housing Society) (also R1)	Provide responses to R1 to R4, R8, R10 and R46 to R70	<p>(a) The proposed development (Amendment Items J1 & J2) will meet the rehousing demands.</p> <p>(b) The proposed development will accommodate POS, dining, retail, cultural, leisure and social welfare facilities that cater for the community needs and bring in vibrancy and liveliness to the Kai Tak waterfront.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development is compatible with the existing and planned developments in the adjacent area.</p> <p>(d) The POS within the site will provide for enjoyment and serve as a pedestrian linkage between Ma Tau Kok, KTSP, the Dining Cove and the waterfront promenade.</p> <p>(e) The proposed development will not bring adverse impact to the surrounding areas on traffic, visual, wind penetration, towngas risk level, noise, air quality and sewerage aspects.</p>	The supportive view is noted.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C2 (individual)	Support R10 and R46 to R70	<p>(a) The proposed DRE development will jeopardize the CBD2 positioning and long term planning vision of Kai Tak for commercial, sports and leisure.</p> <p>(b) The proposed DRE development will significantly affect the impression and scenery of KTSP.</p> <p>(c) High-rise buildings at waterfront will introduce a wall effect, hinder the overall open space planning of KTSP and aggravate traffic congestion.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R9 above is relevant. A diversity of land use with specific sites for sports and leisure, are reserved within KTD, including KTSP.</p> <p>Commercial facilities are also purposely planned on the lower floors of the proposed DRE development, including retail shops, restaurants and alfresco dining facilities, to add variety and vibrancy to the planned waterfront promenade.</p> <p>(b) Response (e) to R8 above is relevant. In general, the proposed development would complement the KTSP in term of enhancing the connectivity and bring vibrancy to the surrounding areas.</p> <p>(c) Regarding the open space planning in the vicinity of KTSP, responses (e) to R8 and (c) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p> <p>As for possible air ventilation, visual and traffic impacts arisen from the DRE development, responses (m) to R10, (d) to R47 to R49 and (e) to R46 above are relevant.</p>
C3 (individual, also R47)	Support R10 and R46 to R70	<p>(a) The proposed Amendment Item J1 in such a valuable waterfront is unacceptable, imposing irreversible damage to the waterfront and also KTD</p>	<p>(a) Responses (e) to R8 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C4 (individual)	Support R10 and R46 to R70	<p>(a) The Kai Tak and To Kwa Wan areas are too densely populated with community overburdened and not suitable for additional residential development.</p> <p>(b) High-rise buildings at waterfront will introduce a wall effect.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development will bring additional risk of gas safety.</p>	<p>(a) Technical assessments including TIA, EA, VIA, AVA, drainage and sewerage impact assessment and water supply impact assessment have been conducted and concluded that no insurmountable technical problems arisen from the proposed DRE development were envisaged.</p> <p>(b) Response (m) to R10 on AVA above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (a) to (d) to R51 above are relevant.</p>
C5 (individual)	Support R50 and R51	<p>(a) The Kai Tak and To Kwa Wan areas are too densely populated with community overburdened and not suitable for additional residential development.</p> <p>(b) High-rise buildings at waterfront will introduce a wall effect.</p>	<p>(a) Response (a) to C4 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (m) to R10 on AVA above is relevant.</p>
C6 (individual, also R88)	Support R9 and Oppose R6 and R7	<p>(a) The rezoning will weaken the CBD2 positioning of Kai Tak and function of the TN.</p> <p>(b) Kai Tak Runway area should be reserved for tourism facilities instead of social welfare facilities, which is incompatible to locality of the prime area.</p>	<p>(a) Regarding the planning intention of KTD, responses (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>Regarding the function of TN, response (b) to R8 above on the development scale of TN and the synergy with KTCT is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		(c) The cancellation of EFLS will significantly reduce the accessibility of Kai Tak.	<p>tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT.</p> <p>(c) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
C7 (individual)	Support R9	<p>(a) The sites should be retained with the existing BHR and should be rezoned for commercial purposes so that more job opportunities to be created in the CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The removal of commercial development will diminish their synergy in the CBD2, which will require a critical mass to be formed.</p>	<p><i>BHR</i></p> <p>(a) The increase in the maximum BHs for Sites 2A2 and 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10 from 80 to 90mPD to 100 to 125mPD (Plan H-4a) is for ensuring that the residential use at the sites, which is subject to a lower permissible SC under the Building (Planning) Regulations than non-domestic use, could achieve the maximum domestic PR of 6.5. Such an increase in BHs is still in keeping with the general stepped BH profile of the locality which is descending progressively from the northeast to the southwest (Plan H-4b), and is in line with the broad urban design framework of KTD on creating a dynamic skyline.</p> <p><i>Commercial Use and Job Opportunities</i></p> <p>Responses (b) and (c) to R9 and (s) to R10 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R9 on the position of CBD2 above is relevant.</p>
C8 (individual)	Support R9	(a) Should not rezone the land for housing development in view of short-term economic situation	(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 and (d) to R11 above are relevant.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C9 (individual)	Support R9	(a) The long-term planning vision of KTD should not be affected by the short-term economic situation.	(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.
C10 (individual)	Support R9	<p>(a) The original planning intention for the former runway area being a commercial and tourism focal point should be retained.</p> <p>(b) The long-term planning vision of KTD should not be compromised by short-term shortfall of housing supply.</p> <p>(c) The increase in population at the former runway area will bring additional traffic flow to the only access road, Shing Fung Road and adverse traffic impact.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R8 on the development of former runway area, (b) and (c) to R9 on the commercial development and planning intention of KTD above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 and (d) to R11 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p>
C11 (Worldwide Cruise Terminal, also R43)	Support R8 and R9	<p>(a) The sites adjacent to the KTCT should be retained for hotel use.</p> <p>(b) There is a need for better transport planning to cater the needs of district users, including residents, local visitors, and overseas visitors</p>	<p>(a) Response (a) to R43 on hotel provision above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p>Furthermore, the possible provision of “multi-modal” EFLS in KE, including KTD, shall provide various environment-friendly and convenient links to different stations and public transport interchanges in KTD and encourage people to walk more and cycle within KTD.</p> <p>Regarding the provision of landing steps, response (g) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		(c) More landing steps should be provided on the waterfront to allow additional ferry services as per ferry operators requested.	(c) Regarding the provision of additional ferry services, at present, there are licensed ferry service (weekends only) using the Kai Tak Runway Pier landing step (Plan H-20). In considering the feasibility of new ferry services, the Government will consider a number of factors, such as the existing road and public transport network, the anticipated passenger demand, financial viability and operational feasibility.
C12 (individual, also R33)	Support R8	(a) The proposed amendments will weaken the vibrancy of the planned Kai Tak Runway development. (b) Rezoning the commercial and hotel uses to residential use will hinder the viability, development and business operations of the KTCT and TN. (c) The increase in living population will bring adverse traffic impact to the former runway area and the original commercial activities would result in better traffic balance.	(a) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant. The rezoning proposal does not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT. (b) Response (a) above is relevant. (c) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.
C13 (individual, also R31)	Support R8	(a) The runway sites should be retained for landmark hotels in view of the shortage in hotels in KE and to form synergy with other upcoming commercial developments.	(a) Responses (b) to R8 on the developments at former runway area and (b) to R34 on the hotel provision above are relevant.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		<p>(b) Monorail EFLS should be redesigned to serve KTCT, TN and the former runway area.</p> <p>(c) Waterfront at runway area should be energized to attract tourists and provide open spaces for local residents.</p> <p>(d) The addition of museums at the TN will be a new landmark in Hong Kong.</p>	<p>(b) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (b) to R8 and (g) to R10 above are relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (b) to R8 on intended development at TN above is relevant. As for the provision of museums, response (c) to R31 above is relevant.</p>
<p>C14</p> <p>(Designing Hong Kong Limited, also R8)</p>	<p>Support R9 and R10</p>	<p>(a) The alignment and stations of monorail EFLS should be kept while reconsidering other alternatives to provide EFLS in the area to support the increasing number of residents and tourists in future.</p> <p>(b) The alternative proposals under ‘multi-modal’ EFLS is subject to weather conditions (water transport and cycling) and also the use of electric vehicles may add pressure to existing traffic network at the former runway area.</p> <p>(c) To keep the existing alignment of the EFLS to enhance the commuting between developments to the nearby railway system, with other supplementary modes such as water transport and cycling.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 on the proposal of “multi-modal” EFLS are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 on the proposal of “multi-modal” EFLS are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 on the proposal of “multi-modal” EFLS are relevant. Regarding water transport, establishing a ‘water taxi’ service point in the KTD to enhance the connectivity of KTD with other districts is one of the initiatives under the “multi-modal” EFLS. As for cycling, response (h) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		(d) High demand for public transport at the former runway area is expected in view of the rezoning proposal.	(d) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.
C15 and C16 (individuals)	Support R9	(a) The proposal of monorail EFLS should be reviewed. It is premature to remove the monorail EFLS alignment from the plan.	(a) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above is relevant.
C17 (individuals)	Support R9	<p>(a) The proposal of monorail EFLS should be reviewed. The monorail EFLS provide efficient connectivity between the KTD to other districts in KE and help relieve anticipated congestion.</p> <p>(b) The former runway area will face serious traffic congestion when the area is fully occupied. The provision of transport network with adequate capacity to serve the needs of residents and visitors is essential.</p> <p>(c) KTD should be built and delivered in a sustainable and green environment. The removal of monorail EFLS will affect the normal lives of the new residents or even will cause serious social problem.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (k) to R9 above is relevant.</p>
C18	Support R9	<p>(a) The proposal of monorail EFLS should be reviewed. It is premature to remove the monorail EFLS alignment from the plan.</p> <p>(b) The runway will not be a walkable environment in particular during summer time. The monorail EFLS makes this CBD more pedestrian-friendly and creating a special character.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Creating a pedestrian friendly environment is one of the urban design principles adopted for the Kai Tak OZP. To achieve the principle, the “podium-free” design concept is adopted. The</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
			<p>pedestrian experience is also enhanced through the continuous waterfront promenade and extensive open spaces network connecting various sub-districts within KTD and neighbouring districts.</p> <p>Along the continuous waterfront promenade at the former runway area, specific design control mechanism is incorporated, including (i) the provision of a retail frontage fronting the Victoria Harbour to provide a diverse and interesting pedestrian experience; and (ii) provision of awning and shading devices along retail frontage to allow a comfortable walking environment. Specific tree planting requirement is incorporated to provide shading effect along the promenade. Essential facilities, such as toilet, charging facilities, seating and shelters will be provided along the promenade for creation of an enjoyable POS. The GreenWay network for shared-use by cyclists and pedestrian will run through the waterfront promenade to enhance the connectivity and connect with other sections within KTD.</p> <p>Kai Tak Sky Garden, an elevated landscaped deck to connect the planned Metro Park to the runway tip is currently open for public use. A 24-hour barrier-free pedestrian access (including vertical connections) between Kai Tak Sky Garden and waterfront promenade/street level (Plan H-5a) through the retail portions at the residential developments at former runway area</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
			<p>is required under lease conditions to enhance the vibrancy and pedestrian connectivity of the area.</p> <p>Meanwhile, with the possible future provision of a “multi-modal” EFLS, various environmental-friendly and convenient links to different railway stations and public transport interchanges in Kai Tak, Kwun Tong, Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay are to be provided to encourage people to walk more and cycle within Kai Tak, thereby relying less on vehicles and roads.</p>
C19 (Hong Kong Tramway Limited)	Support R9	(a) Support the need to implement a structuring transport system at Kai Tak. The previous proposal demonstrated the interest in the system. To achieve an EFLS at Kai Tak requires thorough thinking, study and financial forecast to be relevant and credible, and a need to overcome the challenges.	(a) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant. The Government will continually listen to and collect views of the public on the “multi-modal” EFLS, so as to enhance the recommended measures.
C20 (individual)	Support R9 to R21, R73, R76, R92, R111 and R112	(a) As part of the CBD2, there are insufficient commercial sites within KTD. Sites 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10 shall not be rezoned for residential use.	(a) Response (b) to R9 on the positioning of CBD2 above is relevant.
C21 (individual)	Support R8 to R10, R12 to R36 and R39 to R42	(a) The EFLS provides a solution to traffic congestion in the KE, as well as connectivity between the KTCT, the former runway area, and the rest of the district. The replacement proposal “multi-modal” EFLS cannot provide an effective means of mass transit to serve the growth of KTD.	(a) Responses (f) to (j) to R9 above are relevant.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		<p>(b) The Government should demonstrate a stronger commitment to implement the original EFLS proposal, which was repeatedly publicly consulted and regained its statutory status on OZP.</p> <p>(c) Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 would serve as essential nodes for passengers of the world-class KTCT.</p> <p>(d) The loss of commercial GFA in former runway area would damage the planning vision of KTCT, the former runway area and the KTD.</p>	<p>(b) Responses (j) and (l) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p>
<p>C22</p> <p>(The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong, also R9)</p>	<p>Support R8, R10, R40 and R43</p>	<p>(a) Rezoning commercial sites at the former runway would weaken the vibrancy of the area, hinder the development of the KTCT and the TN and jeopardize the planning intention of the TN.</p> <p>(b) Increase in residential population at the end of the former runway area would increase the peak traffic of Shing Fung Road.</p> <p>(c) Retaining the concerned sites at former north apron (Sites 2A2 and 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10) for commercial use would support the operation of KTSP and cater for needs of KTSP's visitors as well as maintain street vibrancy while causing less nuisance to residents in the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p><i>Operation of KTSP and Street Vibrancy</i></p> <p>(c) Retail and F&B facilities has been provided within the KTSP and the adjoining Hotel/Office (H/O) developments. In addition, to take forward the planning intention of creating a 'Dining Cove', F&B facilities are provided at the two sides of the cove of Ma Tau Kok in KTSP and the proposed DRE development respectively, which will also complement the development of KTSP.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		<p>(d) The monorail or EFLS should not be replaced by some multimodal means which could not address the anticipated traffic issue of KTD, in particular, at the former runway area. The option for monorail EFLS should be reconsidered.</p> <p>(e) ‘Park and ride’ facilities at former runway area for KTCT would provide convenience to cruise tourists, facilitate the operation of the KTCT and reinforce the runway tip as a tourism node.</p> <p>(f) Additional ferry landing steps would provide pleasurable transport experience to tourists and locals alike and add vibrancy to the harbourfront, which can be implemented in a relatively short time frame and kaito ferry service can be added much faster and at much lower cost than other modes.</p>	<p>For street vibrancy at the former north apron, response (c) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p><i>Nuisance to residents</i> Visitors can access KTSP from MTR Sung Wong Toi and Kai Tak stations and public transport interchange (PTI) at the site zoned “CDA(1)” (Plan H-4b) through public open space, including Kai Tak Station Square and the proposed Sung Wong Toi Park. Nuisance to residents in the nearby neighbourhood generated from the visitors of KTSP is not expected.</p> <p>(d) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(e) Response (c) to R43 above is relevant.</p> <p>(f) Regarding the provision of landing steps, response (g) to R8 above is relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C23 and C24 (individuals)	Support R8 to R10, R12 to R36 and R39 to R43	(a) Increase of residential development will increase traffic demand at the former runway area and hinder the development of the TN.	(a) Responses (b) and (c) to R8 above are relevant.
C25 and C26 (individuals)	Support R9	(a) Not provided.	-
C27 (individual)	Provide responses to R9 to R21, R73 to R76, R92, R111 and R112	(a) Not provided.	-
C28 (individual)	Support R41 to R74, R75 to R115	(a) The provision of social welfare facilities is not in line with the tourism development at the runway area. (b) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.	(a) Response (b) to R11 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 above are relevant. The incorporation of social welfare facilities will not affect the Government's intention to develop a world-class tourism, entertainment and leisure attraction at the KTRT. (b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.
C29 (individual)	Provide responses to R41	(a) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation (b) There should be provision of hotels within the KTD for visitors of KTSP and KTCT.	(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant. (b) Response (a) to R43 above is relevant.
C30	Response to R45	(a) Harbourfront from Hoi Sham Park to the former runway area should be developed as landmark destination for locals and oversea visitors.	(a) The waterfront from Hoi Sham Park to the former runway area is generally zoned "O" or falling within areas designated "Waterfront

