

**Minutes of the 1134th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 11.5.2017**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong
Transport Department
Mr Peter C.K. Mak

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Mr C.W. Tse

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr. C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn
Director of Lands

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee
Director of Planning

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Sally S.Y. Fong

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr T.C. Cheng

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1134th Meeting held on 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017, 16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1134th meeting held on 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017, 16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Closed Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/20
(TPB Paper No. 10244)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

2. The meeting noted that, other than the minutes of meeting, the video recordings of the hearing sessions held on 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017, 16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017 were sent to Members by batches on 17.2.2017, 23.2.2017 and 9.3.2017.

3. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests on the item, as shown on the visualizer, which was reported in the minutes of the meeting on 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017 and 1.3.2017, was updated/consolidated. The declaration of interests on the item was as follows :

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee
(as Director of Planning) (SPC) and the Building Committee (BC) of HKHA

- Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn
(as Director of Lands) - being a member of HKHA
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan
*(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)* - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr C.W. Tse
*(as Deputy Director,
Environmental Protection
Department (EPD))* - being an officer of EPD, the operator of the existing Underground Island West Refuse Transfer Station (IWRTS)
- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA and a convenor of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL)
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK), the consultant of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) on ground decontamination works for the Kennedy Town area, and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman (R3888)
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), the representative of China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation

Company Limited (CMG) (R144)

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with MTRCL and Arup, and past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealing with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] HKHA, MTRCL, Arup and MMHK, and hiring Mary Mulvihill (R4120/C305) on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL, Arup and MMHK
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA, Arup and MMHK
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL
- Professor S.C. Wong - being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy, an engineering consultant of Arup, and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) where MTRCL and Arup had sponsored some activities of the Department before
(The Vice-chairman)
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - his relative being a member of Democratic Alliance for the Betterment and Progress of Hong Kong (R4113)

4. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn, Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Franklin Yu, Professor S.C. Wong and Mr C.W. Tse were indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

5. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background of representations/comments on the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) as follows :

- (a) the amendments to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP mainly involved the rezoning of various sites for open space/waterfront park, commercial/leisure/tourism development, public and private housing, and government, institution and community (GIC) developments in accordance with the Recommended Land Use Proposal (RLUP) under the Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (the Land Use Review); and
- (b) the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/20 was exhibited for public inspection on 11.3.2016 under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 7,593 valid representations and 306 comments were received.

6. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, the Secretary then went through the major points made by the representers and commenters in their written and oral submission.

Major Grounds and Responses

General/Technical Issues

7. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on housing provision :

- (a) high-rise, high-density luxury private residential developments in Kennedy Town and Mount Davis area were generally not supported;
- (b) housing target should not be achieved at the expense of the environment and the living quality of the local residents; and
- (c) other alternative sites or means of housing production should be considered.

8. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) a multi-pronged approach was adopted to increase and expedite housing land supply for short and medium term. The western part of Kennedy Town was one of the areas identified for development, providing about 2,340 public rental housing (PRH) units and almost 1,000 private housing units; and
- (b) the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC) supported public housing development in the district. The overall number of flats and the public/private housing ratio had been adjusted in response to C&WDC's comments. The public was positive towards housing land supply in general during the public consultation of the Land Use Review; and
- (c) most of the brownfield sites were currently being used and could not be developed at once.

9. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on technical impacts :

- (a) Development Intensity and Building Heights – the development intensity and the building height (BH) of the proposed developments in the area should be lowered. The BH profile should be decreasing from west to east with taller buildings near hillside for better air ventilation;
- (b) Traffic/Transport – the proposed developments would worsen the local traffic situation and increase the risk of vehicular/pedestrian conflicts and accidents. There were inadequate public transport services in Kennedy Town and inadequate pedestrian connection between the existing and planned developments, as well as the waterfront area. The proposed public transport terminus (PTT) and underground public vehicle park were not justified. The traffic impact assessment (TIA) had not taken into account the additional traffic generated from the proposed East Lantau Metropolis (ELM) development under the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (“HK 2030+”). The traffic impact on Ka Wai Man Road had not been addressed and traffic improvement measures were not adequately explored;
- (c) Air Ventilation and Visual – the Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation (AVA EE) was outdated and had not taken into account the latest changes in BH of the proposed development under Item C2. The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) was not accurate;
- (d) Environment – the decontamination and construction works would expose toxic materials underground and had adverse environmental impact and health hazard. The Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG) under Item C2 had been vegetated and could have undergone decontamination through phytoremediation. The Environmental

