

**Minutes of 1142<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 2.6.2017**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr K.F. Tang

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr David C.V. Ngu

Assistant Director (Regional 3)

Lands Department

Mr John K.T. Lai

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr K.K. Cheung

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (a.m.)

Ms Sally S.Y. Fong (p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr K.K. Lee (a.m.)

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1141<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on 19.5.2017**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1141<sup>st</sup> meeting held on 19.5.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) Judicial Review against the Decision of the Town Planning Board in respect of the Draft Kwu Tung North Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/KTN/1 and the Draft Fanling North OZP No. S/FLN/1
- 

2. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having involved in the relevant consultancy study, having business dealings and/or affiliations with the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) which was a representer of the two draft OZPs, and/or Henderson Land Development Co. Ltd. (HLD) which subsidiaries were representers of the two draft OZPs:

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	- his company had involved in the submission of proposals for a consultancy study on the Development of Kwu Tung North and Fanling North New Development Areas, Phase 1 – Design and Construction; and having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL, and HLD
---------------------	---

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and HLD
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with MTRCL and HLD and past business dealings with HKHA
- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with HKHA; and being employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] HKHA, MTRCL and The Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd, a subsidiary of HLD
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu ] having past business dealings with HKHA,  
Mr Franklin Yu ] MTRCL and HLD
- Professor S.C. Wong - being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering, HKU which had received sponsorship before from MTRCL for organising some activities; being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy; and being employee of HKU which had received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD

- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA; being a convener of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel; and being employee of HKU which had received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of HKHA  
(as Director of Planning)
- Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being an alternative member for the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA  
(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department but was not involved in planning work
- Professor K.C. Chau - being employee of the Chinese University of Hong Kong which had received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Dr Wilton W.T. Fok - being employee of HKU which had received a donation before from a family member of the Chairman of HLD
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had received sponsorship before from HLD
- Ms Christina M. Lee - being Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Events Association which had received sponsorship before from HLD

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a Member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation before from an Executive Director of HLD

3. As the item was to report the court's judgment on the leave application for the judicial review (JR), the meeting agreed that the interests of the above Members were indirect and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. The meeting also noted that Mr H.F. Leung and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

4. The Secretary reported that the JR application was lodged by a villager of Kwu Tung, Mr Tsang Kwong Kuen (the Applicant), against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) in respect of the draft Kwu Tung North and draft Fanling North OZPs. The Applicant also sought time extension to challenge the decision of the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approving the two OZPs.

5. The leave application was heard by the Court of First Instance (CFI) on 10.6.2016. On 23.5.2017, the CFI handed down the judgment and refused to grant leave to the JR application. The gist of the judgment was as follows:

- (i) the evidence filed by the Board had sufficiently demonstrated that the Board members participated in the deliberation sessions had been adequately apprised or made aware of the contents of the representations;
- (ii) given the above, the Applicant's challenge that the CE in C's decision was tainted as a result of the Board's flawed decision was equally unarguable; and
- (iii) the application for time extension to challenge the CE in C's decision should be refused given the lack of merits in the JR application and the Applicant's delay in making such challenge was not excusable.

6. The meeting noted the CFI's judgment and that no appeal against the CFI's decision had been lodged by the Applicant up to the moment.

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/K2/216

Proposed Commercial Bathhouse/Massage Establishment in “Commercial” Zone,

2/F (Portion) and 3/F (Portion), Medilink Square, Bell House,

525-543A Nathan Road, Yau Ma Tei, Kowloon

(TPB Paper No. 10284)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

7. The Secretary reported that Ms Christina M. Lee had declared an interest in the item as she was director of a company which owned properties at 574-576 Nathan Road, Mong Kok.

8. As the properties of Ms Christina M. Lee’s company were near the application premises, the meeting agreed that Ms Lee should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item.

[Ms Christina M. Lee left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

9. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), the applicant and his representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK), PlanD

Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen - Senior Town Planner/Yau Tsim Mong (STP/YTM), PlanD



Mr Ching Lung - Applicant

Mr Chung Kun Kin ] Applicant's representatives

Mr Ching Fai ]

Ms Wong Hung Ying ]

10. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the review application.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Michelle M.S. Yuen, STP/YTM, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) and the MPC's decision of approving the application on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years, the applicant's proposal, public comments and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10284.