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
(individual, also R41)			Promenade” on the Kai Tak OZP, forming part of the continuous promenade from To Kwa Wan to KTD.
C31 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) The rezoning of commercial uses for residential sites is not in line with the planning intention of CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The existing transport and community facilities are insufficient to support the current population.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R9 on the positioning of CBD2 above is relevant.</p> <p><i>Transport facilities</i></p> <p>(b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p><i>Community facilities</i></p> <p>Response (c) to R29 above is relevant.</p>
C32 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Adequate reserve and supply of commercial lands in KTD should be made available to contribute to the success of KTD and CBD initiatives. Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(b) Frequent changes without well-justified reasons and merits jeopardize the public confidence towards the government.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R9 on the positioning of CBD2 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above is relevant.</p>
C33 (individual)	Not provided	(a) Oppose to the rezoning of Site 2A for residential use. The site should be retained for commercial use.	(a) Response (b) to R9 on commercial GFA of KTD above is relevant.
C34 (individual)	Not provided	(a) Public housing developments with excessive high density will result in a drop in property price in the area	(a) The sites (Site 2A3 and Site 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10) (Plan H-4a) are proposed for private residential developments.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
			For the concerns on development density, response (b) to R13 above is relevant.
C35 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Rezoning proposals under this round of OZP amendment significantly reduce the supply of commercial sites and weaken the initiative to transform KE into CBD2.</p> <p>(b) The changes in planning of KTD, including the rezoning proposal, incorporation of social welfare facilities and transitional housing will jeopardize long term planning vision of Kai Tak as a vibrant, active and attractive CBD2 with sports, tourism, commercial developments. Residential developments shall be considered at Sung Wong Toi, To Kwa Wan and Kowloon City.</p> <p>(c) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R9 on the positioning of CBD2 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 and (b) to R11 and above are relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
C36 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(b) Frequent changes in policy direction jeopardise the public confidence towards the government.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
C37 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Increase of residential developments and social welfare facilities will bring adverse impact on tourism development within KTD and increase traffic demand. The social welfare facilities should be relocated to To Kwa Wan, Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8 on the development at the former runway area and (b) to R11, (d) to R12, R18 and R100 and (b) to R71, R72 and R108 for social welfare facilities are relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		(b) All commercial sites should be retained for commercial and government use.	(b) Responses (k) to R8 and (b) and (c) to R9 above are relevant.
C38 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) The rezoning proposals undermine the long term planning of KTD as a CBD2</p> <p>(b) Housing supply can be provided in North-eastern New Territories New Development Area.</p> <p>(c) Without improvement in transport facilities, the rezoning proposals will bring adverse traffic impact.</p>	<p>(a) Response (b) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (d) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p>
C39 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) KTD has been positioned as a commercial and tourism hub. Rezoning the sites to residential use due to short-term housing shortfall will bring long-term impact.</p> <p>(b) Insufficient transport and community facilities to support the additional population at the former north apron are and former runway area.</p> <p>(c) Insufficient of transport facilities will be worsened in view of the cancellation of monorail EFLS.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (b) to R8, (b), (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p><i>Transport facilities</i> (b) Responses (c) to R8 and (b) to R15 above are relevant.</p> <p><i>Community facilities</i> Response (c) to R29 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
C40 (individual)	Not provided	(a) Continuous change of land use violates the purpose and the theme of the KTD planning in shaping and creating a distinguished, vibrant and attractive area. It demonstrates the lack of long-term vision and determination in shaping a better Hong Kong.	(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 on the positioning of CBD2 are relevant.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		<p>(b) The housing shortfall should be addressed by supply through Northern Metropolis and Tomorrow Lantau Vision. Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(c) The introduction of more residential population in the former runway area will generate significant amount of traffic to Shing Fung Road. The feasibility of the amendment proposal should be critically examine from traffic point of view.</p>	<p>(b) Response (d) to R11 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (c) to R8 above is relevant.</p>
C41 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Should not rezone Sites 2A3, 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10 in view of short-term economic situation.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p>
C42 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) KTD has a long planning intention to be CBD with tourism, commercial, residential and leisure developments. Should not rezone the sites at former runway area in view of short-term economic situation and housing supply.</p> <p>(b) Pure residential developments at the former runway area, instead of diverse and comprehensive developments with tourism and leisure, cannot support the operation of KTCT.</p> <p>(c) Monorail EFLS proposal should be reviewed to enhance the connectivity between the Kai Tak and KE to alleviate traffic congestion.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (b) to R8 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (f) to R9 above is relevant.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C43 (individual, also R48)	Not provided	(a) The rezoning will lead to a significant reduce in total non-domestic GFA at the former runway area, which will affect the function of the TN. (b) The provision of commercial sites and hotels in KE and the provision of those in KTD should be considered separately	(a) Responses (b) to R8 on the function of TN and response (b) to R9 on the provision of commercial GFA in KTD above are relevant. (b) Response (b) to R34 is relevant.
C44 (individual)	Not provided	Oppose Items G, H and I without providing grounds.	-
C45 (individual)	Not provided	(a) The proposed DRE development will bring adverse air ventilation impact. (b) Preserving waterfront open space is important for the living quality for the local residents.	(a) Response (m) to R10 on air ventilation impact above is relevant. (b) Response (c) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.
C46 (individual)	Not provided	Oppose Amendment Items I and J1 without providing grounds.	-
C47 (individual, also R69)	Not provided	Oppose Amendment Item J1 without providing grounds.	-
C48 (individual)	Not provided	(a) Should retain the waterfront area at Ma Tau Kok as open space and promenade to connect Kai Tak	(a) Response (c) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
<p>C49</p> <p>(individual, also R68)</p>	<p>Not provided</p>	<p>(a) The proposed rezoning undermine the overall planning of the KTSP and the surrounding areas as a leisure and sports destination. This key waterfront area should be used as open space for enjoyment of the general public.</p> <p>(b) Harbourfront area is precious in Hong Kong and the Government should safeguard it from encroachment by urban tall buildings. The proposed development will affect the visual amenity and the established BH profile of the area.</p> <p>(c) The proposed development will block the air flow from the seaward side, reducing ventilation into the built-up cluster of To Kwa Wan.</p> <p>(d) Traffic along the To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Wai Road are very congested during rush hours. Further increase in population arisen from the proposed development would worsen the situation. It will also delay the emergency services when needed.</p> <p>(e) Alternatively, a site at Harmony Garden, which have been vacant for many years, shall be considered. The redevelopment of the 13-Street can create a synergistic effect on the development of To Kwa Wan and KTSP and bring greater development potential and return.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (e) to R8 and (c) to R47 to R49 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) Response (d) to R47 to R49 above is relevant.</p> <p>(c) Response (m) to R10 above is relevant.</p> <p>(d) Response (e) to R46 above is relevant.</p> <p>(e) Response (d) to R46 above is relevant. The concerned sites are under private ownership and the redevelopment of these sites shall be subject to consideration of respective owners as well as technical feasibility.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
C50 (individual, also R10)	Not provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The solution to housing could be resolved via rental subsidies rather than increasing production of public housing estates. (b) Hotel accommodation and car parking should be provided in close proximity to KTCT (c) Alternative transportation modes, including ferry services, should be provided. (d) A dedicated cycle path and bike parking nodes should be provided in Kai Tak. (e) EFLS as an emission free transport system is essential to avoid KTD becoming a vehicle clogged corridor and provide connectivity with Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Response (d) to R11 above is relevant. (b) Responses (b) to R34 and (a) and (c) to R43 above are relevant. (c) Response (c) to C11 above is relevant. (d) Response (h) to R8 above is relevant. (e) Responses (f) and (k) to R9 above are relevant.
C51 (individual)	Not provided	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Multiple rezonings and intensifications in KTD lead to an accumulative increase in population density and deviate from the original planning intention and urban design framework. (b) The aggravation of ‘wall effect’ and reduction of commercial facilities is not in line with the CBD2 positioning. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant. (b) Response to (b) to R9 on provision of commercial GFA above is relevant. <p>Technical assessments including AVAs have been conducted for the relevant amendment items and concluded that no insurmountable air ventilation problem arisen from the proposed developments was envisaged.</p>