Impact Assessment (EIA) for decontamination had overlooked the potential presence of dioxin and the historical development of Kennedy Town. There was no mitigation measure to tackle climate change and alleviate air pollution/heat island effect;

- (e) Landscape and Tree – the two old and valuable trees (OVTs) at the slope abutting Victoria Road to be affected by Item A2 should be preserved;
- (f) Provision of Open Space, GIC Facilities and Other Supporting Facilities – there were inadequate provisions of open space and GIC facilities to support the additional population. It was unreasonable to assess open space provision at District Council (DC) level and the open space provision was lower than that in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and Hong Kong 2030+. Recreational/community facilities within the Central and Western District were far away from Kennedy Town. Some also considered that Kennedy Town was being gentrified with unaffordable goods and services; and
- (g) Public Consultation – there was inadequate consultation on RLUP and/or the OZP amendments. Local residents should be allowed to formulate their own land use proposals and the public consultation period should be extended.

10. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) based on the RLUP under the Land Use Review, maximum plot ratios (PRs) of 6 and 6.5 for public housing and private residential sites respectively were adopted. The stepped BH profile was proposed having regard to the waterfront setting and the general topography of the area;

- (b) the Traffic Review by Transport Department (TD) had demonstrated acceptable traffic impact with the implementation of the proposed traffic improvement measures. New pedestrian footbridges and crossings were proposed to enhance accessibility to the waterfront and improve the pedestrian network. TD would monitor the public transport provision to ensure that there was adequate service. The PTT within the proposed private residential development under Item C2 would replace two existing open-air bus termini, thus releasing those sites for housing and open space development. The feasibility of an underground public carpark would be subject to further study. Traffic improvement measures including road widening and traffic diversion were proposed for Ka Wai Man Road. The proposed ELM was a preliminary concept and, if pursued in future, would be subject to a separate TIA;

- (c) the analysis in AVA EE was generic and applicable to development with a bulky and extensive podium and closely packed tower blocks. Despite revised BH restrictions for Item C2, no major air ventilation impact was anticipated with the incorporation of building gap. The overall stepped BH profile had given due respect to the waterfront setting and the general topography. The VIA was conducted in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41;

- (d) Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had confirmed that the proposed development would not have insurmountable environmental impact. Decontamination by plants/trees through phytoremediation was technically infeasible for such large area with high concentration and wide distribution of contaminants. Although CSTG would not pose any imminent health hazard, decontamination works were still required even if CSTG was to be developed into a permanent public open space. The Planning Brief would set out the required technical assessments to guide PRH development. NBA and building gap

requirements for some sites would facilitate air ventilation and help alleviate the urban heat island effect;

- (e) the “Open Space” (“O”) zone for the adjoining site under Item A2 would be extended to cover the two OVTs for better protection. Appropriate landscape measures, tree preservation/compensatory planting would be adopted in accordance with the relevant Technical Circular and practice note;
- (f) the overall provision of open space and GIC facilities were adequate at DC level for the planned population in accordance with the HKPSG. Opportunity would be taken to increase open space provision where appropriate. There was provision in the OZP for additional premises-based GIC, social welfare and healthcare facilities; and
- (g) two rounds of extensive consultation for the Land Use Review were carried out from 2013 to 2016. The RLUP had been revised to address the public views received. The draft OZP was published in accordance with the Ordinance and all valid representations and comments received were considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) accordingly.