12. The Chairman then invited the applicant to elaborate on the review application.

13. Referring to the information in the website of his company as shown on the computer screen and the documents shown on the visualizer, Mr Ching Lung, the applicant, made the following main points:

- (a) his company, Windsor Spa, had been operating for more than 20 years in North Point and had never received any complaint or been charged for misconduct over the years. They provided a wide range of massage, spa and beauty services for both men and women;
- (b) in 2016, when their new spa centre was opened in Hung Hom, they organised a charity activity to raise fund for the schools in the remote mountainous areas of the Mainland, which had been reported in the media;
- (c) the operation of their proposed spa centre in Yau Ma Tei required a massage establishments licence from the Police. In processing the licence application, other government departments, including the

Buildings Department, the Fire Services Department, the Home Affairs Department and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department, would be required to provide comments on their proposal. According to the guidelines issued by the Police Licensing Office, a total of 212 working days would be required for processing a massage establishments licence application. Besides, given the large floor area involved, an additional period of about 6 months would be required for renovation works at the application premises. The proposed spa centre would provide employment opportunities for about 150 people, and the total investment would be about \$30 million. They had already reached a 10-year tenancy agreement running from April 2017 to March 2027 with the landlord. If the planning permission would only last for five years, they would only have about four years to operate the spa centre, which might be too short for them to cover their investment; and

- (d) the public and the local residents might have some misunderstanding on the operation of their spa centre, thinking that it was related to disgraceful and immoral activities. It should be noted that their operation was monitored by the Police as they needed to renew their massage establishments licence with the Police every year. They had not been charged by the Police for any offence in the operation of their two spa centres in North Point and Hung Hom over the years.

14. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the applicant were completed, the Vice-chairman invited questions from Members.

15. Some Members asked the applicant the following questions:

*Tenancy Agreement*

- (a) whether the tenancy agreement could be terminated under certain circumstances, e.g. planning permission was not granted by the Board or massage establishments licence was not issued by the Police;

- (b) why he or his company would still enter into a 10-year tenancy agreement with the landlord commencing from April 2017 when he should have already known in February 2017 that the planning permission granted by the Board was only on a temporary basis of 5 years;

*Licensing and Renovation Time*

- (c) whether the massage establishments licence application would be processed by different government departments concurrently or the renovation works of the premises could be carried out during the licence application period so that the estimated one-year period for licence application and renovation could be shortened;

*Approval Period*

- (d) noting that he considered that the approval period of 5 years was too short, the duration of approval period for the application he would consider acceptable;

*Local Objection*

- (e) noting that the Incorporated Owners (IO) of the subject building had raised strong objection to the operation of the proposed use in the building, whether he or his company had had any communications with the IO to ease their worries;
- (f) noting his view that the residents might have misunderstood the operation of their spa centre, what the residents' major misunderstandings were on their operation;
- (g) whether the operations of their two existing spa centres at North Point and Hung Hom were objected to by the other users of the buildings, and whether they had encountered similar objections when they submitted planning applications, if any, for those centres; and

*Benefits to the Community*

- (h) besides providing employment opportunities, what other benefits the proposed spa centre could bring to the community.

16. In response, Mr Ching Lung, the applicant, made the following main points:

*Tenancy Agreement*

- (a) the landlord had agreed that if they could not obtain planning permission from the Board for the proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment use at the premises, the tenancy agreement could be terminated. Otherwise, they needed to rent the premises for the whole tenancy term. As planning permission had now been granted by the Board, albeit for only 5 years, they would fulfil the tenancy till the end of the 10-year term, and an application for renewal of the planning permission upon expiry of the 5-year period would be required;

*Licensing and Renovation Time*

- (b) generally speaking, an investor would only commence the renovation works for a business premises once he had obtained the initial approval of the Government for his business. Otherwise, he had to bear the risk of not getting government approval in the end. Their proposed spa centre would involve construction of bathing pools with water-proofing works, which would require a substantial investment;
- (c) considering the need to have several rounds of correspondence exchange with the concerned government departments on their massage establishments licence application and that the government departments would not expedite the procedures for their application, the overall processing time of 212 working days was a prudent estimate;

*Approval Period*

- (d) he was aware that the MPC's granting of the planning permission on a temporary basis of 5 years was intended to monitor the operation of their applied use. However, as their tenancy agreement for the premises was for a term of 10 years, he would like to seek the Board's planning permission for a period of 10 years to tie in with the tenancy term;

*Local Objection*

- (e) there were a number of residential units on the upper floors of the subject building. He understood that the residents of the subject building might have misunderstanding on the nature of their business. However, as he was not the owner of the premises, he was not in a position to attend the meetings of the IO to discuss the issues of concern with the residents direct. He knew that the landlord had had some dialogues with the IO but it was difficult to get full understanding and acceptance of the IO on their proposed use. Their communication with the owners was mainly through the management office. They were willing to communicate with the IO and the residents to see if there were anything they could do during the renovation and operation stages to address their concerns;
- (f) some of the residents might worry that the proposed spa centre was a vice establishment involving in illegal and immoral activities, and it would set an undesirable image to the neighbourhood. However, their operation would not involve in any vice activities. Some residents had also raised concerns on fire risk and environmental pollution, but such concerns should not be unique to their use;
- (g) the premises of their spa centre in North Point was self-owned, while that in Hung Hom was leased. The two floors of their centre in North Point were granted with planning permissions by the Board in 1997 and 2002 respectively on a permanent basis, while their centre in Hung Hom did not require planning permission. Unlike the proposed centre in Yau Ma Tei

which was located on the lower floors of a commercial/residential building, their centres in North Point and Hung Hom were within commercial buildings and there was no complaint from the occupants of the two buildings on their operations; and