Comment No. TPB/R/S/K22/7-	Related Representation(s)	Gist of Comments	Responses to Comments
		(c) Implementation of EFLS by phases or with shortening route should be explored.	(c) Responses (f) and (j) to R9 above are relevant.
C52 (individual)	Not Provided	<p>(a) Commercial sites in Kai Tak is insufficient and should not be rezoned to residential sites.</p> <p>(b) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation The rezoning for residential uses is unnecessary due to the expected slowdown in population growth and housing demand.</p>	<p>(a) Response to (b) to R9 on provision of commercial GFA above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 and (d) to R11 above is relevant.</p>
C53 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Should not rezone the land in view of short-term economic situation.</p> <p>(b) The reviewed site at the former north apron area should swap with the public housing sites near Sung Wong Toi Station to increase long-term value of Kai Tak commercial sites.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above is relevant.</p> <p>(b) The concerned public housing sites were designated for public housing developments in 2018 and are currently in respective flat sale and construction stages.</p>
C54 (individual)	Not provided	<p>(a) Oppose to the overall land use changes in KTD</p> <p>(b) GIC facilities such as library, swimming pool and schools should be provided as soon as possible.</p>	<p>(a) Responses (c) and (e) to R9 above are relevant.</p> <p>(b) For the overall provision of GIC facilities within KTD, response (c) to R29 above is relevant.</p> <p>A swimming pool and library at Site 1J3 (Plan H-13a) are under preliminary planning. A total of six school sites have been reserved and three of which had been completed and commenced operation. One of the remaining site for primary school is expected to be completed in 2025/2026.</p>

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 621st Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 1.2.2019**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Chairman

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Michael H.S. Law

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

In Attendance

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms W.H. Ho

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Gloria Y.L. Sze

the application site to residential use; and

- (b) the approval of the application for piecemeal rezoning of the application site for residential use would set an undesirable precedent for other similar applications in Ap Lei Chau Business Area (ALCBA) and the cumulative impact of such approvals would diminish the function of ALCBA as an employment centre in the area and would result in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area.”
-

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

Section 12A Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Y/K22/3 Application for Amendment to the Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/6, to Rezone the Application Site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft” and “Government, Institution or Community” to “Commercial (9)”, Lucky Building, 3-5 San Ma Tau Street, Ma Tau Kok, Kowloon
(MPC Paper No. Y/K22/3B)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

40. The Secretary reported that Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and WSP Hong Kong Limited (WSP) were five of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Arup and past business dealings with RLP; and his firm having current business dealings with MVA;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealings with RLP, MVA, Arup and WSP;

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA, Arup and WSP;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) and an ex-employee of the Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently having business dealings with KTA; and
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a member of DURF.

41. The Committee noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Daniel K.S. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had no involvement in the application, the Committee agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

42. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD's Representatives

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Mr K.K. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Applicant and its Representatives

Worldy Limited

Ms Ng Mei Yee

Mr Chau Wing Kin

KTA

Ms Pauline Lam

Ms Kitty Wong

RLP

Mr K.H. Cheng

Ramboll Environ

Hong Kong Limited

Mr Tony Cheng

} Applicant's representatives

<u>Arup</u> Mr Lo Kin Wang	}	Applicant's representatives
<u>MVA</u> Mr George Lee		

Presentation and Question Sessions

43. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the background of the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, presented the application and covered the following aspects as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) background to the application;
- (b) the proposed rezoning of the application site (the site) from "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Tunnel Ventilation Shaft" ("OU(TVS)") and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Commercial (9)" ("C(9)"), subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 12, building height (BH) of 100mPD and site coverages (SCs) of 62.5% (15m or above) and 94% (below 15m);
- (c) departmental comments – departmental comments were set out in paragraph 9 of the Paper. Concerned government departments had no objection to or no adverse comment on the application;
- (d) during the first three weeks of the statutory publication periods, a total of 26 public comments were received from two Kowloon City District Council members, the Owners' Committee of Grand Waterfront, the Kowloon City District Service Centre of the Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions and individuals. Amongst which, 24 were objecting comments. Major views were set out in paragraph 10 of the Paper; and
- (e) PlanD's views – based on the assessments set out in paragraph 11 of the Paper, PlanD had no in-principle objection to the application and partially

agreed to the application. It was no longer necessary to retain the current “OU(TVS)” zoning for the site as the Highways Department confirmed that the other proposed tunnel ventilation shaft in Kai Tak was sufficient to serve the purpose. The “G/IC” portion of the site might be treated as rectification of discrepancies between the lot boundary and the zoning boundary. The proposed rezoning of the site for commercial use was generally in line with the proposal of “Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (URPKC)” prepared by DURF and would not be in conflict with the Central Kowloon Route (CKR) project under construction. The proposed commercial development was considered not incompatible with the adjacent residential uses and the proposed retail and dining facilities could serve the needs of the neighbourhood. Technical assessments submitted by the applicant had demonstrated that the proposal would not have adverse impacts on environmental, sewerage, traffic, visual, air ventilation and safety aspects. While the proposed BH of 100mPD was not incompatible with that of the existing developments in the surrounding areas and the planned BH profile in the area, the proposed PR of 12 for the site was on the high side. A lower PR of 9.5 was recommended, after making reference to the maximum PR of the “C” zone under the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and the maximum non-domestic PR of 9 for areas near the site zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) under the Ma Tau Kok OZP. The SC control for development sites in Kai Tak was to enhance air ventilation and discouraging podium development, the same SC control of 65% for “C(2)” zone under the Kai Tak OZP was recommended to be stipulated on the site. Regarding the adverse public comments, the comments of government departments and planning assessments above were relevant.

44. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) background information of the site;

- (b) the context of the surrounding areas including the Kai Tak Development, the waterfront enhancement proposal in URPKC and the landscape deck and beautification proposal for Ma Tau Kok waterfront under the CKR project;
- (c) details of the rezoning proposal and the proposed commercial/office development, including the proposed pedestrian connection between the ground floor (G/F) and the podium deck on the second floor (2/F) of the proposed development, and the proposed footbridge connecting 2/F of the proposed development and the future landscape deck above the adjoining reprovisioned Kowloon City Ferry Pier (KCFP) Public Transport Interchange (PTI) site;
- (d) design merits of the proposed development, including widening of the existing informal pedestrian footpaths; provision of setbacks along the site boundaries; enhancing visual and air permeability; connecting to future landscape deck above PTI; and providing a better pedestrian walking environment accessible to waterfront and quality activity space for public enjoyment; and
- (e) the proposed maximum PR of 12 for the proposed “C(9)” zone was the same as that for the “C” and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” zones in the old districts in Kowloon. Although the site fell within the Kai Tak OZP, it was physically located in the old district of To Kwa Wan and adjoining the Ma Tau Kok OZP area. The planning context of those existing industrial buildings zoned “C(2)” with a maximum PR of 9.5 in the Kai Tak OZP area was different from the subject site as they were adjoining the old Kai Tak Airport and physically separated from the Kowloon Bay hinterland by Kwun Tong Bypass. All technical assessments had demonstrated that the proposed PR of 12 was technically feasible and could enable efficient use of scarce land resources.

45. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representative were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

The “G/IC” Portion of the Site

46. In response to some Members’ enquiries, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, explained that a portion of the private lot fell within the “G/IC” zone (i.e. about 11% of the total site area). It might be treated as rectification of discrepancies between the lot boundary and the zoning boundary, which could be regarded as minor adjustment of boundaries between zones permitted under the covering Notes of the OZP. There was in general no deficit in the provision of G/IC facilities in the area.

PR Restriction

47. In response to a Member’s question on the proposed PR restriction for the site, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng explained that the proposed PR for the site had made reference to the “C(2)” zones, which were located in the eastern portion of the Kai Tak OZP at the Kowloon Bay hinterland. The concerned “C(2)” sites were originally zoned “Industrial” (subject to PR of 12) on the Ngau Tau Kok & Kowloon Bay OZP. Subsequently, the waterfront area of Kowloon Bay (including the concerned sites) was excised from the said OZP for inclusion in the Kai Tak (South) planning scheme area in 1998. The sites had been rezoned to “C(2)” on the Kai Tak OZP (subject to a maximum PR of 9.5 or the PR of the existing building, whichever was the greater) since 2006. As for the Ma Tau Kok OZP, there were only two “C” zones (subject to a PR of 12), i.e. the Regal Oriental Hotel and the BMW House, which were far away from the site. Besides, the “R(A)” and “R(E)” zones in the vicinity of the site were subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 9. As such, it was considered that a maximum PR of 9.5 for the proposed “C” zone was appropriate for the site.

Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

48. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the difference in the BH between the PR of 12 proposed by the applicant and the PR of 9.5 as recommended by PlanD, Mr K.H. Cheng, the applicant’s representative, explained that under the current indicative scheme with a site area of about 2,000m² and SC of 62.5%, the floor area would be about 1,700m² for each storey. If the proposed PR was reduced from 12 to 9.5, there would be a reduction of the total floor area of about 5,000m², which was equivalent to about four storeys. Assuming an

average floor-to-floor height of 4m, the BH of the proposed development would be reduced from 100mPD (under PR of 12) to 84mPD (under PR of 9.5). In response to the same Member's follow-up question on air ventilation, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng said that the site did not fall within any identified air path.

Basement Carpark

49. A Member asked if the proposed development was subject to a PR of 9.5 instead of 12, whether the provision of two storeys of basement was sufficient to accommodate the required car parking spaces. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng said that under the scenario of PR 12, there was a deficit of about 30 car parking spaces if the high end standard for car parking provision in Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was to be adopted. Based on the submitted floor plan with about 50 car parking spaces per floor, two basement car parks might be able to meet the HKPSG requirement under the scenario of PR 9.5. She supplemented that a PR of 9.5 or the PR of the existing building, whichever is the greater, was proposed for the site, which was in line with the general planning control for other sites under the OZPs. According to the applicant, the PR of the existing building at the site was about 9.88.

Connectivity between the Site and KCFP PTI

50. In response to a Member's question, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng said that the level difference between the proposed landscape deck above the reprovisioned PTI and the ground level would be about 10m, i.e. the landscape deck would be provided at a level of about 14.5mPD.

