

HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD

(downgraded on 1.6.2007)

Minutes of 883rd Meeting of the Town Planning Board held on 20 April 2007

Agenda Item 7

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only).]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Hai Tan Street/
Kweilin Street/Pei Ho Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K5/URA2/A
Prepared under Section 25 of Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance
(TPB Paper No. 7806)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

1. The Secretary said that as the proposed Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was submitted by Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had interests in this item:

Mrs. Ava Ng as the Director of Planning]	
		being a non-executive director of the URA
Mr. Herbert Leung as the Director of Lands]	
Mr. Walter K.L. Chan]	
Ms. Margaret Hsia as the Assistant Director (2) of Home Affairs Department	-	Being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of the URA
Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim]	having current business dealings with the
Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong]	URA
Mr. Michael K.C. Lai	-	Being a former non-executive director of the URA

2. The Secretary reported that Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim, Messrs. Michael K.C. Lai and Walter K.L. Chan had tendered apology for being unable to attend the afternoon session of the meeting. Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Mrs. Ava Ng, Ms. Margaret Hsia and Mr.

Herbert Leung had tendered apology for not attending this item of the meeting.

3. The Chairperson said that the Board would discuss the draft DSP including the boundary proposed by URA. In accordance with the TPB PG No. 29A, the Board's decision on the DSP would be kept confidential for 3-4 weeks after the meeting and would be released when the DSP was published under s5 of the Ordinance. Members agreed to the proposed arrangement of the meeting.

4. Ms. Heidi Chan, District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District (DPO/TWK) and Miss Carrie Chan, Town Planner/TWK (TP/TWK) of Planning Department (PlanD) and Mr. Michael Ma of URA were invited to the meeting at this point.

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and [explained the procedures of the meeting](#). [She then](#) invited Ms. Heidi Chan to brief Members on the background of Paper.

6. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Ms. Heidi Chan did so as detailed in the Paper and made the following main points:

Background

- (a) URA submitted on 3.3.2006 the draft Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street DSP No. S/K5/URA2/A under section 25(5) of the URA Ordinance (URAO) to the Board for consideration. Taking into account departmental comments received, the URA had requested for deferments and submitted supplementary information, including revised notional scheme and technical assessments in March and November 2006 respectively. URA proposed to rezone 3 sites currently comprising 4-7 storey buildings of 1950-60s, namely Sites A, B and C in the DSP, from "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") to "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") zone, with a maximum domestic and non-domestic PR of 7.5 and 1.5 respectively in the Notes of the "CDA" sites;

Notional Scheme

- (b) the development would include 4 residential towers of 27 to 47-storey at the 3 sites comprising retail, clubhouse and parking facilities, subject to a maximum building height of 150mPD, and one 2-storey block at Site C for retail use. The scheme would include 2,200m² GFA for social welfare facilities to be constructed by the developer and managed and maintained by

the Government, a 1,500m² public open space site at Site C including a closed section of Pei Ho Street, and 3 vehicular ingress/egress along Hai Tan Street and Tung Chau Street. The scheme was tentatively scheduled to be completed by 2013;

Draft Planning Brief (PB)

- (c) the above development parameters were incorporated into the draft PB submitted to the Board for consideration and would serve as the basis for preparation of the Master Layout Plan (MLP);

Social Impact Assessment (SIA)

- (d) the SIA, with household information and findings of the survey summarized in paragraph 6 of the Paper, was circulated to relevant departments. The SIA concluded that services by the social services team were sufficient to address the impacts and mitigation measures were proposed to help affected residents;