*Benefits to the Community*

- (h) the proposed spa centre would provide employment opportunities for about 150 staff members. The centre would provide a wide range of services and facilities for its customers, such as body massage, foot massage, spa, beauty treatment, Jacuzzi and rest rooms, and the male and female customers would be served in separate premises. The centre, operating from 11:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m., would be a decent leisure and resting place for the local people and tourists.

17. Some Members asked DPO/TWK the following questions:

- (a) whether the Board could approve a planning application on a temporary basis if the applicant was seeking planning permission on a permanent basis;
- (b) for those commercial bathhouses/massage establishments which were approved by the Board on a temporary basis, whether complaints had been received during their operation periods;
- (c) when the 5-year approval period of the subject application would commence, and whether the applicant could apply for renewal of the planning permission upon expiry of the 5-year approval period; and
- (d) whether the Board could grant planning permission on a temporary basis for a longer period, e.g. 10 years.

18. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, made the following main points:

- (a) the Board might grant planning permission to an application on a temporary basis if it considered appropriate, notwithstanding the applicant was seeking planning permission on a permanent basis. There were 13 similar applications for commercial bathhouse and/or massage establishment in different districts of Hong Kong which were approved by the Board on a temporary basis before;
- (b) there was no record of complaint for those commercial bathhouses/massage establishments which were approved by the Board on a temporary basis;
- (c) the validity of the subject planning permission commenced on 17.2.2017, i.e. the approval date of the planning application by the MPC, for a period of 5 years until 17.2.2022. The applicant could apply for renewal of the planning approval, which could be submitted about 2 to 4 months before the expiry of the 5-year temporary approval period; and
- (d) the Board might grant planning approval on a temporary basis for a period of 10 years, though the Board might not have done so before.

19. As Members had no further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures for the review application were completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant and his representatives and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD, the applicant and his representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

20. Members generally considered that the decision of MPC at the s.16 stage to grant planning permission on a temporary basis for a period of 5 years was appropriate in order to monitor the operation of proposed commercial bathhouse and massage establishment which was located within an existing commercial/residential building. The granting of a longer approval period exceeding 5 years might defeat the intention of monitoring the possible

nuisance of the proposed development to the occupants of the subject building. While the applicant indicated that he had entered into a 10-year tenancy agreement with the landlord and wished to be granted with a 10-year approval period in order to recover his substantial business investment, such a justification could not outweigh the need for monitoring the operation of his business within the building in order to address the concerns of other occupants. Before expiry of the temporary approval, the applicant could submit an application for renewal of the planning approval.

21. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for a permanent planning approval on review and maintain the MPC's decision of granting a temporary planning permission for 5 years until 17.2.2022 subject to the same approval conditions in paragraph 1.2 of the Paper for the following reason:

“the proposed development may cause nuisance to the occupants of the subject commercial/residential building, and temporary permission is appropriate in order to closely monitor the operation of the proposed use under application.”

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting, Mr Franklin Yu arrived and Ms Christina M. Lee returned to join the meeting at this point.]



**Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of  
Draft Urban Renewal Authority Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street  
Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA2/1  
(TPB Paper No. 10285)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

22. The Secretary reported that the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was located in Hung Hom and submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) which was also a commenter (C1). MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Ramboll Environ Hong Kong Limited (Environ) were the consultants of URA. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings/affiliations with URA or its consultants, or owning properties in the area:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee<br>(as Director of Planning) | - | being a non-executive director of URA, and a member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA  |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon                            | - | being a non-executive director of URA, a member of the Lands, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee, and a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA |
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang                            | - | being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA  |
| Mr Philip S.L. Kan                               | ] | being a director of the Board of the Urban  |
| Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung                              | ] | Renewal Fund of URA   |

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with URA and MVA
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with MVA and Environ
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA and MVA
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with Environ
- Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] URA
- Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being a past member of Wan Chai District Advisory Committee of URA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with URA
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MVA
- Dr F.C. Chan - owning a flat at Laguna Verde, Hung Hom
- Ms Christina M. Lee - co-owning a flat with spouse at Oi King Street, Hung Hom

23. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

24. As the interests of Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang and Patrick H.T. Lau were direct, the meeting agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for this item.