51. Noting that a footbridge would be provided for the connection between the 2/F of the proposed development and the landscape deck above the reprovisioned PTI, a Member asked whether the escalator inside the proposed development for connection to the footbridge would be closed after the office hours of the proposed development. In response, Ms Pauline Lam, the applicant's representative, said that the design of the proposed development was indicative at the moment. Public access to the escalator and footbridge after the office hours of the proposed development would be considered during the detailed design stage.

Planning in the Adjacent Area

52. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any implementation plan for the reprovisioning of PTI adjoining the proposed development;
- (b) whether there would be any development above the PTI; and
- (c) the future use of the area zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) to the south-east of the site.

53. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng made the following responses:

- (a) the existing open-air PTI would be reprovisioned in-situ. The reprovisioned PTI would be covered by a landscape deck as a noise mitigation measure under the Environmental Permit of the CKR project upon completion of the underground section of the CKR;
- (b) the possibility of topside development above the reprovisioned PTI was under review by the Government; and
- (c) the area zoned “OU(Pier)” was currently occupied by the KCFP which was in operation. A waterfront promenade would be provided in the adjoining areas upon completion of the CKR project.

54. As the applicant’s representatives had no further points to raise and there were no further questions from Members, the Chairman informed the applicant’s representatives that the hearing procedure for the application had been completed and the Committee would deliberate on the application in their absence and inform them of the Committee’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives from PlanD and the applicant’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

55. Members in general had no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning of the site for commercial development as the subject “OU(TVS)” zone was no longer required for the reserved use, the proposed commercial development was in line with URPKC’s proposal and technically feasible. Given that the site was located adjacent to the “R(A)” and “R(E)” zones on Ma Tau Kok OZP which were subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 9, and the context of the site was more akin to the “C(2)” zone (with a maximum PR of 9.5) on the Kai Tak OZP, Members supported PlanD’s recommendation to partially agree to the application by rezoning the site to an appropriate sub-zone of “C” with a maximum PR of 9.5, a maximum SC of 65% and a maximum BH of 100mPD, or the PR/SC/BH of the existing building, whichever was the greater.

56. Some Members also made the following suggestions:

- (a) the connectivity between the proposed development and the future landscape deck and/or possible topside development above the reprovisioned PTI could be further improved; and
- (b) the planning intention for the provision of open space at the future landscape deck and/or possible topside development above the reprovisioned PTI should be reflected in the next round of OZP amendment.

57. After deliberation, the Committee decided to partially agree to the application for rezoning of the application site from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Tunnel Ventilation Shaft” (“OU(TVS)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” to an appropriate sub-zone of “Commercial” with a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 9.5, a maximum site coverage (SC) of 65% and a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD, or the PR/SC/BH of the existing building, whichever is the greater. The zoning boundaries and the development restrictions to be set out in the Notes should be submitted for the Committee’s agreement prior to gazetting under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance upon reference back of the approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan for amendment by the Chief Executive in Council. The Committee also noted that PlanD would review the zoning of the remaining part of the

“OU(TVS)” zone.

[Ms Katy C.W. Fung, Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK), was invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 6

Section 16 Application

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions Only)]

A/K20/131 Proposed Comprehensive Hotel Development in “Comprehensive Development Area (2)” Zone, Lai Ying Street, Cheung Sha Wan
(MPC Paper No. A/K20/131A)

58. The Secretary reported that the application was submitted by Fedder Limited, which was a subsidiary of Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK). Kenneth To & Associates Limited (KTA), Sun Hung Kai Architects and Engineers Limited (SHKAEL) (which was a subsidiary of SHK) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) were three of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	- having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM;
Mr Franklin Yu	- having past business dealings with SHK and AECOM; and his spouse being an employee of SHKAEL;
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	- his firm having current business dealings with SHK and AECOM; and

TOWN PLANNING BOARD

**Minutes of 684th Meeting of the
Metro Planning Committee held at 9:00 a.m. on 26.11.2021**

Present

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M. K. Chung

Chairman

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Vice-chairman

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Mr C.H. Tse

Assistant Commissioner for Transport (Urban),
Transport Department
Mr Patrick K.H. Ho

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Kirstie Y. L. Law

63. After deliberation, the Committee decided to defer a decision on the application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Committee agreed that the application should be submitted for its consideration within two months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Committee's consideration. The Committee also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/6
(MPC Paper No. 9/21)

64. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments involved rezoning proposals in Kai Tak that were supported by the Study on Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (the Review Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM), Urbis Limited (Urbis) and Barrie Ho Architecture Interiors Limited (BHA) as three of the consultants. The proposed amendments for development of a proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) were supported by a feasibility study with AECOM as one of the consultants. Amendment Item I was related to the proposed amendment to take forward the decision of a section 12A application (application No. Y/K22/3), with Ronald Lu & Partners (HK) Limited (RLP), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) and WSP Hong Kong Limited (WSP) being four of the consultants of the applicant. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory

(the Chairman) Board of HKHS;
(as the Director of
Planning)

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM,
RLP, MVA, Arup and Urbis;

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with Arup;

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings
with HKHS, AECOM, BHA, RLP, MVA, Arup
and WSP; and

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS.

65. The Committee noted that according to the procedure and practice adopted by the Town Planning Board (the Board), as the proposed amendments for the DRE was the subject of amendment to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of Members in relation to HKHS would only need to be recorded and they could stay in the meeting. The Committee noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho and Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting, and as Mr Franklin Yu had no involvement in the respective amendment items, the Committee agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

66. The following representatives from PlanD, CEDD, AECOM and Urbis were invited to the meeting at this point:

PlanD

Ms Katy C.W. Fung - District Planning Officer/Kowloon
(DPO/K)

Mr K.K. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Ms Joyce L.M. Lee

Assistant Town Planner/Kowloon

CEDD

Mr George K.M. Mak

-

Chief Engineer/E5 (CE/E5)

Mr Jason K.C. Wong

-

Senior Engineer/10 (East)

Consultants

AECOM

Mr Igor Ho

Mr Steven Wong

Mr David Wong

Mr Charles Choy

Urbis

Ms Winona Ip

67. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, presented the background and details of the following proposed amendments:

- (a) Amendment Items A to C and F to H - to rezone five commercial sites (the Reviewed Sites) in Kai Tak Development (KTD) for residential use in view of the latest economic situation and the persistent acute demand for housing which was supported by the Review Study;
- (b) Amendment Item D – to revise the alignment of the proposed Underground Shopping Street (USS);
- (c) Amendment Items E1 to E3 – to rezone and adjust the zoning boundary of the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) to accord with the latest boundary of the permanent government land allocation;
- (d) Amendment Item I - to take forward the decision of a section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3) to rezone a site at the junction of To Kwa Wan Road and San Ma Tau Street from “Other Specified Uses” annotated

“Tunnel Vent Shaft” (“OU(TVS)”) and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Commercial (9)” (“C(9)”);

- (e) Amendment Items J1 and J2 – to rezone a site at To Kwa Wan Road for a proposed DRE by HKHS;
- (f) Amendment Item K - to rezone the Kwun Tong Ferry Pier from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “(Pier)” (“OU(Pier)”) to “OU(Pier)(1)” to incorporate ‘Institutional Use’ and ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ as Column 1 uses as recommended under the Recommended Outline Development Plan for Kwun Tong Action Area;
- (g) Amendment Item L - to rezone a site at Cha Kwo Ling Road from “G/IC” to “Open Space” (“O”) to reflect the Government’s latest planning intention for development of a continuous waterfront promenade at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront; and
- (h) other amendments/revisions – to rectify minor discrepancies of zoning boundaries to reflect existing developments/latest proposals; and to remove the indicative alignment of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) from the OZP to reflect the Government’s latest decision on the implementation mode of the EFLS.

Rezoning of the five commercial sites for residential use in KTD

68. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) given that no noise mitigation measures were required for the sites at the former runway area originally intended for commercial uses, whether there would be noise impacts on the residential developments upon the rezoning;
- (b) given the rezoning of the Reviewed Sites from commercial use to residential use, why the overall change in residential gross floor area (GFA) was not the same as that for commercial GFA as shown on slide 36 of the PowerPoint presentation;
- (c) as the commercial developments originally intended on the Reviewed Sites

were to use the district cooling system, what the impacts in reduction of commercial uses on district cooling were;

- (d) implications of rezoning the Reviewed Sites on the overall population mix;
- (e) whether the rezoning would affect the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge Preservation Corridor (LTSBPC); and
- (f) whether flexibility was allowed for gradual change of types and quantity of social welfare facilities provision to suit the changing demographic profile over time.

69. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K.M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) road traffic noise impact on Site 4B5, located at the end of the former runway, could be mitigated by the semi-open noise barrier along Shing Fung Road (with the Kai Tak Sky Garden on top). According to the noise impact assessment conducted, the exceedance of road traffic noise level under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines for Sites 4C4 and 4C5 could be mitigated by installation of acoustic balconies and windows;
- (b) the overall change of residential and commercial GFA as shown on slide 36 of the PowerPoint presentation was for the whole OZP, which reflected changes due to rezoning of the Reviewed Sites as well as other amendments under Items I and J;
- (c) while the proposed rezoning of the sites would reduce the demand for district cooling service, given that there were still ample commercial developments (amounting to a total floor space of about 2 million m²), significant adverse impact on the district cooling system was not anticipated;
- (d) since the Reviewed Sites were intended for private residential developments, the resultant housing mix would hinge on the developers' decisions that were affected by market demand, marketing decisions and

other relevant factors. Hence, it was not possible to predict the impact of the proposed rezoning on the population mix;

- (e) the “CDA(4)” site under Amendment Item A abutted the LTSBPC. The proposed amendment was to revise the building height restriction (BHR) and planning intention of the “CDA(4)” zone from commercial to residential use, and the “CDA(4)” zoning would be retained. The planning brief to be prepared for the “CDA(4)” site would guide the future development to ensure its compatibility with and no adverse impact on the LTSBPC. The requirement for submission of Master Layout Plan would also allow the Committee to consider the development proposal at that site; and
- (f) the Social Welfare Department (SWD) had advised their required facilities to be provided on some of the Reviewed Sites and they were still reviewing the facilities to be provided at Sites 4C4 and 4C5. There were flexibility and room to incorporate different social welfare uses thereat to suit the needs of the local community.

70. A Member considered that there should be flexibility for changes in the provision of types and number of social welfare facilities within private developments so as to respond to changing society needs and aging population over time. There should be similar considerations in the provision of facilities by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD).

71. The Chairman supplemented that since social welfare facilities were exempted from GFA calculation under the respective zones, there was more flexibility to include requirements for specific social welfare facilities under the lease if required by SWD. Nonetheless, PlanD could convey the Member’s suggestions to SWD and the LCSD for their consideration as appropriate.

Underground Shopping Street

72. Members enquired on the following:

- (a) connectivity of the USS with the nearby area;
- (b) details about the revised alignment of the USS;
- (c) the party responsible for the design and construction of the USS and how good interface in design and ambience between different sections of the USS could be ensured; and
- (d) whether there were requirements for commercial uses and/or continuous shopfront along the USS.

73. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K.K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K.M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) the USS would provide connection between MTR Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station in KTD and would have subway connections to Kowloon City and San Po Kong. The USS would provide a barrier-free pedestrian passageway that would be opened for 24-hour public access. The USS section traversing the LTSBPC would be on LG1/F and that traversing Kai Tak River would be at-grade, but there would be vertical pedestrian facilities including lifts, escalators and staircases at specified locations to allow barrier-free access between the USS and the ground level;
- (b) the amendment to the alignment of the USS near Kai Tak Station were mainly to reflect the as-built conditions. There was also a 24-hour public pedestrian passageway on B1/F between the “CDA(1)” and the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use(2)” (“OU(MU)(2)”) sites. The alignment of the section of USS between the LTSBPC and Sung Wong Toi Station was shifted north-westwards from underneath the adjacent road/public open space (POS) to within the Reviewed Sites as shown on Plan 5 of the Paper. This would allow better integration of the USS with the commercial portions of the Reviewed Sites and had taken into account development programme of the road/POS;

- (c) the developers of the concerned sites were required under land sale conditions to construct, maintain, manage and operate the USS sections within or adjacent to their sites. The concerned sites in the former north apron area would be bundled into two, and as only two developers would construct the USS thereat, the interface issues would be reduced. Furthermore, under the land sale conditions, the developers would be required to submit plans and designs on the interfacing section of the USS for review and comment by relevant government departments, including the CEDD and the Architectural Services Department; and
- (d) a minimum commercial floor area would be required to be provided by the future developers adjoining the USS within the Reviewed Sites to enhance the vibrancy and attractiveness of the USS. Although there was no specific requirement for a continuous shopfront, it was expected that the minimum commercial floor space requirement would result in a fairly continuous shopfront along the USS. For the developments in the “CDA(1)” and “OU(MU)(2)” sites near Kai Tak Station, the proposed commercial floor areas at the USS level by the developers were more than required.

74. Members enquired on the following:

Connectivity and EFLS

- (a) connectivity amongst sites at the former runway;
- (b) implications of removing the EFLS on land use zonings on the OZP;
- (c) implications of removing the EFLS on public transport in KTD and whether there were any additional traffic impacts;
- (d) connectivity of the former runway area with the hinterland under the ‘multi-modal’ EFLS;

Open Space and Greening

- (e) implications of the proposed amendments on the overall provision of open space and greenery in KTD;

LTSBPC and Heritage Trail

- (f) accessibility and connectivity of the LTSBPC to the surrounding areas;
- (g) details of the heritage trail of Kai Tak and the parties responsible for its design and construction;

Amendment Item I

- (h) the reason for rezoning the “OU(TVS)” site for commercial use;
- (i) current status of the ventilation shaft originally intended to be built at the site;
- (j) proposed BHR of the “C(9)” site and proposed uses in the adjacent area zoned “G/IC”; and

Amendment Item J

- (k) the interface between the sewage treatment works and the DRE.

75. In response, Ms Katy C.W. Fung, DPO/K, Mr K. K. Lee, STP/K, and Mr George K. M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD made the following main points:

Connectivity and EFLS

- (a) different sites at the former runway area were well-connected through the open space network. The Kai Tak Sky Garden, a landscape deck above Shing Fung Road, served as a major connection for sites along the former runway. The landscape deck was connected to the promenades (via footbridges, lifts and staircases with 24-hour pedestrian access) on both

sides of the former runway facing the Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC)/Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) and the Victoria Harbour. Shops and eating places would be provided at designated sites along the promenade. There were also at-grade pedestrian streets connecting the promenades on both sides of the former runway area. The two ends of the landscape deck were connected to the Metro Park and the Tourism Node/Cruise Terminal. The Kai Tak Bridge Road provided connection to the Hong Kong Children's Hospital's side across KTAC;

- (b) an indicative alignment of the EFLS was shown on the OZP for information and no zoning was designated for the EFLS. Hence, the proposed removal of the EFLS alignment would have no implication on the land use zonings on the OZP;
- (c) the previous proposal for a EFLS in Kowloon East (KE) in the form of an elevated monorail was replaced by a proposed 'multi-modal' EFLS. The key components of the 'multi-modal' EFLS included (i) enhancing public transport services in KE, and deploying electric vehicles to run new bus/green minibus routes in the area; (ii) developing a traveller network that would link up the former runway of Kai Tak, the Kowloon Bay Action Area and the Kwun Tong Action Area; (iii) providing a greenway network that would run through promenades and open spaces in the KTD for shared use by pedestrians and cyclists; and (iv) establishing a "water taxi" service point in the KTD. With the proposed 'multi-modal' EFLS system to replace the originally envisaged monorail EFLS, no adverse traffic impact in KTD was anticipated;
- (d) a 600-metre long pedestrian cum cyclist bridge with travellers was proposed across KTTS to connect the former runway area with the Kwun Tong hinterland under the 'multi-modal' EFLS. Nevertheless, the proposal might have implications on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and required further study;

Open Space and Greening

- (e) two of the proposed items were related to open space provision. Amendment Item L involved proposed rezoning of a “G/IC” site with no long-term designated use at the Cha Kwo Ling waterfront to “O” to reflect the Government’s latest planning intention to develop a continuous waterfront promenade. Amendment Item J1 involved proposed rezoning of a piece of land zoned “O” to “R(A)6” for inclusion into HKHS’s DRE project. HKHS would designate an area in the DRE for the provision of a POS, which would be larger than the area of “O” to be rezoned, for public enjoyment. As such, there was no overall reduction in POS provision in Kai Tak;
- (f) although there was a shortfall of 4.31 ha in local open space, the overall provision of POS in the Kai Tak OZP was close to 100 ha, with ample surplus of district open space. Given a total planning scheme area of about 320 ha, the open space provision in KTD was considered comparatively high. In addition, to enhance the greenery in KTD, development sites in Kai Tak were required to provide a minimum green coverage of 30%;

LTSBPC and Heritage Trail

- (g) the LTSBPC was highly accessible and would be connected to the USS on LG1/F, which would be connected to the MTR Kai Tak Station and Sung Wong Toi Station. The LTSBPC would be connected to the Shek Ku Lung Road Playground in Kowloon City via a subway across Prince Edward Road East, which would further link to the Kowloon Walled City Park;
- (h) the heritage trail shown on Plan 4 of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP showed selected links of pedestrian network connecting sites of heritage/cultural interests in Kai Tak and would largely route through open space. PlanD would discuss with LCSD and relevant project proponents on the possibility of improving accessibility and connectivity to those sites of heritage/cultural interests when opportunities arose;

Amendment Item I

- (i) the rezoning of the site from “OU(TVS)” to “C(9)” was to take forward a section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3) for proposed redevelopment of Lucky Building at San Ma Tau Street for commercial use, which was partially agreed by the Committee;
- (j) the “OU(TVS)” site was previously reserved for development of a tunnel ventilation shaft for the Central Kowloon Route. The site was no longer required as the concerned ventilation shaft was built on another site in KTD;
- (k) the proposed BHR for the “C(9)” zone under Amendment Item I was 100mPD. Regarding the adjacent area currently zoned “G/IC”, its current BHR was 15mPD, and the relevant departments were examining the feasibility for a topside development with a public transport interchange thereat. Hence, the BHR and/or plot ratio restriction to be stipulated for the site would be further considered in the future; and

Amendment Item J

- (l) the southern portion of the “G/IC” zone was originally intended for development of an electricity substation which was subsequently provided in another site within KTD, hence, that part was rezoned to “R(A)6” for the proposed DRE. The northern portion of the “G/IC” site was occupied by an existing sewage pumping station, and the relevant assessment concluded that the sewage pumping station would not have noise and odour impacts on the DRE. The DRE would provide public rental housing and subsidised sale flats for residents affected by government developments and/or urban renewal projects.

76. Members had no questions regarding other proposed amendments to the OZP and generally considered that they were acceptable.

77. After deliberation, the Committee decided to:

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6 and that the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6A at Attachment II of the Paper (to be renumbered to S/K22/7 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment III were suitable for exhibition under section 5 of the Ordinance; and
- (c) adopt the revised ES at Attachment IV of the Paper for the Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the OZP and the revised ES would be published together with the OZP.

78. The Committee noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before their publication under the Town Planning Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

[The Chairman thanked the government representatives and the consultants from AECOM and Urbis for their attendance to answer Members' enquiries. They left the meeting at this point.]

Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development

Minutes of Forty-second Meeting

Date : 1 November 2021 (Mon)

Time : 3 p.m.

Venue : Conference Room, 15/F, North Point Government Offices, 333 Java Road, Hong Kong

Present

Mr Vincent NG

Chairman

Organization Members

Mrs Margaret BROOKE

Representing Business Environment Council Limited

Dr Vivian WONG

Representing Friends of the Earth (HK) Charity Limited

Mr Benny CHAN

Representing Hong Kong Institute of Urban Design

Mr Winston CHU

Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (attended Item 2)

Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN

Representing Society for Protection of the Harbour (attended Item 3)

Mr Sam CHOW

Representing The Chartered Institute of Logistics and Transport in Hong Kong

Dr CHUNG Shan-shan

Representing The Conservancy Association

Mr Jacky CHEUNG

Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Ms Iris HOI

Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects

Mr Edward LO*

Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Planners

Sr Francis LAM

Representing The Hong Kong Institute of Surveyors

Ir Victor CHEUNG*

Representing The Hong Kong Institution of Engineers

Mr Jeff TUNG

Representing The Real Estate Developers Association
of Hong Kong

Individual Members

Mr Mac CHAN*

Mr Ivan HO

Ms Angela SO*

Hon Tony TSE

Official Members

Mr Vic YAU

Deputy Secretary (Planning & Lands) 1, Development
Bureau (DEVB)

Mr Johnny CHAN

Principal Assistant Secretary (Works) 2, DEVB

Ms Stephenie HO

Senior Manager (Tourism) 41, Tourism Commission
(TC)

Mr Patrick HO

Assistant Commissioner/Urban, Transport
Department (TD)

Mr Henry CHU

Head (Kai Tak Office), Civil Engineering and
Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Michael CHIU

Chief Executive Officer (Planning) 1, Leisure and
Cultural Services Department (LCSD)

Mr Chesterfield LEE

Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, Planning
Department (PlanD)

Mr Steven LEE

Secretary

In Attendance

Miss Rosalind CHEUNG

Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB

Mr William LEUNG

Assistant Secretary (Harbour) Special Duties, DEVB

Mr William CHAN

Project Manager (Harbour), DEVB

Mr NG Shing-kit

Senior Engineer (Harbour)2, DEVB

Ms Phoebe WU

Engineer (Harbour), DEVB

Ms Helen CHU*

Landscape Architect (Harbour), DEVB

Absent with Apologies

Ms Kelly CHAN

Mr Frankie NGAN

For Item 2

Mr George MAK

Chief Engineer/East 5, East Development Office,
CEDD

Mr Jason WONG

Senior Engineer/10(E), East Development Office,
CEDD

Ms Melissa WAYE

Engineer/15(E), East Development Office, CEDD

Mr Chesterfield LEE

Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 3, PlanD

Ms Joyce LEE

Assistant Town Planner/Kowloon 8, PlanD

Mr Oliver LAW

General Manager (Planning & Development), Hong
Kong Housing Society (HKHS)

Mr Raymond LIU

Senior Manager (Planning & Development), HKHS

Mr FU Yee Ming

Senior Manager (Planning & Development), HKHS

Mr Howard YEE

Senior Manager (Project Management), HKHS

For Item 3

Mr Kasper NG

Principal Assistant Secretary (Further Education),
Education Bureau (EDB)

Miss Jasmine CHIU

Assistant Secretary (Further Education) 2, EDB

Miss May LEE

Assistant Secretary (Further Education) 2 Des., EDB

Ms Karen CHEK

Senior Executive Officer (Further Education)3, EDB

Dr Wilson LAM

Architect / Subvented Projects (4), Architectural
Services Department (ArchSD)

Dr Eric LIU	Deputy Executive Director, Vocational Training Council (VTC)
Mr Philip SHUM	Head/Estates, Health and Safety Division, VTC
Ms Ariel CHOW	Project Manager/Estates, Health and Safety Division, VTC
Mr Joel CHAN	Director, P&T Group

*Denoting attendance online.