Departmental Comments

- (e) Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) considered residential development as not desirable from noise planning point of view. There was concern on the practicability of the proposed mitigation measures in the EIA, including provision of 17m high podium, single aspect building design, balcony, architectural fins and no openable windows at some side facades, to address the traffic noise impact from West Kowloon Corridor (WKC),. The noise compliance rate, being 74%, was unable to meet the 80% requirement. Assistant Commissioner for Transport/Urban, Transport Department (AC for T/U,TD) advised that queue analysis was required to demonstrate the acceptability of car lift and vehicular access while the TIA design year should be 2021. Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UDL) considered the proposed building height of 150mPD as incompatible with the surroundings and elaboration was required for the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA). CHE/K, HyD advised that there were plans to resurface section of WKC fronting the scheme with low noise material by end 2007. Director of Social Welfare had no objection on GIC provision uses and the SIA and would offer necessary assistance to address

the needs of affected residents if required. Director of Leisure and Cultural Services had no objection to the proposal;

Local Views

- (f) the District Officer (Sham Shui Po) (DO(SSP)) considered the SIA agreeable. The Housing Committee of the SSP DC (HC, SSP DC) had passed a motion urging URA to offer satisfactory compensation/rehousing and relocation arrangement, and to include 205-211 Hai Tan Street into the DSP. It was noted that SSP DC members had been invited to a workshop on 14.4.2007 on URA projects in Sham Shui Po District. It was agreed that URA would consult SSP DC during the gazettal of the DSP;

Public Comments

- (g) 48 comments (including 39 in standard letters) were received during the publication of the draft DSP and SIA report with the following comments:
- *to include 205-211 Hai Tan Street* adjoining Site B into the DSP due to similar building condition/age and possible environmental and structural safety impacts during construction stage (44 comments);
 - *to include 201 to 203A Yee Kuk Street and 270-286, Tung Chau Street (Tung Chau Bldg)* into the DSP as both were buildings over 40 years and in poor condition (2 comments);
 - *to include 4/F, 184 Hai Tan Street* into the DSP (1 comment);
 - *to exclude 189-203 Hai Tan Street* from the DSP as redevelopment plan had already been drawn up since 1990 by the majority of owners (1 comment);

PlanD's Views

- (h) there was no in-principle objection as the draft DSP would bring about early implementation of comprehensive redevelopment for environmental improvement, provision of community facilities and open space to address the district shortage. The "CDA" zone, as compared to the previous "R(A)" zoning, could ensure appropriate control on the scale and design of development through submission of MLP and technical assessments;

- (i) the boundary of the draft DSP was considered not unreasonable as the properties/sites proposed to be included in the DSP by some commenters could not fulfil the selection criteria in terms of building conditions, age and height. Being located at the periphery, some of the sites were large enough for redevelopment on its own. While 189-203 Hoi Tan Street was able to meet the selection criteria, its exclusion would adversely affect the comprehensiveness of the development scheme. Regarding DEP's concern on traffic noise in the EIA, mitigation measures and improvement in building layout could be examined in the MLP stage. To address EPD's concern, it was proposed to stipulate a 80% noise compliance in the Notes, Explanatory Statement (ES) and PB. Other technical issues, including TIA, AVA, building height and interface with infrastructure could be considered in the MLP stage. SSPDC's concern on compensation and rehousing policies were acquisition issues to be addressed in the implementation stage. Should the Board consider the current scheme boundary appropriate and the DSP be exhibited for public inspection, the public could submit representation during the gazettal period. The public could also provide comments on the MLP under the planning permission system;
- (j) PlanD proposed the following amendments to the draft PB to address departmental concerns:
- the proposed residential, retail and open space uses and the development intensity, i.e. a maximum domestic PR ratio of 7.5 and a maximum non-domestic PR of 1.5, were compatible with the surrounding developments. To restrict the development bulk of the development, the clause on allowing bonus PR under Building (Planning) Regulation 22(1) or (2) should be deleted;
 - taking into account CTP/UD&L's comment and to maintain a harmonious height profile, no maximum building height would be stipulated in the PB and the building height should be determined and justified by a visual impact assessment at the MLP stage, subject to technical assessments including AVA when more details and design were available;

- a noise compliance of 80% should be stipulated in the PB to address DEP's concern on possible traffic noise;
- a revised AVA should be submitted at the MLP stage to minimize possible adverse air ventilation impact; and
- the requirements of various technical assessments were set out to ensure that possible adverse impacts would be properly mitigated.