25. As Messrs Philip S.L. Kan, Wilson Y.W. Fung and Ivan C.S. Fu and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had no involvement in the subject development scheme (DS), the meeting agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. As the properties of Dr F.C. Chan and Ms Christina M. Lee have no direct view to the DS site, and the interests of Messrs Stephen H.B Yau, Stephen L.H. Liu and Franklin Yu were indirect, the meeting agreed that they should also be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang and Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

26. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, the Town Planning Board (the Board) should proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

27. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD), representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### *PlanD's representatives*

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 2 (STP/K2)

##### *Representers, commenters and their representatives*

R8 – 周小姐

R16 – 成惠湘

R21 – 陳瑋然

R35 – 吳煒彬

R36 – 陳楚思

R41 – Asmiley

R58 – 鄧滿蘭

R67 – 廖小姐

R71 – 羅浩豪

R89 – 許謹穎

R95 – 黎文浩

R98 – Vycky Ho Wing Yin

R110 – 梁敬生

Ms Hui Kun Wing Helen ] Representers and  
Mr Leung King Sang ] Representers' representatives

土家 –

Ms Tjhan Pauline Jessica Hillary ]

Ms Chan Chor See ]

土家/維修香港 –

Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham ]

Mr Ng Wai Pan ]

R49 – 洪蘭芬

落土 – Mr Lee Tin Yau - Representer's representative

R111 – 彭美芳及林傲俊

Mr Lam Ngo Chun - Representer

R113 – 曾志昌

Mr Tsang Chi Cheong - Representer

C1 – URA

Mr Mike Kwan ] Commenter's representatives

Mr Matthew Law ]

C11 – 武文鋒

Mr Mo Man Fung - Commenter

C12 – Chan Chun Hei

Mr Chan Chun Hei

- Commenter

28. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to PlanD's representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting; and the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

29. The Chairman then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

30. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, informed the meeting that a replacement page (p.13) of TPB Paper No. 10285 (the Paper) had been sent to Members before the meeting and was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yip briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the preparation of the draft URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1, the URA projects in the area, the redesigned local transport and road network, the views and proposals of the representations and comments, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments, as detailed in the Paper.

31. The Chairman then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

32. Mses Tjhan Pauline Jessica Hillary, Hui Kun Wing Helen and Chan Chor See, and Messrs Lai Ka Chun Abraham, Ng Wai Pan and Leung King Sang, representing R8, R16, R21, R35, R36, R41, R58, R67, R71, R89, R95, R98 and R110, requested to make their oral submissions in a preset sequence after other representers. As no objection to the proposed arrangement was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to their request.

R49 – 洪蘭芬

33. Mr Lee Tin Yau made the following main points:

- (a) he was a preacher of a Christian church in To Kwa Wan. About half a year ago, he and the followers of other churches in To Kwa Wan formed a group called 「落土重建關注組」 with the aim of arousing the local churches' concerns on the urban renewal issues;
- (b) there were about 19 churches located in different parts of To Kwa Wan. Many local residents participated in the church activities. They noticed that the life of the residents was affected by the urban renewal projects implemented by URA in the area. Some residents were concerned about how the local traffic conditions could be improved and how the new infrastructure provision could enhance their life. They were also concerned about the rehousing arrangements and the proposed development options;
- (c) he would like to know from URA what the 'district-based planning approach' that they advocated was about. To his understanding, the 'district-based planning approach' should embrace social development, community engagement, preservation and reinforcement of the local economy and control of the impact of external capitals on the local economy. He wondered if URA's approach was similar to his cognition of the concept;
- (d) To Kwa Wan was lacking of picking-up and dropping-off spaces for coaches. The on-street picking-up and dropping-off activities of coaches

in certain locations, such as the areas around Chatham Gate and Sung Kit Street, had caused disturbances to the district. While the proposed underground car park within the DSP would provide some parking spaces for coaches, he wondered if URA had thought of other measures to address the problem caused by coaches;

- (e) the capacity of the existing pavements in the district was only adequate to serve the local population. However, the tourists of the tour groups always gathered on the pavements for long time, affecting the use of the pavements by the local residents. He wondered if the redevelopment projects implemented by URA could help improve such a situation; and
- (f) URA should engage the local people in the planning of the district. In the implementation of an urban renewal project in the United Kingdom in 2008, the local population including the ethnic minorities had participated in the planning process. They created an area characterised by the culture of the South Asian people, which had become a very popular tourist spot. Hung Fook Street in To Kwa Wan also had the potential to be developed into a specialty street as it had already established a sense of cohesion for different ethnic groups over the past few years. A marketplace would be opened on the street in the last Sunday of every month, and the local people had also been active in promoting the characteristics of the street by organising guided tours and other activities. He hoped that URA could preserve the characteristics of Hung Fook Street and help revitalise the local economy.