Specific Issues

Items A1 and A3 – Waterfront Park/Open Space

11. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) Commercial facilities at the future waterfront park under Item A1 would affect the connectivity and public use of the promenade, and high-end products were not affordable by the general public;

- (b) there were concerns on the design, accessibility, connectivity and implementation mechanism for the future waterfront park;
- (c) the utilisation rate of uncovered playground in Hong Kong was usually low in view of the rainy and hot climate; and
- (d) there were proposals to relocate the school under Item D1 to the recreation ground under Item A3 and to rezone the recreation ground under Item A3 for residential use.

12. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the conceptual design of the waterfront park submitted to the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Islands (TFHK) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) in 2015 was yet to be determined. HC would be consulted in taking forward the proposed waterfront park. Appropriate landscaping and greening would be provided in accordance with the HKPSG in the planned open spaces. New pedestrian footbridges and crossings were proposed to enhance accessibility to the waterfront; and
- (b) the representers/commenters' proposals were not in line with the harbourfront planning principles. Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground (KTTRG) under Item A3 formed part of the proposed continuous promenade. The area and width of the KTTRG site could not accommodate a 30-classroom primary school. KTTRG was the only recreation ground providing sports facilities in the neighbourhood and needed to be retained.

Item B – Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses

13. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) the proposed “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” zoning failed to provide incentive for a wine-themed commercial, leisure and tourism destination. An increase in allowable GFA to 65,100m² or plot ratio (PR) of 5 was necessary for the conversion of the existing pier for commercial, Leisure and tourism uses (R144);
- (b) the GFA and BH restrictions, the proposed 12m-wide waterfront promenade and a 30m non-building area (NBA) were not justified. There was inconsistent NBA requirement for the site and the adjacent public rental housing development on the same air path (R144);
- (c) the Schedule of Uses should be amended to allow multi-level waterfront promenade with a total width of 6m and a 15m-wide building gap above 20mPD (R144);
- (d) hotel development was not compatible with the surrounding developments and had adverse traffic impact and air/light pollution. The plot ratio and BH should be reduced considerably;
- (e) the Government should resume the site to enhance the connectivity of the future waterfront park. The RLUP should not bundle with the commercial and tourism development proposal of R144;
- (f) provision should be made to allow two to three-storey facilities at the pier portion with industrial operations on ground level and commercial, retail and recreational uses on the upper levels (R4112);

- (g) the site should be reserved for the provision of waterfront promenade by exchanging Western Wholesale Food Market for cruise terminal use (R178/C291 and others); and
- (h) the existing BH and use as a wine cellar should be maintained (R4096 and others).

14. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the “OU” zone was to facilitate the phasing out of incompatible godown use. A more stringent planning control on gross floor area (GFA) and BH was required for this prominent waterfront location. The GFA and BH restrictions were considered appropriate, which had taken into account the existing GFA, development right, technical assessments and comments from relevant government departments;
- (b) the 12m-wide waterfront promenade was required to provide a continuous pedestrian linkage connecting the future waterfront park under Item A1 and the existing recreation ground under Item A3. The 30m-wide NBA was required based on the AVA EE to improve the visual permeability and avoid wall-like development at the waterfront. Designation of a NBA for the PRH site was not practicable in view of the sloping terrain of the site. Instead, a NBA and building gaps above podium level were imposed for the PRH site;
- (c) the proposed increase in GFA and BH was not justified, and the reduction of the waterfront promenade to 6m was not conducive to creating a sense of entry to the pier portion and enhancing the visual connectivity towards the waterfront. A quantitative AVA at detailed design stage would be required to justify changes to the NBA requirement;

- (d) given the intention was to phase out existing industrial uses, it was not appropriate to incorporate warehouse use or to provide a separate Schedule of Uses for industrial or industrial-office building. Industrial operations at the pier portion were not in line with the planning intention;
- (e) there was no insurmountable technical problem for development at the site. All uses would be subject to planning application, which would be considered by the Board, and relevant requirements could be incorporated into the lease for better control; and
- (f) all uses within the “OU” zone except piers required planning permission. Detailed information including the design concept and opening hours of waterfront promenade would be required for the consideration by the Board.