~~pedestrian connectivity and walking experience from hinterland to harbourfront was supplemented by EKEO and was circulated to Members on 31 December 2021 for information and comments. With the Chairman's agreement, the Secretariat made a written submission consolidating Members' views and comments on the proposed development plan and amendment proposal of the Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to the Town Planning Board (TPB) on 1 March 2022.]~~

1.2 Since the last KTTF meeting was only held a short while ago, **the Chairman** informed Members that the minutes of the 41st meeting would be confirmed at the next meeting.

Item 2 Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (TFKT/07/2021)

Briefing by the proponent

2.1 **The Chairman** informed the meeting that a briefing was arranged on 26 October 2021 for PlanD and CEDD to consult Members on the further review of land use in Kai Tak Development (KTD). Subsequently, the team had submitted a paper (TFKT/07/2021) on the latest review proposal.

2.2 Upon **the Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. In view of the latest economic situation and market response, as well as the acute housing demand, the review study was commissioned in 2020 to examine the feasibility of rezoning 5 commercial sites for residential use. Other proposed amendments to the prevailing Kai Tak OZP including, among others, the proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) at Ma Tau Kok, were also focus of the current item.

2.3 **Sr Francis LAM** declared that he was a Member of the Hong Kong Housing Authority. **The Chairman** decided that he could remain in the meeting but should refrain from commenting on the specific site concerned where potential conflict of interest was involved.

2.4 With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, **Mr Chesterfield LEE** from PlanD briefed Members on the latest review proposal.

Discussion

Dining Cove

2.5 **Mr Ivan HO, Mr Jeff TUNG, Ms Iris HOI, Mr Jacky CHEUNG** and **the Chairman** expressed grave concerns over the removal of the Dining Cove and that the proposed remedial measures of implementing the public open space (POS) outside the original Dining Cove lacked vibrancy. **Mr Ivan HO** and **the Chairman** stressed the importance of providing alfresco dining within the POS to be managed by LCSD, and if this was not possible in the near future, it was considered that there should at least be proper seating, tables and shelters on this LCSD site to support the restaurants inside the site to be managed by the HKHS.

2.6 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that the proposed DRE development adjoining the Dining Cove POS was intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from government development and/or urban renewal projects. He added that that site had been reconfigured with a view to facilitating HKHS to accommodate certain at-grade food and beverage as well as alfresco dining provision for public enjoyment following the original planning intention and facilitating the implementation of the intended Dining Cove. **Mr Oliver LAW** supplemented that open air alfresco dining and

commercial facilities fronting the adjoining Dining Cove POS were planned on the lower floors of the proposed development. **Mr Michael CHIU** remarked that while food and beverage facilities were generally not allowed in venues managed by LCSD, they would be willing to explore with HKHS ways to facilitate their dining activities.

2.7 **The Chairman** expressed that with reference to the experience of Central Market, the public should be able to enjoy food and beverage within the POS. **Miss Rosalind CHEUNG** remarked that if there would be at least proper seating, tables and shelters on the LCSD site, it would allow members of the public to enjoy their food and beverage purchased from the outlets in HKHS' development. **Mr Jeff TUNG** considered that the proposed arrangement was still inconvenient for public enjoyment. He suggested having more food kiosks in the LCSD site directly so as to have a vibrant harbourfront.

2.8 **Mr Ivan HO** enquired about the types of "Government, Institution or Community" (GIC) and social welfare facilities to be provided in the site, and expressed concerns that some proposed uses might not be compatible with the original planning intention of achieving a vibrant area. **Ms Iris HOI** opined that the overall design of the POS within the DRE site was not conducive to vibrancy but only provided a passive passageway. She suggested rearranging the building disposition for having a more open public space with shelters and seating which could offer multi-functional uses for public enjoyment.

2.9 **Mr Oliver LAW** responded that the GIC and social welfare facilities were planned for elderly care, pre-school rehabilitation services, care services for children with special needs, hostel for physically or mentally handicapped persons, etc. He also explained that the proposed building

disposition was arranged having regard to both technical constraints imposed by the residential developments and the intention to open up the at-grade POS for public enjoyment.

2.10 **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** requested further elaboration regarding the interdepartmental design review panel formed by relevant government representatives in monitoring the design and construction of the POS by HKHS.

2.11 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that making reference to the practice for the residential sites at Kai Tak former runway, the interdepartmental design review panel would compose of representatives of different departments including CEDD, PlanD, LCSD, ArchSD, Harbour Office and the Green and Landscape Office of DEVB. The project team would also consult the Task Force on the detailed design of the POS to be delivered by HKHS in due course.

Underground Shopping Street (USS) and Underground Carpark

2.12 **Mr Ivan HO** opined that with the segregated ownership along the different USS sections, the business viability for the realigned USS should be considered thoroughly so as to achieve a critical mass. He further enquired which party was responsible for constructing the section of USS which was not to be taken forward by private developers. **Mr Benny CHAN, Mr Jeff TUNG** and **Mr Jacky CHEUNG** concurred. They proposed that the USS could be managed by a single operator for holistic management, which would be conducive to its vibrancy and integration. **Mr Jeff TUNG** suggested having sufficient retail facilities at the podium of the residential buildings above and exploring the possibility of having hotel development nearby so as to create synergy and attract a critical public mass for the USS.

2.13 **Mr George MAK** responded that in the future land sale documents of the sites concerned, developers would be required to integrate the basement retail provision with the USS so as to achieve a critical mass. In response to Members' comments on holistic management of the USS by government, he said that the USS would generally be located within private land and be integrated with other shops at the USS level. The developers concerned would also be required to maintain round-the-clock pedestrian access through the USS. It would therefore be prudent for the developer to manage its own section of USS as a single party.

2.14 **Mr Ivan HO** urged the project team to study the possibility in linking up the basement carpark within the rezoned bundled residential sites in Area 2 so as to provide more parking spaces and flexibility to meet the anticipated traffic flow. **Mr Jeff TUNG** concurred.

2.15 **Mr George MAK** responded that in line with the latest updates to the parking standard under Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, more underground parking spaces would be provided. He remarked that there were also considerable parking provisions in other parts of KTD such as the Tourism Node and Kai Tak Sports Park to meet the parking demand. In response to Members' suggestion on linking up the basement carpark, **Mr Chesterfield LEE** supplemented that the project team would liaise with relevant departments to explore if it would be technically feasible. [Post meeting note: Members' proposal involved the use of the underground space underneath public roads and pedestrian street for parking use. Upon consulting relevant departments, it was considered that the notional schemes under the Review Study with parking spaces confined to the development sites (i.e. without encroaching into the underground areas of public roads) were technically feasible. If the future developers had the intention to provide ancillary car parking spaces of commercial/residential development in area

shown as 'Road' on the OZP, they could submit planning application to the TPB under the provisions of the OZP.]

2.16 **Dr CHUNG Shan-shan** opined that the factor of global climate change should be taken into account in the design of USS and asked if the proposal had considered the possible adverse weather conditions in the years to come.

2.17 **Mr George MAK** explained that necessary architectural and drainage features had been incorporated in the design of USS to avoid flooding brought about by the adverse weather.

Pedestrian-cum-cyclist Bridge across Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter

2.18 While agreeing that a pedestrian connection should be added across Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, **Mr Winston CHU** expressed concerns over its potential adverse impact on the operation of the Typhoon Shelter due to height restriction, and urged the proponent to consider other possible locations for constructing the bridge, such as at the opening of Kai Tak Approach Channel or along the existing breakwater. With reference to the Greenwich Foot Tunnel in London, he proposed that alternative solutions such as pedestrian tunnel or ferry services should be considered. He also expressed that the views of relevant stakeholders on the conceptual proposal should be fully considered before proceeding to prepare the detailed design of the proposed bridge.

2.19 **Mr Edward LO** supported enhancing cycling connectivity throughout KTD as it could promote cycling for recreation as well as commuting purposes. **Mr Benny CHAN** requested further details showing the latest overall connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists in KTD.

2.20 **Mr George MAK** responded that the latest proposed location of the pedestrian-cum-cyclist bridge had already significantly reduced its impact on the operation of Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. The project team would also take into consideration Members' comments in refining the proposal as appropriate. In respect of the suggested pedestrian tunnel, he explained that it might not be technically feasible as Trunk Road T2 would also pass through the seabed underneath Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter. He further explained that under the proposed travellers networks, including the 1.3km traveller along Wai Yip Street linking up Kowloon Bay Action Area and Kwun Tong Action Area, together with the proposed pedestrian-cum-cyclist bridge (with traveller) would provide a direct and convenient linkage among Kwun Tong Action Area, Kowloon Bay Action Area and Kai Tak Runway under the "multi-modal" Environmentally Friendly Linkage System. He supplemented that the commencement of detailed design of the proposed bridge was still subject to review with regards to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance and various technical impact assessments.

2.21 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** explained that a holistic pedestrian and cycling connection network had been planned throughout KTD in particular in connecting the various open spaces and Kai Tak Sports Park. Pedestrian connections in form of footbridges and subways had also been provided to connect to other areas in the vicinity of KTD including San Po Kong and Kowloon City.

Other Comments

2.22 **Hon Tony TSE** enquired if the increase in maximum building heights (BHs) for the residential sites at the former north apron area would visually block the surrounding buildings, and if minor relaxation of BHs would

be allowed for other sites in the vicinity. **Mr Edward LO** concurred and considered that the visual impact assessment should fully consider the potential effects on the ridgeline and harbour view.

2.23 **Mr Chesterfield LEE** responded that the maximum BHs for the rezoning sites were increased with a view to achieving the planned domestic plot ratio along with the reduced footprint. The increased BHs were also in line with the surrounding building profile, and a stepped height profile of the locality would be maintained.

2.24 **Hon Tony TSE** requested further elaboration in terms of traffic flow and the potential impact of the proposed rezoning of the commercial sites for residential use on the overall KTD.

2.25 **Mr George MAK** responded that the overall traffic flow in the area was expected to be slightly reduced upon the proposed rezoning of the commercial sites according to the traffic impact assessment.

2.26 **Hon Tony TSE** added that the traffic impact assessment should also include traffic flow information at different time periods brought about by the rezoning.

Way Forward

2.27 In conclusion, notwithstanding that the Task Force had no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning for residential uses, Members expressed grave concerns over the lack of vibrancy at the original Dining Cove area. Members also provided other comments with less harbourfront angle including the implementation of the USS and the possibility in linking up the basement car parks within the rezoned bundled residential sites in Area 2.

The **Chairman** invited the project team to take into account Members' comments in taking forward the rezoning proposal for consideration by the TPB, and to consult the Task Force on the detailed design of the POS to be delivered by HKHS as soon as possible.

~~**Item 3 – Pre-construction Works for Proposed Development of New Campus of Vocational Training Council at Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling) (TFKT/08/2021)**~~

Briefing by the proponent

3.1 **The Chairman** informed Members that EDB submitted a paper (TFKT/08/2021) on the pre-construction works for the proposed development of new campus of VTC at Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling). Further to the briefing session arranged on 26 October 2021, the project team had further refined the proposal taking into account Members' comments.