R111 – 彭美芳及林傲俊

34. Mr Lam Ngo Chun made the following main points:

- (a) he was a master's degree student at the Department of Social Work and Social Administration of the University of Hong Kong;

*Affected Business Operations*

- (b) he and his classmates had worked as social worker interns in the redevelopment area of URA around Ngan Hon Street, Hung Fook Street, Kai Ming Street and Wing Kwong Street (i.e. URA Project Code KC-010, KC-011 and KC-012) from September 2016 to April 2017, focusing on the rights of the car repair workshops and small local shops that were affected by the urban renewal projects. They had interviewed the operators of the car repair workshops and small local shops in the area and listened to their concerns and worries about the urban renewal projects;
- (c) there were a number of discrepancies in the social impact assessment (SIA) conducted by URA for the area. URA only based on some figures to quantify the needs of the business operators but lacked any qualitative assessment on the actual business environment of the area. The SIA had only examined the general needs of the car repair workshops and small local shops collectively without analysing the impacts of urban renewal on individual trades. There was no study in the SIA on the co-relation among street design, building design and the operation of the ground floor shops. The findings of the SIA that the business operators in the area could easily re-establish their businesses in other districts was not correct. Although the SIA report also mentioned that URA would provide assistance in identifying suitable replacement premises for the affected businesses, nothing had been done by URA so far;
- (d) their opinion survey had interviewed the operators of 65 ground floor shops at Ngan Hon Street, Hung Fook Street, Kai Ming Street and Wing Kwong Street, 30 of which were car repair workshops (generally of 1,000 sq. ft. in size) and 35 were small local shops (generally of 500 to 1,000 sq. ft. in size). The interviewees (aged from 26 to 70) had been asked to respond to 19 questions about their past, present and future views on their businesses. The survey results revealed that 80% of the business operators were tenants, 70% were single operators without any employees, 86% of the local shops wished to continue their business after the



commencement of the redevelopment projects and more than 70% of them hoped that their businesses could continue for 20 more years, 85% of them considered that URA should assist them on relocation in addition to cash compensation, and most of the operators were the main or entire support for their family incomes. Many of the shops had been operating in the area for over 20 years but the operators had still not reached their retirement age. The commencement of the redevelopment projects without any reprovisioning arrangements had affected the future plan and livelihood of the operators and their families;

- (e) similarly, more than half of the car repair workshops had been operating in the area for over 16 years. As most of the operators/mechanics were still at their middle age and they had no other skills, the closure of the car repair workshops as a result of the redevelopment projects would very likely make them jobless. On the other hand, the car repair workshops in the area had provided opportunities for the apprentice mechanics to learn their skills and pursue their career as proprietors. The redevelopment projects would take away the opportunities for the young people;
- (f) while URA thought that the affected business operators could easily re-establish their businesses elsewhere, that was not agreed by the operators as they would need to bear much higher rents in other districts. The small local shops had played an important role in providing the daily necessities for the area and facilitating the maintenance of a harmonious neighbourhood relationship. If they were forced to move to other districts, their network of customers would be lost. That was unjust to the operators who had been working hard and making great contributions to the neighbourhood. The car repair workshops and other small workshops, which were currently operating in relatively large premises with low rents in the area, were particularly difficult to be relocated to other districts due to the lack of suitable premises in the urban area and the high rental level;
- (g) the operators of 89 car repair workshops and small local shops in the area

had jointly written to URA three times to seek dialogue with URA on the compensation and reprovisioning arrangements. However, URA had never made any response to the operators' request. Meanwhile, the tenant operators were facing drastic increase in rents or shortening of lease terms of their shops by the landlords after the announcement of the redevelopment projects;

- (h) it was noted that the Government was handling the issue of brownfield sites in the New Territories and exploring the feasibility of releasing the sites for development. It might be a good opportunity for the Government to explore at the same time how the operation of the car repair workshops in the urban area could be sustained as the car repair workshops provided the needed services to car owners and were an important sector of the economy. There were over 300 car repair workshops affected by URA's redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan. The Government or URA could study the feasibility of relocating the affected car repair workshops to purpose-designed multi-storey buildings through pilot schemes. Of the car repair workshop operators in the area interviewed, 70% were willing to move their workshops to multi-storey buildings and 50% were willing to move to the spaces underneath flyovers if the Government or URA could make arrangements for them, and
- (i) a video was played to show the stories of several car repair workshop operators affected by the redevelopment projects in the area and their views on the difficulties of relocating their workshops to other areas.

R113 – 曾志昌

35. Mr Tsang Chi Cheong said that he had been running a small repair shop for electric appliances and plumbing in the DS site for over 30 years. While his shop was included in the DSP for redevelopment, URA had not proposed any reprovisioning arrangement for him nor talked to him since the initial freezing survey. Due to the high property price, it was very difficult for him to find another suitable premises to re-open his shop elsewhere. He was worried about his future, and hoped the Board could take care of

the relocation arrangement for the small shops affected by the URA projects.