Item C1 – Public Housing

15. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) the site was not suitable for PRH development due to its prime location. There was adverse traffic impact and safety concern at Ka Wai Man Road. The ingress/egress of light goods vehicle (LGV) car park should be moved further east or west;
- (b) there were adverse visual and air ventilation impacts. The wind corridor should be widened and moved northward to enhance air ventilation and reduce tree felling. A 5m strip of vegetation along Victoria Road should be retained to mitigate air and odour pollution;
- (c) the number of PRH units should be reduced (i.e. to not more than 1,000 units) and smaller unit size should be adopted for smaller

household. Priority should be given to rehouse Sai Wan Estate residents; and

- (d) the western portion of the site should be rezoned to “Green Belt” (“GB”) while the eastern portion be retained as “R(A)”. The stepped BH profile should be altered to allow better air ventilation and avoid blockage of view.

16. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the proposed PRH would help meet the shortfall in housing land supply. The Traffic Review had demonstrated that the overall traffic condition would be acceptable, with the implementation of traffic improvement measures;
- (b) the overall BH profile had taken into account the topography, surrounding developments and possible visual impact. Quantitative AVA would be required at the detailed design stage. Although there was no redevelopment plan of Sai Wan Estate, the Housing Authority could take account of its future redevelopment in the planning and design of the proposed PRH, subject to a comprehensive assessment of the whole development;
- (c) LGV parking spaces was provided to address the district shortfall. The LGV park would only be accessible through Victoria Road; and
- (d) proposals related to the detailed design of PRH and tree preservation could be conveyed to Housing Department for consideration.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Item C2 – Private Housing at Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG)

17. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) there was inadequate open space provision at local and district levels. Retaining CSTG would help mitigate the adverse impact from construction in the surrounding area. CSTG was not replaceable by other open spaces such as the overcrowded Belcher Bay Park. CSTG should be zoned “O” for park use;
- (b) alternative ground decontamination methods had not been explored. The concerns on public health and safety during decontamination had not been addressed satisfactorily. The site was contaminated and was not suitable for residential development. Alternative sites should be considered for residential development;
- (c) social impact assessment should be required to assess the impact on the health and well-being of local residents; and
- (d) the BH of the proposed residential development should be reduced to 100mPD or less, The proposed school under Item D1 should be relocated to the site under Item C2 to reduce the overall development intensity.

18. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) CSTG was a temporary garden with minimal passive facilities. It was highly desirable to conduct ground decontamination for all the sites in one-go within a dense urban area;
- (b) extensive public consultation was conducted for the ground decontamination works. C&WDC generally supported the

decontamination works and requested that decontamination works of ex-Kennedy Town Incinerator Plant and ex-Kennedy Town Abattoir be carried out in one-go. The EIA and supplementary EIA on the decontamination works were approved by the Director of Environmental Protection in 2002 and 2015 respectively. The site was suitable for development after the ground decontamination works;

- (c) the proposals to retain CSTG and to reduce the BH restriction at the site were not supported given the shortfall in housing land supply and the appropriate stepped BH profile; and
- (d) Item D1 was the only suitable site for primary school development to meet the education need. The suggested alternative sites for residential use were not appropriate.

Item C3 – Private Housing

19. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) it was not appropriate to relocate the Arch and Foundation Stone of the Tung Wah Smallpox Hospital at Item C3 to the waterfront park under Item A1;
- (b) the existing bus terminus at the site under Item C3 should be retained as it was more convenient to the public at this location and the PTT be extended to include the public mortuary site;
- (c) the BH restriction for the site should be reduced from 100mPD to 40-60mPD or less. The PTT and underground car park proposed under Item C2 should be relocated to Item C3; and

- (d) the site should not be rezoned to “R(A)” but “G/IC” for a low-rise government complex with PTT and car park.

20. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the Arch and Foundation Stone originally from its former hospital site at Ka Wai Man Road was to be relocated to the future waterfront park for a better preservation setting;
- (b) the existing bus terminus under Item C3 and that at Shing Sai Road would be replaced by the proposed PTT under Item C2. Retaining the open-air bus terminus at Item C3 would undermine the development potential of the proposed residential site. The proposal to relocate the PTT and underground car park to Item C3 was considered not feasible due to the small site area; and
- (c) the proposal not to rezone Item C3 to “R(A)” was not supported in view of the shortfall in housing land supply. Given the stepped BH profile of the area, the BH was considered appropriate.