3.2 Upon the **Chairman's** invitation, **Mr Steven LEE** briefed Members on the background of the item. PlanD and CEDD consulted the Task Force on the amendments incorporated in the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5, including the proposed rezoning for the proposed VTC campus development, in 2017. While the Task Force recognised the need to cater for the different needs of society, Members expressed concerns over the building bulk of the proposed campus, integration between the campus and the promenade, and connectivity to the waterfront, etc. Subsequently, the TPB considered that the project's purpose of nurturing young people in Hong Kong is compatible with the objective of enhancing the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront area, and considered that a more responsive building design and configuration of the VTC campus should be explored at the implementation stage to achieve better integration of the campus with the waterfront. To take

第六屆九龍城區議會
第十三次會議記錄

日期：2021年11月4日(星期四)
時間：下午2時30分
地點：九龍城民政事務處會議室

<u>出席者：</u>	<u>出席時間</u>	<u>離席時間</u>
主席：楊永杰議員	會議開始	會議結束
副主席：何顯明議員,BBS,MH	會議開始	會議結束
議員：林德成議員	會議開始	會議結束
張景勛議員	會議開始	會議結束
黃國桐議員	會議開始	會議結束
吳寶強議員,MH	會議開始	下午6時正
何華漢議員	會議開始	下午6時正
潘國華議員,JP	會議開始	會議結束
楊振宇議員	會議開始	會議結束
左滙雄議員,MH	下午2時36分	下午5時48分
李慧琼議員,SBS,JP	會議開始	下午5時45分

秘書：劉秀敏女士 九龍城民政事務處高級行政主任(區議會)

缺席者：
議員：梁婉婷議員

列席者：

蔡敏君女士,JP	九龍城民政事務專員
簡耀進先生	九龍城民政事務助理專員
廖淑芬女士	九龍城民政事務處高級聯絡主任(地區聯絡)2
劉美儀女士	九龍城民政事務處高級聯絡主任(特別職務)
郭麗娟女士	九龍城民政事務處高級行政主任(地區管理)
麥慧敏女士	九龍城民政事務處高級聯絡主任(大廈管理)
冼寶琼女士	九龍城民政事務處聯絡主任主管(紅磡)
劉鎮達先生	土木工程拓展署總工程師/東4
林明偉先生	食物環境衛生署九龍城區環境衛生總監
凌菊儀女士	房屋署物業管理總經理(西九龍及西貢)
張惠英女士	康樂及文化事務署總康樂事務經理(九龍)
湯德欣女士	康樂及文化事務署九龍城區康樂事務經理
廖健威先生	運輸署總運輸主任/九龍2

周 虹女士	香港警務處九龍城區指揮官
謝芷晴女士	香港警務處九龍城區警民關係主任
鄧穎天先生	香港警務處牛頭角分區指揮官
周健清女士	香港警務處九龍城區助理警民關係主任

應邀出席者：

議程一	余德祥先生,JP 吳煥賢女士 陳詠雯女士	屋宇署署長 屋宇署高級屋宇測量師/E2 屋宇署署長行政助理
議程三	麥健明先生 黃啟聰先生 李建基先生 李樂敏女士	土木工程拓展署總工程師/東5 土木工程拓展署高級工程師/10(東) 規劃署署理九龍規劃專員 規劃署助理城市規劃師/九龍 8
議程四	區俊豪先生 孫知用先生 殷倩華女士	市區重建局總監(規劃及設計) 市區重建局總經理(業務策略) 市區重建局高級經理(社區發展)

* * *

開會辭

1. **主席**歡迎各位議員及各部門的代表出席九龍城區議會第十三次會議。

2. 在開始商討議程前，**主席**提醒各位議員按《九龍城區議會會議常規》(下文簡稱《會議常規》)的規定申報利益，若稍後討論的事項與其物業業權、職業或投資等個人利益有所衝突，議員須在討論前申報，以便他考慮是否須要請有關議員於討論或表決時避席。此外，根據《會議常規》第 12(1)條，區議會會議的法定人數為不少於當其時擔任該區議會議員的人數的二分之一。由於區議會現有 12 位議員，如會議期間在席議員人數不足 6 位，並有議員向他提出此事時，他會立即中止討論，並指示秘書請離席議員返回會議室。如 15 分鐘屆滿後仍未有足夠的法定人數，他會立即宣布會議結束。他又提醒與會人士關掉手提電話的響鬧裝置或將其改為震動提示，以免會議受到干擾。此外，因應疫情的最新情況，

14. 主席作出總結，感謝余德祥先生抽空出席會議，並代表區議會致送由九龍城區議會出版的《龍城。濃情》給他留念。

議程二

通過第三次特別會議記錄及第十二次會議記錄

15. 主席宣布第三次特別會議及第十二次會議的會議記錄無須修訂，並獲得一致通過。

議程三

啟德發展進一步檢討研究

(九龍城區議會文件第 70/21 號)

16. 規劃署署理九龍規劃專員李建基先生介紹文件，重點如下：
- (i) 政府於 2020 年開展研究，探討把啟德發展區五幅商業用地改劃作住宅用途的可行性。研究結果顯示有關建議在技術上可行；
 - (ii) 上述五幅用地中，兩幅位於前北面停機坪區(第 2A 區)的用地將合併出售(即 2A2 和 2A3 號用地及 2A4、2A5(B)和 2A10 號用地；下文簡稱「第 2A 區用地」)，而餘下的三幅用地則位於前跑道區(第 4 區)；
 - (iii) 第 2A 區用地實際上涉及五幅土地。當中毗連龍津石橋保育長廊的 2A2 號用地現時在啟德分區計劃大綱圖(下文簡稱「大綱圖」)上是劃為「綜合發展區」地帶，現署方建議將其規劃意向由「作商業用途」改為「作住宅用途」。至於其餘四幅土地，即 2A3、2A4、2A5(B)和 2A10 號用地，署方則建議由「商業」地帶改劃為「住宅(甲類)」地帶；
 - (iv) 規劃署擬把第 2A 區用地改劃後的最高住用地積比率訂為 6.5 倍，即在《香港規劃標準與準則》(下文簡稱《規劃標準》)中市區新發展區的上限，以及將最高非住用地積比率訂為 1 倍(2A2 和 2A3 號用地)和 1.5 倍(2A4、2A5(B)和 2A10 號用地)；

- (v) 第 2A 區用地的建築物高度限制亦將由主水平基準上 80 至 90 米增加至 100 至 125 米，以達到規劃的地積比率，並維持現時區內由東北向西南逐步遞降的梯級式建築物高度輪廓，以符合啟德發展區城市設計大綱的概念；
- (vi) 因應改劃和賣地及建設時間的改變，署方建議把由龍津石橋保育長廊至宋皇臺港鐵站的一段地下購物街改道至第 2A 區用地之內，以減少工程上的複雜性，並讓地下購物街與發展用地內的商業樓面面積有更好的融合。地下購物街將由第 2A 區用地的發展商負責興建，並設有 24 小時開放的無障礙行人通道和垂直行人連接設施，可連接啟德及宋皇臺兩個港鐵站、九龍城和新蒲崗；
- (vii) 此外，前跑道區共分為 14 幅用地，當中 11 幅用地已出售作住宅發展。署方建議把餘下的三幅用地，即 4B5、4C4 和 4C5 號用地(下文簡稱「第 4 區用地」)，由「商業」地帶改劃為「住宅(乙類)」地帶，並把最高住用地積比率訂為 5.7 至 7 倍，以及把最高非住用地積比率訂為 0.3 倍(4C4 號用地)及 0.5 倍(4B5 號用地)；至於用地內的建築物高度限制將維持現時的主水平基準上 95 至 108 米，以維持跑道區起伏有致的建築物高度輪廓；
- (viii) 第 2A 區用地及第 4 區用地已預留空間提供一系列的社福設施，包括各類長者、兒童、青少年和復康設施；
- (ix) 前跑道區的公共休憩空間將包括兩邊的海濱長廊、啟德空中花園、都會公園、跑道公園和啟德郵輪碼頭公園，而區內設有行人天橋、行人街道和垂直行人連接設施；
- (x) 《行政長官 2020 年施政報告》提及會以「多元組合」模式發展九龍東環保連接系統，當中包括興建一條長約 600 米、橫跨觀塘避風塘的行人及單車天橋。因應以上建議，署方將刪除在大綱圖上的環保連接系統示意走線，並更新大綱圖《說明書》的相關資料；
- (xi) 署方亦建議把一幅位於馬頭角土瓜灣道的用地由「政府、機構或社區」地帶、「其他指定用途」註明「與海旁有關的商業、文化及休憩用途」地帶和「休憩用地」地帶改劃為「住宅(甲類)」地帶，並交由房協發展專用安置屋邨。改劃後的

用地預計可提供約 1 100 個單位、服務長者和復康人士的社福設施，以及約 2 700 平方米的地面公共休憩空間；

- (xii) 城市規劃委員會(下文簡稱「城規會」)較早前根據《城市規劃條例》第 12A 條同意把位於新碼頭街幸福大廈的用地改劃作商業用途，現署方建議把涵蓋幸福大廈和毗鄰紅棉工業大廈的土地由「其他指定用途」註明「隧道通風塔」地帶和「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「商業(9)」地帶；
- (xiii) 署方亦建議把位於茶果嶺道的一幅用地由「政府、機構或社區」地帶改劃為「休憩用地」地帶，以發展茶果嶺海濱長廊。有關海濱長廊是政府其中一項優化海濱重點項目，將納入職業訓練局新校舍項目一併發展；
- (xiv) 大綱圖改劃後，啟德發展區的整體住宅單位數目會由原先的約 50 000 個增至約 59 000 個，居住人口會由原先的約 134 000 人增至約 158 000 人，而商業樓面面積則會由原先的約 2 280 000 平方米減至約 1 940 000 平方米；
- (xv) 大綱圖的改劃建議不會導致交通、供水、排水及排污等各方面的基礎設施超出負荷，亦不會對周邊環境包括噪音、空氣質素、空氣流通和景觀等方面帶來不良影響；以及
- (xvi) 規劃署稍後會把大綱圖的改劃建議連同議員的意見提交城規會審議。若改劃建議獲通過，城規會會根據《城市規劃條例》展示有關大綱草圖，並作為期兩個月的公眾諮詢。

17. **楊振宇議員**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 他支持增加房屋供應，但擔心署方過於依賴地下購物街和港鐵站，以致忽略地面的行人和公共交通設施；
- (ii) 他指出宋皇臺區缺乏民生類商店，區內的市民現時不得不前往九龍城區或土瓜灣區的商店購買所需的物品，故要求署方增加民生設施；以及
- (iii) 他認為區內社福設施的名額嚴重不足，故建議於擬建的社福設施加入九龍城區居民優先使用的規則。

18. **何華漢議員**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 他認同增加房屋供應具迫切性，並指出增加社區配套同樣

重要。他以啟德為例，指出區內雖然有一座街市、兩間小學和一間中學，但是卻沒有游泳池、圖書館、大型公共運輸交匯處、單軌列車等設施；

- (ii) 他認為按改劃建議增加區內的居民數目會突顯區內社區配套的不足。他又以德朗邨為例，指出邨內大部分學生自 2013 年入伙以來均須跨區上學；
- (iii) 他認為區內的交通過於依賴啟德及宋皇臺港鐵站，而富豪東方酒店外的巴士站已超出負荷，故認為署方須增加港鐵以外的交通配套；
- (iv) 他指出德朗邨的街市只有 36 間店舖，當中一間為新鮮豬肉店、兩間為新鮮水產店，以及兩間為新鮮蔬菜店，導致濕貨商品價格容易出現被壟斷的情況。他認為小型街市無助緩解區內的需求，故要求署方切實地從居民角度考慮需求和價格問題；
- (v) 他查詢署方如何評估有關改劃對啟德郵輪碼頭和周邊旅遊設施的影響，以及有否諮詢旅遊業人士的意見；以及
- (vi) 他建議把第 2A 區用地作重置馬頭圍邨和樂民新村的居民之用。