R8 – 周小姐

R16 – 成惠湘

R21 – 陳瑋然

R35 – 吳煒彬

R36 – 陳楚思

R41 – Asmiley

R58 – 鄧滿蘭

R67 – 廖小姐

R71 – 羅浩豪

R89 – 許謹穎

R95 – 黎文浩

R98 – Vycky Ho Wing Yin

R110 – 梁敬生

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham made the following main points:

- (a) he was representing the House of To Kwa Wan Stories;

*Road and Transport Facilities*

- (b) URA proposed to provide 274 car parking spaces in the communal car park within the DSP and a new through road running north-south direction connecting Ngan Hon Street and Wan On Street as part of an improvement scheme to ease road traffic in the area. However, the local roads in the area, including Ma Tau Wai Road and To Kwa Wan Road, were already very congested at the moment. The bringing in of more vehicles to the area was against the Government's policy on promoting walkability and reducing car usage. It was noted from the traffic impact assessment (TIA) conducted by URA that the provision of the new through road would only improve the performance of the road junction at Ma Tau Wai Road/Bailey

Street and there was no significant difference in the performance of other road junctions. The needs for the proposed number of car parking spaces and the proposed through road were hence questionable;

- (c) while four coach parking spaces were proposed to be provided within the DSP, the TIA report had not elaborated the provision standard or requirement for such spaces. Tourist coaches had been causing traffic problems in To Kwa Wan for years, particularly in the areas around Yuk Yat Street and Sung On Street. As such, the Kowloon City District Council had formed a “Working Group on Concern about the Problems Caused by Coaches in the District” to look into the problem. The provision of four coach parking spaces in the DSP would inevitably bring in more visitors to the local area, thereby overloading the surrounding pavements. To address the coach parking problem of the district, the Transport Department had recently proposed to provide a total of 70 coach parking spaces at two temporary coach parks at Wa Shun Street and Bailey Street. In the circumstances, URA should review if there was still a need to provide four coach parking spaces in the DSP; and

*Air Ventilation*

- (d) while no air ventilation assessment (AVA) had been conducted by URA for the DSP, PlanD had conducted an AVA in the course of amending the Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan. As the area around URA’s projects KC-010 to KC-013 was close to the sea, URA should consider reducing the building heights of those projects to enhance air ventilation in the inland area. The Board might also require URA to specifically conduct an AVA to assess the ventilation impact of its redevelopment projects on the area.

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tjhan Pauline Jessica Hillary made the following main points:

*Holistic Planning Approach*

- (a) URA should adopt a holistic planning approach in the planning and implementation of its redevelopment projects in the area. URA's projects KC-010 to KC-013 located at Ngan Hon Street, Hung Fook Street and Wing Kwong Street were adjoining each other but they were split into different piecemeal projects for implementation. It was also strange that the much older tenement buildings to the east of Wing Kwong Street were not included in URA's DS boundaries;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left the meeting at this point.]

- (b) URA's redevelopment projects were not only affecting the residents and businesses within the DS boundaries but also those in the immediate surroundings outside the boundaries. However, the planning by URA seemed to have neglected the impacts of its projects on the surrounding people, which was against the holistic and people-oriented planning principles. While the Government was advocating a liveable city concept in the Hong Kong 2030+ planning study, such a concept was not materialised in the redevelopment of To Kwa Wan. Without holistic planning, it was difficult to formulate the required transport, community, social welfare and leisure facilities for the area. Moreover, if there was no effective long-term planning control on the redevelopment projects, the projects could easily deviate from the original plan during the course of implementation; and
- (c) redevelopment was affecting the life of everyone in the area and should not be regarded only as a replacement of the physical building fabric. To Kwa Wan was a lively community with strong ties for people from different walks of life. If the redevelopment projects would only result in the construction of some high-end modern residential blocks, the original residents and business operators who could not afford the high price of the new housing and shops would be evicted from the area and the community ties would be lost, and so was people's memory of the old district. She

hoped the Board could take into account the social needs of the community when considering URA's redevelopment projects.

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Hui Kun Wing Helen made the following main points:

*Affected Residents and Business Operators*

- (a) an audio recording was played to show the views of a local resident, Mr Lui, on the redevelopment of the area and the difficulty of renting a residence in the area due to the rising rental level. Mr Lui hoped the Board could help the residents to meet their housing needs;
- (b) although URA said that the redevelopment planning for the area would be a public participatory process involving the local people, it was indeed a top-down planning process aimed at pursuing property development for profit-making. It was anticipated that the redevelopment projects would eventually become high-end residential units and modern shopping centres which could not be afforded by the current residents and business operators; and
- (c) she and her colleagues had talked to many local residents and business operators to listen to their needs and their views on how to improve the area. The collaboration of the local people and professionals was important for the planning of a decent area which could meet the needs of people.