Item D1 and E – GIC Facilities

21. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) there was no strong justification for a primary school under Item D1 at a prime location. There was also interface problem between the proposed school and the wine-related recreational use at China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited’s (CMG’s) pier under Item B. The proposed school would be surrounded by roads on three sides and would lead to traffic accidents/congestions;

- (b) the school site under Item D1 should be relocated to the PRH site under Item C1 or to other location, thus releasing the site for other value-added/low-density residential development;
- (c) part of the site should be shown as 'Road' for extension of tram services to Sai Ning Street; and
- (d) there was no justification for a public mortuary under Item E.

22. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) Item D1 was the only suitable site for the proposed primary school to meet the education need of the area. The school site was well connected with the surrounding areas and close to the MTR Kennedy Town Station;
- (b) the relocation of the proposed school to the PRH site under Item C1 would reduce the supply of PRH. Extension of tram route to Sai Ning Street would reduce the school site, affect the traffic flow and undermine the effectiveness of road improvement works; and
- (c) the existing Victoria Public Mortuary at Sai Ning Street would be re-provisioned for a continuous waterfront promenade. The public mortuary under Item E would utilise an existing cavern and the adjoining area.

Item F (part) – Road/Junction Improvement Works

23. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) there was no justification to rezone the area for road use; and
- (b) the affected area should be retained as open space to serve the dense population in Kennedy Town.

24. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following response :

- (a) The new access road was essential to relief the critical junction of Cadogan Street and Victoria Road.

Item E (part), J and M – Preservation of Mount Davis

25. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points :

- (a) Mount Davis should be rezoned to “OU” annotated “Nature Park” or be designated as Country Park for preservation;
- (b) a heritage trail linking Kung Man Village, Sai Wan Swimming Shed and Plague Cemetery should be provided; and
- (c) the staircase to youth hostel should be refurbished.

26. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) Mount Davis was generally wooded and largely zoned “GB” with general presumption against development. Designation of Country Park was outside the purview of the Board. The current zoning did not preclude Country Park designation by the relevant authority; and

- (b) 'Nature Trail', 'Picnic Area' and 'Tent Camping Ground' were always permitted within the "GB" zone. There was no strong justification for the "OU" annotated "Nature Park" zone.

Other Proposals

27. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had the following major proposals :

- (a) to develop a community complex and a waterfront promenade at part of the area bounded by Cadogan Street, Victoria Road and Sai Ning Street (Items A1, C2 and F);
- (b) to redevelop Sai Wan Estate;
- (c) to reserve the area to the east of Sai Ning Street (Items A1, C2, D1 and F) for open space/recreational use; and
- (d) to restrict the BH of new developments around CSTG to not more than 30m.

28. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the responses were similar to those outlined above for Items A1, C2, D1 and F.

29. The Chairman then invited Members to express their views, noting that the grouping of issues under the above main aspects served only as a framework for reference to facilitate discussions. Members would be free to raise any issues and aspects as they saw fit.

30. Members generally noted the representers'/commenters' views and the government departments' responses on the general/technical issues mentioned above. As the general/technical issues raised by representers/commenters and the comments on individual items were inter-related, the Chairman suggested and Members agreed that they should be considered in conjunction with the specific amendment items discussed below.

31. The Chairman then invited Members' views on the concerns/proposals raised by the representers/commenters in respect of each amendment item which was the subject of representation/comment. In particular, the Chairman said that most of the representations/comments were on the proposed private residential development at CSTG under Item C2 and suggested that discussion on that item and Item C3 which were inter-related should be conducted last to allow more time for a thorough discussion. Members agreed.

Items A1 to A4 – Waterfront Park/Open Space

32. A Member did not support the relocation of the Arch and Foundation Stone of Tung Wah Smallpox Hospital to the proposed waterfront park under Item A1 as it might give the public a wrong impression that the hospital was originally located at the waterfront. This Member considered retaining the Arch and Foundation Stone at its current location of Item C3 more appropriate. Other Members had no particular views on this aspect but noted that whether or not the Arch and Foundation Stone was to be relocated to the waterfront would not affect the "O" zoning of the waterfront park. After deliberation, Members agreed that the zoning of the sites under Items A1 to A4 was appropriate and no amendment was required.