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

7. The Chairperson then invited the representative from URA to elaborate on the DSP.

8. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Michael Ma made the following main points:

Traffic Noise

- (a) the layout had been revised to address EPD's concern on traffic noise, including amendment to the layout and number of blocks, relocation of open space to Pei Ho Street, and provision of 17m high podium, 20m setback from the WKC, single aspect building design and no openable window along some facades, architectural fins and balcony with noise reduction design. Together with the proposed noise mitigation measures such as noise insulation on balcony facing WCR and taking into account HyD's proposal for partial resurfacing of WKC by low noise materials, the compliance rate was expected to achieve 80%. The specification of 80% noise compliance in the PB was acceptable and an EIA based on detailed design would be undertaken at the MLP stage;

Building Height

- (b) regarding the height concern, the building height had been reduced to 150mPD with the revised layout. The previous AVA, adopting the Computational Fluid Dynamics model, would be reviewed at the MLP stage based on detailed design to consider options to improve air circulation; and

Responses to Public Comments

- (c) priority would be accorded to redevelop older buildings in poor conditions. It was noted that other buildings proposed to be included into the DSP by commenters failed to meet the selection criteria. 184 Hai Tan Street 4/F was a single unit. 201 to 203A Yee Kuk Street, Tung Chau Bldg and 205-211 Hai Tan Street, were taller buildings in comparatively better conditions, with some being exposed to traffic noise. 189-203 Hai Tan Street, comprising 4-storey structures built in 1954, were in poor condition and there was no firm redevelopment plan nor approved building plan yet. As the DSP would already involve 680 households, inclusion of these sites would affect more households and likely to create greater social disruption. More comprehensive improvement would be initiated for the broader district. It would be prudent to proceed with redevelopment of this area by phases, with emphasis on the more imminent cases.

9. The Chairperson then invited Members to comment on the Paper.

10. A Member enquired about the rationale in removing the building height limit of 150mPD. Ms. Heidi Chan replied that imposing a specific height limit at this stage might give the impression that a building height up to 150 mPD would be acceptable to the Board. Instead of specifying a maximum building height, it would be more prudent to require the applicant to justify and demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed building height to the Board at the MLP stage, with regard to further assessments including VIA and AVA. This would also strike a balance between design flexibility and planning control.

11. Members also asked questions on the following main points:

- (a) there seemed to be merit in including the adjacent buildings at 205-211 Hai Tan Street into Site B;
- (b) inclusion of 201 to 203A Yee Kuk Street to the north of Site A would provide a bigger site to enable greater design flexibility and consideration for provision of open space;
- (c) whether Tung Chau Building, being subject to traffic noise issue would be considered for inclusion to the scheme to enable a more comprehensive design;

- (d) whether the closed section of Pei Ho Street would be decked over;
- (e) what would be the arrangements for the business operators as 70% would be affected; and
- (f) whether there would be a comprehensive redevelopment strategy in the district.

12. **Mr. Michael Ma** replied as follows:

- (a) the adjacent buildings at 205-211 Hai Tan Street; which were completed in 1960's and in a better condition, did not meet the selection criteria. However, they would be included in future improvement schemes to be initiated by the URA;
- (b) the addition of 201 to 203A Yee Kuk Street was proposed by 1 commenter who was the Owners' Incorporated (OI), hence might not represent the views of all owners of the whole block. Inclusion of this 8-storey building into Site A would affect more residents while the revised configuration of Site A would compromise the flexibility on the design and layout of the site;
- (c) the Tung Chau Building, being a 9-storey building completed in 1964 and recently renovated, was located at the periphery of the area and large enough to initiate redevelopment on its own. Older buildings with height below the flyover would generally be less susceptible to traffic noise than higher buildings;
- (d) the closed section of Pei Ho Street at Site C would be developed into a 1500m² ground-level open space, to connect with the temporary jade market under the flyover and the Tung Chau Street Park to the south;
- (e) a 2-storey retail block would be planned in Site C to allow special retail outlets and shops with local characteristics. The temporary jade market to the south would not be affected by the scheme but would be included as an integral part of an area-wide revitalization scheme in future; and
- (f) in addition to the redevelopment projects in the DSP, URA was in the process of initiating other schemes for renovation and reactivation in the

Sham Shui Po area, including pedestrainization and landscape plan, so as to formulate a more comprehensive improvement strategy for the area.