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Wai Pan made the following main points:

*Rehousing of Affected Residents*

- (a) an audio recording was played to show the views of a ground floor shop owner, Mr Ying, on the need to have local re-housing arrangement for

people affected by redevelopment project;

- (b) many redevelopment projects were carrying out in To Kwa Wan at the moment and many residents were affected. While some residents might be eligible to be rehoused to public housing units, others were not. People who were not eligible for public housing might only rent another residence in the old tenement buildings in the area but their new homes were still not secure as they might soon be included in redevelopment projects again;
- (c) although URA emphasized that urban renewal was to improve the living conditions of residents in the old districts, the existing residents would unlikely be able to afford the new housing units and car parking spaces in the same district after redevelopment. That manifested the deficiencies of URA's current policy on compensation and rehousing. It was important for the existing residents to be properly rehoused before the redevelopment projects took place. URA should make reference to previous experience of the Land Development Corporation in rehousing the people affected by the redevelopment project of Prosperous Garden in Yau Ma Tei to the mixed rental and subsidised sale housing units within the same site, and the Hong Kong Housing Society's recent proposal in rehousing the people affected by the Northwest New Territories New Development Area developments to similar mixed housing blocks; and
- (d) URA should earnestly listen to the views of the existing residents to understand their needs, and should consider developing some affordable housing for the existing residents, rather than building the high-end housing units for speculation by people. The new housing units should also cater for the needs of the minorities including the elderly and the disabled.

[Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Chor See made the following main points:

*Housing Type*

- (a) it was noted from the Paper that URA had made a response to the representations stating that according to the current government policies, URA could only redevelop commercial/residential development for sale in the private market. However, there were several redevelopment projects implemented by URA which were wholly for commercial uses rather than commercial/residential uses, including the Langham Place project in Mong Kok, the K11 project in Tsim Sha Tsui and a proposed hotel development at Anchor Street/Fuk Tsun Street, Tai Kok Tsui. If URA would redevelop the original residential sites for commercial development, she wondered how the local people's living conditions could be improved;
- (b) in the 2015 Policy Address, the Government stated that it would actively explore ways to increase the supply of subsidised sale flats by engaging the public or non-profit-making organisations, including URA and others, for providing more property choices and home ownership opportunities for the low and middle-income families. That showed the Government had expected URA to help provide subsidised sale flats to the market. In fact, the development of De Novo in Kai Tak was a subsidised sale flat project of URA, and the Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street project had also been planned for providing subsidised flats despite the proposal was eventually dropped. The ex-Chairman of URA had also proposed in 2012 to transfer the land resumed by URA in the old urban areas to the Hong Kong Housing Authority for public housing development;
- (c) URA was operated under the provisions of the URA Ordinance and the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS). URS was a government strategy to be implemented by URA as well as relevant government departments and other stakeholders. However, there was no stipulation in URS that URA could only redevelop commercial/residential development for sale in the



private market. One of the main objectives of urban renewal as stated in URS was to provide purpose-built housing for groups with special needs, such as the elderly and the disabled. In a meeting of the Tonkin Street and Castle Peak Road Redevelopment Concern Group with URA held in March 2017, the representative of URA told the Concern Group that it was possible for URA to develop rehousing flats for the affected residents. URA was requested to clarify its stance in that regard;

- (d) PlanD's response to the representations in the Paper also stated that for housing type, there was no restriction under the DSP regarding the type of housing (public, private or subsidized) to be developed. If the objective of URA's redevelopment project was to address the housing need of people but not their investment or speculation need, the Board should specify in the DSP that URA should provide mixed housing on the site which would cater for the rehousing needs of the affected residents. There were also some overseas examples on mixed housing, e.g. the intergenerational housing for the elderly and the youth in the Netherlands, and the "80/20" apartments in New York where about 80% of the residential units would be sold at market value and 20% would be subsidised sale flats for the low and middle-income families;

#### *Ethnic Minorities*

- (e) 32 households or about 15% of the residents in the subject DS site were ethnic minorities mainly of the South Asian origins, and there were a total of 182 ethnic minority households in the redevelopment area covering projects KC-009 to KC-013. The ethnic minority group was concerned about not only the compensation and rehousing arrangements but also how the sites would be redeveloped;

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left the meeting at this point.]

- (f) a video and an audio recording were played to show the lives of two ethnic minority people, Mr K Singh and Ms Asfa Kabir, in the area and their

views on the redevelopment projects and living in To Kwa Wan, as well as the views of Mr Hendrik Tieben, associate professor at the School of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, on the opportunities that To Kwa Wan could provide to the ethnic minorities;

- (g) To Kwa Wan was a very important place for the ethnic minority community as they had strong social networks there. However, the ethnic minorities were the most vulnerable group in the face of urban renewal. The Board should consider the special needs of the ethnic minorities in the planning of social welfare and recreational facilities for them, such as the provision of cricket field.