Item B – Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses

33. Some Members made the following main points :

- (a) The intention to develop commercial, leisure and tourism facilities at the site and better utilization of the pier were supported, which would bring vibrancy to the area. The request of the representer (R144) for

more commercial GFA and relaxation of development restrictions should be dealt with through planning application under s.16 or s.12A of the Ordinance, with the support of relevant technical impact assessments; and

- (b) given the presence of a set of landing steps on the north-eastern end of the site, requirement for the provision of a 12m-wide waterfront promenade as stipulated on the OZP might not be achievable in that location.

34. In respect of the provision of a 12m-wide waterfront promenade, the Secretary said that the requirement on the OZP would not affect the existing landing steps. The OZP only stipulated the width of the waterfront promenade to be provided in the future development but did not prescribe its form and design including level. Minor structures within the 12m-wide promenade could be tolerated as long as the overall width of the promenade could be maintained.

35. Members generally supported the provision of more food & beverage and tourism facilities at the site and considered that the proposal to increase GFA for conversion of the pier should be justified with necessary technical assessments for the Board's consideration through a separate planning application. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to the OZP regarding Item B was necessary.

Item C1 – Public Housing

36. While supporting the “Residential (Group A) 5” (“R(A)5”) zoning for PRH development under Item C1, the Vice-chairman shared the views of some representers that opportunity should be taken to consider Sai Wan Estate redevelopment in tandem so that the affected Sai Wan Estate residents could be rehoused in the proposed PRH development. Members generally concurred with this view and considered that the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) should be requested to explore the opportunity for redevelopment of Sai Wan Estate in conjunction with the PRH development under Item C1. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to the OZP regarding Item C1 was

required and Members' view regarding the redevelopment of Sai Wan Estate should be conveyed to HKHA for consideration.

Item D1 and E – GIC Facilities

37. A Member said that there was no information on the timeframe for the proposed school development under Item D1. While having no objection to the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone under Item D1, the same Member pointed out that the use of the site under Item D1 might need to be revisited if there were changes to the land use arrangement of other sites which might impact on the school use of this site. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to the OZP was required for Item E and that Item D1 would be subject to further deliberation after considering Items C2 and C3.

Item F (part) – Road/Junction Improvement Works

38. The meeting noted that this item mainly involved road and junction improvement works in Kennedy Town area which were necessary to improve the traffic condition along Cadogan Street and Victoria Road to cater for the proposed developments under the RLUP. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to the OZP in respect of Item F was required.

Item E (part), J and M – Preservation of Mount Davis

39. Members noted that the representations/comments on Items E (part), J and M were mainly related to the preservation of Mount Davis area and some representers/commenters proposed to rezone Mount Davis area to “OU” annotated “Nature Park” or to designate the area as a Country Park for preservation. Members were of the general views that the designation of country parks was under the jurisdiction of the Country and Marine Parks Authority and the “GB” zoning of Mount Davis with a general presumption against development was appropriate in the planning context. After deliberation, Members agreed that amendments to the OZP regarding Items E (part), J and M were not necessary.

Other Proposals

40. Members noted that the other proposals made by some of the representers/commenters regarding developing a community complex and waterfront promenade at part of the area bounded by Cadogan Street, Victoria Road and Sai Ning Street, redevelopment of Sai Wan Estate, reserving sites for open space or recreational use to the east of Sai Ning Street and altering the BH restrictions had generally been considered when dealing with the specific amendment items. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to the OZP in response to these proposals were necessary.