13. The Chairperson remarked that it would be useful for URA to present the findings of the study to the Board to enable Members to have a comprehensive picture and understanding of URA's overall improvement strategy of the area. Mr. Michael Ma agreed to brief Members once the study was completed.

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

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

15. The Chairperson believed that in drawing up the boundary of the proposed DSP, the URA had carefully considered the scope, location and building conditions, age and height. The commenters' proposals, for inclusion or exclusion of properties/buildings, either failed to meet URA's selection criteria or possessed reasonable potential for redevelopment on its own. She noted that further requirements and assessments were proposed by PlanD in the DSP and PB to accord appropriate control on the development intensity and design at the MLP stage, with a view to addressing the departmental concerns on building height and traffic noise.

16. Members were generally in support of the proposal and also expressed the following views:

- (a) consideration could be given to provide more greenery and setback in the detailed design stage;
- (b) in addition to the traffic impact of WKC, more thoughts should also be given to mitigation measures to address similar impact along Kwelin Street and Hai Tan Street;
- (c) as there were comparatively more single families and new migrants in Sham Shui Po, the SSPDC should be consulted on the provision of community facilities; and
- (d) given the residents' aspirations and general community support for early

implementation of urban renewal, it would be prudent not to propose significant changes to the current scheme boundary to accommodate additional properties/buildings which were unable to satisfy the selection criteria and would compromise the implementation programme. Notwithstanding, it would be preferable for URA to initiate early public consultation and be prepared in responding to such local requests for amending the DSP boundary.

17. The Chairperson said that any proposed changes to the DSP boundary would need to be fully justified. Given that redevelopment was a relatively long drawn process, expanding or reducing the scheme at this stage to accommodate requests from a single OI or some commenters without meeting the criteria nor securing the agreement of all the owners concerned, would further complicate the already difficult social and rehousing issues, in addition to causing further delay to the programme. It would be advisable to proceed with the current scheme as scheduled and to continue with URA's further initiatives in an phased manner pending the overall urban improvement plan for the area.

18. Mr. Michael Chiu remarked that the proposals in the EIA, such as single aspect building design and no openable windows, were not normally considered as acceptable mitigation measures and also difficult to implement, while other noise reduction features such as balcony might not be adequate to address the traffic noise. There was a need to meet the 80% compliance with more innovative measures at the MLP stage.

19. Taking into account the departmental views, Members agreed to the draft DSP together with its Notes and ES. Members also considered the amendments to the PB as proposed by PlanD reasonable and agreed to impose a 80% noise compliance rate and consider the building height subject to detailed assessments at the MLP stage.

20. After further deliberation, the Board decided to incorporate the amendments proposed by the PlanD and:

- (a) deemed the draft Hai Tan Street/Kweilin Street and Pei Ho Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K5/URA2/A and the Notes as being suitable for publication as provided for under section 25(6) of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance, so that the draft DSP should be exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);

- (b) endorsed the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft DSP and adopt it as an expression of the Board's planning intention and objectives of the Plan, and agree that the ES as being suitable for public inspection together with the draft DSP;
- (c) agreed that the draft DSP, its Notes and ES are suitable for submission to the Sham Shui Po District Council for consultation/information upon exhibition of the Plan;
- (d) agreed that the draft Planning Brief are suitable for submission to the Sham Shui Po District Council for consultation; and
- (e) noted the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) (Stages 1 and 2) Reports respectively.