19. **張景勛議員**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 不少市民反對於 2A2 和 2A3 號用地建設男童院等社福設施；
- (ii) 他認為於五幅用地合共增設七所弱智人士宿舍乃過多，並建議改建為其他社福設施；
- (iii) 他查詢啟德綜合大樓仍未動工的原因；
- (iv) 他查詢啟德河畔花園的規劃進度；以及
- (v) 他指出啟德郵輪碼頭一帶的泊車位嚴重不足，故查詢在該處增設泊車位的可行性。

20. **副主席**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 他認為改劃第 2A 區用地屬無可厚非；
- (ii) 他指出原規劃擬把鄰近啟德郵輪碼頭的第 4 區用地發展為

旅遊區，若把用地改劃作住宅用地，啟德郵輪碼頭將變為死城，因此他反對有關改劃建議；

- (iii) 他認為前跑道區已有大量公共休憩空間，故建議把都會公園一帶改劃作住宅用地；
- (iv) 他建議署方研究於前跑道區建設酒吧街；
- (v) 他認為於美食海灣設置下水位置較使用啟德明渠進口道便利，故查詢其可行性。他又查詢市民可否使用啟德體育園的下水位置；以及
- (vi) 他指出若香港國際七人欖球賽等大型賽事於啟德體育園舉行，參賽隊伍會優先選擇鄰近的酒店住宿設施。由於啟德體育園可容納約五萬人，因此他認為區內的酒店房間不足以應付需求。

21. **李慧琼議員**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 雖然啟德原規劃的主調乃保育和給予市民更充裕的休憩空間，但她希望署方在改劃時把化解香港的深層次矛盾納入考量，並合理地訂定地積比率；
- (ii) 她建議預留部分土地作原區安置之用；
- (iii) 她要求增加啟德郵輪碼頭的配套設施，以活化該處；以及
- (iv) 她認為啟德的交通設施不足以應對市民的需求，故要求署方改善相關規劃。

22. **主席**的意見綜合如下：

- (i) 他支持改劃建議，但他要求署方先增加街市、學校和康體設施等民生設施；
- (ii) 他指出啟德區的違泊問題十分嚴重，而是項改劃建議未有增加泊車位，故擔心改劃會導致違泊問題惡化；
- (iii) 他認為居住在前跑道區的人大多會駕駛私家車代步，故認為取消單軌列車的決定會令該區的交通問題惡化；
- (iv) 他支持把用地改劃予房協發展專用安置屋邨，但他擔心該處缺乏交通和民生設施；

- (v) 他建議署方於 2A2 號用地或鄰近用地建設連接新蒲崗的通道，以達至協同效果；以及
- (vi) 他擔心第 4 區用地的改劃建議會增加啟德醫院和香港兒童醫院一帶的交通負荷。

23. **規劃署李建基先生回應，重點如下：**

- (i) 是項改劃建議的目的主要是把原規劃方案的部分商業用地改劃作住宅用途，而非為了增加發展密度；
- (ii) 根據規劃，來往啟德近九龍城或新蒲崗一帶的人士可使用港鐵及途經太子道東的公共交通服務，包括多條巴士線和小巴線。隨着區內人口的增長，運輸署會適時檢視交通需求並增強公共交通服務；
- (iii) 南豐集團旗下項目 AIRSIDE 的用地內將設有新的公共運輸交匯處，為區內人士提供更多的交通選擇。有關工程預計於 2022 至 2023 年間完成；
- (iv) 由於啟德區內的公共房屋發展項目有限，而街市一般由公共房屋發展項目提供，因此啟德區現時只有位於德朗邨的晴朗街市。位於 1E1 和 2B3 號用地的公共房屋發展項目將會提供新的街市設施；
- (v) 食環署暫未有計劃於啟德區建設一座大型公眾街市。他會向食環署轉達議員有關建設大型公眾街市的意見；
- (vi) 除了地下購物街的商業樓面外，第 2A 區的兩幅合併出售土地亦有足夠的地積比率讓發展商建設臨街店鋪類的商業樓面。此外，周邊的其他商業和住宅用地亦會設有店鋪，因此他相信區內的店鋪足以滿足居民的需求；
- (vii) 社署會根據當區居民及社會的需要和周邊的配套設施去規劃地區的社福設施。根據《規劃標準》，除學校和幼兒中心外，啟德區內社福設施的供應大致足以應付居民的需求；
- (viii) 教育局就學校方面的規劃會從更大的範圍考慮，而當局經考慮九龍城區的學校分佈後，認為區內的學位供應相對充足，當局亦會因應需求情況不時檢視須否增加區內幼稚園或中小學學位；

- (ix) 雖然第 4 區用地擬改劃為住宅用途，但是前跑道區相關的住宅用地將會沿海濱長廊提供共約 23 000 平方米的商業樓面面積。此外，鄰近亦有可提供約 23 萬平方米商業樓面面積的旅遊中樞項目，當中包括提供約 700 至 900 間房間的酒店及商業樓面，以帶動區內的旅遊業；
- (x) 隨着前跑道區的樓宇落成，啟德郵輪碼頭一帶將會有更多的零售及餐飲類店舖，吸引更多人到該處消費觀光；
- (xi) 啟德郵輪碼頭現有約 100 個泊車位，而鄰近的旅遊中樞將設有約 1 000 個泊車位，故署方認為有關的泊車位數目足以應付區內人士的需求。此外，當局亦正研究於旅遊中樞增設更多泊車位的可行性；
- (xii) 考慮到乘搭郵輪的外地旅客大多會選擇於郵輪上住宿，加上毗鄰擬議的酒店(提供約 700 至 900 間房間)和附近啟德體育園的酒店(提供約 400 間房間)將可為啟德郵輪碼頭的旅客提供所需的住宿設施。署方已就大綱圖的改劃建議諮詢旅遊事務署，並未有收到反對意見；
- (xiii) 建築署和康樂及文化事務署(下文簡稱「康文署」)正進行啟德綜合大樓的前期工作，並會在落實具體方案後諮詢區議會的意見；
- (xiv) 美食海灣的設計原意是為了讓顧客在海灣兩邊的露天店舖一邊享受餐飲，一邊欣賞維多利亞港的景色。啟德體育園的下水位置屬於公共休憩空間，故會開放予市民使用。至於在美食海灣公共休憩用地設置下水位的建議，可於該休憩用地的詳細設計階段考慮。除了啟德明渠進口道和啟德體育園外，前跑道區亦會增設更多下水位置，以便利市民進行水上活動；
- (xv) 規劃署已於今年較早前修訂了《規劃標準》中有關泊車位的標準，並會於改劃所涉及的用地中採用新的泊車位標準。新住宅項目可提供的泊車位數目會較舊標準有所增加；
- (xvi) 根據現時的安排，真善美村的居民將會被重置到於 1E1 號用地所興建的公共房屋。至於馬頭圍邨和樂民新村的重置地點則有待相關部門和機構作決定；

(xvii) 現時連繫啟德和新蒲崗的行人通道乃一條連接 Mikiki 商場和啟德社區會堂的弧形高架行人路，根據規劃，此通道將會延伸至啟德 1M1 和 1M2 號用地。而地下購物街亦會設有行人隧道以連接至新蒲崗景泰苑附近的地方；以及

(xviii) 長遠而言，當局亦計劃建設一條連接李求恩紀念中學附近和啟德 1M1 號用地的行人隧道。

24. 土木工程拓展署總工程師/東 5 麥健明先生回應，重點如下：

(i) 土木工程拓展署已於 2019 年把承豐道改道至前跑道區的中心，並把兩邊行車線由單線增至雙線，以增加該道路的交通容量；

(ii) 土木工程拓展署正全速興建 D3 路(都會公園段)，有關工程目標於 2022 年完成。當工程完成後，市民可由前跑道區使用新路直接往來前北面停機坪和土瓜灣一帶；以及

(iii) 土木工程拓展署正於海濱道與祥業街的交界處進行路口改善工程，而當興建中的 6 號幹線工程完成後，啟德一帶的交通狀況將有所改善。

25. 副主席指出部分乘搭郵輪的乘客會選擇住在碼頭周邊的酒店，以體驗香港的風情，故擔心有關改劃建議會導致啟德郵輪碼頭一帶的住宿設施不足。

26. 規劃署李建基先生回應，表示在大綱圖改劃後，啟德區內的商業樓面仍有約接近 200 萬平方米，主要集中在啟德港鐵站附近、九龍灣前南面停機坪區和前跑道區的旅遊中樞。發展商可按實際需要考慮是否於商業用地上興建酒店。值得注意的是，整個九龍東地區現時已提供超過 10 000 間酒店房間。

27. 主席作出總結，表示雖然議員原則上支持改劃建議，但他亦希望規劃署認真考慮議員的意見。

議程四

市區重建局龍城區市區更新研究初步分享

(九龍城區議會文件第 71/21 號)

Provision of Open Space and Major GIC Facilities in Kai Tak Area
(as at May 2022)

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 [#]	14.16 ha	7.19 ha	55.85 ha	+41.69 ha
Local Open Space	10 ha per 100,000 persons [#]	14.16 ha	3.76 ha	9.72 ha	-4.44 ha
Secondary School	1 whole-day classroom for 40 persons aged 12-17	182 classrooms	30 classrooms	60 classrooms	-122 classrooms
Primary School	1 whole-day classroom for 25.5 persons aged 6-11	407 classrooms	109 classrooms	169 classrooms	-238 classrooms
Kindergarten/ Nursery	34 classrooms for 1,000 children aged 3 to 6	159 classrooms	14 classrooms	32 classrooms	-127 classrooms
District Police Station	1 per 200,000 to 500,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Divisional Police Station	1 per 100,000 to 200,000 persons	0	1	1	+1
Hospital	5.5 beds per 1,000 persons [^]	810 beds	468 beds	2,868 beds	+2,058 beds
Clinic/Health Centre	1 per 100,000 persons	1	0	1	0
Magistracy (with 8 courtrooms)	1 per 660,000 persons	0	0	0	0
Child Care Centre	100 places for 25,000 persons	566 places	0	500 places	-66 places
Integrated Children and Youth Services Centre	1 for 12,000 persons aged 6-24	2	1	2	0
Integrated Family Services Centre	1 for 100,000 to 150,000 persons [#]	0	0	1	+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	N.A.	0	0	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	N.A.	1	7	N.A.
Community Care Services (CCS) Facilities	17.2 subsidised places per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above ^{*@}	488 places	84 places	527 places	+39 places
Residential Care Homes for the Elderly	21.3 subsidised beds per 1,000 elderly persons aged 65 or above [@]	605 beds	0	1,050 ^{**}	+445 beds
Library	1 district library for every 200,000 persons	0	0	1	+1
Sports Centre	1 per 50,000 to 65,000 persons [#]	2	0	2	0
Sports Ground/ Sport Complex	1 per 200,000 to 250,000 persons [#]	0	0	1	+1
Swimming Pool Complex – standard	1 complex per 287,000 persons [#]	0	0	0	0

Note:

- The overall planned population (i.e. usual residents + mobile residents + transients) in Kai Tak area is about 147,453 which is based on TPEDM with adjustment based on latest district situation and an assumption of 85% occupation rate of proposed flats. If excluding transients, the planned resident population is about 141,639.

The requirements exclude planned population of transients.

^ The provision of hospital beds is to be assessed by Hospital Authority on a regional basis.

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

@ This is a long-term goal and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the Social Welfare Department in the planning and development process as appropriate.

** 60% of total planned places assumed to be subsidized beds