Items C2 – Private Housing at Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG)

41. Some Members made the following main points :

- (a) it was noted that the private residential development under Item C2, providing about 600-700 flats, would only be available by 2027/28 taking into account the long lead-time required for the ground decontamination works. In this regard, the proposed housing development at this site might not help address the immediate housing demand but the local residents would suffer from the permanent loss of CSTG without a replacement park in place;
- (b) as the government had confirmed that it was not essential to carry out ground decontamination works at CSTG if the temporary park remained in its status quo and that there would not be any imminent health hazard for the park users, consideration should be given to retain the existing open space use of the site;
- (c) CSTG had been used as an open space for a long time serving the local residents and it should be retained as a breathing space in the densely built-up area of Kennedy Town. Other alternatives to increase housing land supply such as rezoning suitable “GB” sites at

the urban fringe area with less environmental impact should be considered;

- (d) there was inadequate open space provision in Kennedy Town. CSTG could meet the need of the local residents, in particular, the elderly living near CSTG and those in the nearby residential care homes for the elderly (RCHEs);
- (e) CSTG should be retained in its current state with dense vegetation and green lawn even if it was to be kept as a permanent open space. Such type of green park was rare in Hong Kong and valuable to the local residents; and
- (f) while not objecting to the retention of CSTG, the effectiveness of decontamination by tree roots as claimed by some representers was doubtful. As the trees in CSTG were transplanted trees and the roots would normally be trimmed which would unlikely be able to reach 10m deep into the soil. Ground decontamination through phytoremediation would take decades to be effective and there was no record to prove the effectiveness of such ground decontamination method in Hong Kong.

42. There was a consensus amongst Members that CSTG should be retained for open space use and the “R(A)6” zoning of the site should be amended to reflect the intention. With a plan shown on the visualizer, the Secretary explained that the majority of CSTG was zoned “O” on the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/19 with a minor portion zoned “Undetermined” (“U”). Should the Board decide to retain CSTG, the area generally confining to the boundary of the existing CSTG could be rezoned to “O”. This would not affect the proposed new road linking Cadogan Street and Victoria Road as well as the proposed waterfront park. As the remaining part of the “R(A)6” zoning to the west of CSTG (about 2,000m² in site area) was currently occupied by a refuse collection point and a temporary carpark, Members could consider whether this portion should be rezoned to “G/IC” with a BH restriction of 40mPD, which was the same

as the current BH restriction for this portion on the OZP, for future GIC use such as accommodating the RCHE originally proposed on this “R(A)6” site and other community facilities.

43. Members then had a discussion on the rezoning options of the CSTG site and further enhancement of the pedestrian linkage between CSTG and the waterfront. Some Members were of the view that better pedestrian connection between CSTG and the future waterfront park should be considered, e.g. by using a semi-sunken road design and landscaped pedestrian deck over the road. A Member also suggested that the waterfront park should be connected with the planned open space to the east abutting New Praya Kennedy Town and boardwalk on cantilever structure could be explored for such connection.

44. After deliberation, Members agreed to propose amendment by rezoning Item C2 from “R(A)6” to “O” and “G/IC” and retaining the BH restriction of 40mPD for the “G/IC” portion. The Notes and the Explanatory Statement would be revised as appropriate to reflect the proposed amendments.

Item C3 – Private Housing

45. Members generally considered the zoning of the site appropriate to facilitate private housing development. Nonetheless, due to the retention of CSTG, the existing bus terminus on the site could not be reprovisioned to the site under Item C2. Members noted that other reprovisioning arrangement would need to be made by the Government and the planned residential development at the site could only be materialized upon reprovisioning of the existing bus terminus. After deliberation, Members agreed that no amendment to Item C3 was required.

Item D1 – School

46. In considering Items C2 and C3, Members also had a brief discussion on the possibilities of releasing the school site under Item D1 for other alternative uses. The following initial ideas had been raised :

- (a) to combine the new “G/IC” site to the west of CSTG with the “G/IC” site under Item D1 to form a larger residential site for better site utilisation, thus maintaining the private housing supply, and to realign the proposed road linking Cadogan Street and Victoria Road to run between CSTG and the new housing site; and
- (b) to swap the proposed school development under Item D1 with Ka Wai Man Road Garden subject to technical feasibility, and to extend CSTG westward and northward to form a larger open space connecting to the waterfront, on the assumption that the proposed new road was no longer required with the deletion of developments under Items C2 and D1.

47. Members noted that there might be technical difficulties associated with these land use rearrangement which had not been examined in detail. Besides, the proposals would affect other sites not being the subject of the current OZP amendments. In order not to complicate the plan-making process, Members generally agreed that such site swap proposals should not be pursued in the absence of any technical support and public consultation. As planning was an on-going process, PlanD could continue to explore other land use proposals for the area as the ground decontamination works proceeded.

48. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representations No. R1 to R110, R111 (Part) to R142 (Part) and R4096 (Part). The Board also decided to uphold/partially uphold Representations No. R111 (part) to R142 (part), R143, R146 to R4095, R4096 (part), R4097 to R4837, R7613 and R7614 and considered that the Plan should be amended to meet/partially meet the representations as stated in paragraph 44 above. The Chairman said that the amended OZP would be gazetted for further representation for three weeks and the Board would consider the further representations, if any, in accordance with the Ordinance.

49. The Board decided not to uphold Representations No. R144, R145, R4838 to R5008, R5011 to R5081, R5083 to R7198, R7200, R7201, R7203 to R7227, R7229 to

R7303, R7305 to R7329, R7331 to R7340, R7342 to R7367, R7369 to R7388, R7390, R7392 to R7404, R7406 to R7435, R7437 to R7439, R7441 to R7498, R7501 to R7530, R7532 to R7540, R7542 to R7554, R7556 to R7572 and R7574 to R7612 and the reasons were :

- “(a) the amendments to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis OZP No. S/H1/20 are formulated on the basis of the Recommended Land Use Proposal (RLUP) under the Land Use Review for the Western Part of Kennedy Town having regard to relevant planning principles on harbourfront planning, housing land supply, provision of open space and Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, preservation of structures with historic interest and Old and Valuable Trees, technical feasibility, and public views received during the two rounds of consultation on the Land Use Review;
- (b) the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase and expedite housing land supply in the short and medium-term, there is a need to optimise the use of developed areas in the existing urban areas and new towns, as well as the nearby land in the vicinity of existing infrastructures. The western part of Kennedy Town is one of the areas identified for land use review for development among others;
- (c) technical assessments on traffic, air ventilation and visual aspects and an initial tree survey have been conducted to ascertain the technical feasibility of RLUP and no insurmountable technical problems are anticipated from RLUP;
- (d) there would be adequate provision of GIC facilities to cater for the planned population of the area. There would also be new pedestrian facilities to enhance the accessibility of the area including the harbourfront, as well as traffic improvements works to enhance the local traffic conditions;

- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance;

Amendment Item A1

- (f) there would be scope for incorporating various design requirements, including pet garden and more greening in the detailed design of the proposed waterfront park;

Amendment Item B

- (g) the restrictions on gross floor area (GFA) and building height (BH) and the provision of a 12m-wide promenade of the “OU(Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses)” zone are appropriate having regard to its prominent harbourfront location, the existing setting of the site along the coastline and the need to maintain a smooth transition between the two open spaces;
- (h) there is no strong justification for supporting the changes to the Schedule of Uses and the development restrictions under the Notes for the “OU(Commercial, Leisure and Tourism-related)” zone and for relaxing the GFA/BH restrictions of the site (**R144** only);

Amendment Item C1

- (i) further detailed technical assessment will be undertaken at the detailed design stage as appropriate to enhance and optimise the pedestrian wind environment. The provision of public car parking spaces and goods vehicle parking spaces is to address the district shortfall and is acceptable in traffic terms;

Amendment Item D1

- (j) the proposed school is required to meet the education need of the area. With the proposed enhancement of the pedestrian network of the area, the accessibility of the school site from nearby residential development and public transport facilities will be improved;

Amendment Item E

- (k) the site is for the reprovisioning of the Victoria Public Mortuary, which is to facilitate the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade;

Amendment Item F

- (l) the provision of a new access road and other road improvement works are required to support the land use proposals; and

Proposals involving the remaining Amendment Items

- (m) there is no strong justification for the proposals that would either result in reduction of housing land supply or their technical feasibilities have yet to be demonstrated.”

50. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 10:47am.