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Wai Pan made the following main points:

*Provision of Community Facilities*

- (a) at the meeting of the Board held on 7.10.2016, there was a request from a Member for providing some social welfare facilities, such as an integrated family service centre, in the DSP. The representative of URA however responded that some sensitive community facilities would require agreement from the District Council before they could be included in the URA projects. Under the current planning, only a neighbourhood elderly centre would be provided in the nearby URA site at Kai Ming Street. However, he noticed that the area was also lacking facilities for children. The House of To Kwa Wan Stories at Hung Fook Street was a very popular recreational venue visited by the children living nearby every day. He queried whether URA had adopted the appropriate methodology in the planning of various community facilities for the area;

*Impact of Parking Spaces*

- (b) the provision of car and coach parking spaces in the DSP would not serve the needs of the existing residents in general. It would only induce more vehicles to the area and affect the safety of children who used to play on the streets and the open grounds. The planning of facilities in the area should duly consider the habits and actual needs of the local residents;
- (c) an audio recording was played to show the views of two teenagers, Ms Ng and Ms Chow, on the facilities, such as provision stores and public housing, that they wished to be provided in the area and their objection to provide car and coach parking spaces in the DSP;

*Public Open Space*

- (d) according to URA, a public open space would be provided in its Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street redevelopment site. However, as the proposed public open space would be provided within a private development, he wondered whether the property owners would put any barrier to impede the use of the space by the public. In the Kerry Hotel Hong Kong in Hung Hom Bay and The Avenue development in Wan Chai, the public was discouraged to use the public open spaces provided within the sites as they were either fenced off by the property owner or designed with an inconvenient access. URA should engage the local people in the planning of public open space to cater for the users' needs; and

*Preservation of Eiver House*

- (e) in view of the unique built form of Eiver House at junction of Kai Ming Street and Wing Kwong Street, he wished the building could be preserved and revitalised by URA to serve as a landmark for the area and showcase the lifestyle of the existing residents.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting at this point.]

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung King Sang made the following main points:

- (a) while the main function of the Board in promoting the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community through the systematic preparation of plans should be appreciated by the public, he noted that the current proposals of the DSP were in effect evicting the existing residents from the area and paving the way for speculation of the new housing units by the future property buyers;

*Engaging Local People*

- (b) there were many spaces with unique characteristics in To Kwa Wan, which would be lost as a result of redevelopment. Most of the existing residents in the area did not have cars, and therefore the provision of car parking spaces in the future development was not to meet their needs. URA should adopt the “people first, district-based, public participatory” in urban renewal as stated in URS. The planning process should be a bottom-up process respecting the needs of the existing residents. If future development could not serve the needs of the local people, the plan should be shelved and redone;
- (c) he did not agree with DPO/K that the issues of compensation and rehousing were not within the purview of the Board. It was wrong to assume that after making compensation and rehousing arrangements for the existing residents, the existing residents should be disassociated from the future development of the site and their views and needs would no longer be important;

*Designation of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”)*

- (d) URA’s redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan covered a large area. The Board should consider incorporating all the redevelopment sites into a single “CDA” for proper planning control and monitoring;

*Preserving Social Network*

- (e) to pursue democratic planning, it was important for the existing owner residents to be compensated with a new flat, the existing tenant residents to be allowed to rent a new flat, and the existing business operators to be provided with new premises to continue their businesses on the site after completion of the redevelopment project. Only in such a way could the original social network of the area be preserved;
- (f) an audio recording was played to show the views of an old resident, Mr Chan, on the need for providing affordable housing in the redevelopment project;
- (g) there were a lot of authentic shops in To Kwa Wan that reflected its local character. The local shops should be retained and not to be replaced by typical modern shopping centre with the same chain stores. It would be a failure in planning if urban renewal was only a process of replicating the same type of development and leading to loss of local character;
- (h) an audio recording was played to show the wish of a resident, Ah Ming, on retaining the existing social network of the area and to be rehoused locally upon redevelopment; and
- (i) while the SIA conducted by URA revealed that more than half (around 50% to 70%) of the households surveyed considered that the redevelopment would not affect the social network, such figure could not reflect the actual social impact. Some venues of the area, such as the House of To Kwa Wan Stories, the open ground at Hung Fook Street and the street marketplace, were important meeting and social gathering spaces of the local people. The retention of such spaces would help the maintenance of the social network for the local people and the ethnic minorities as well as the future residents of the middle class. However, URA indicated that the open ground at Hung Fook Street was part of an emergency vehicular access for fire engines and could not be designated as

open space. He urged the Board to examine how the social function of the Hung Fook Street open ground could be sustained. On the contrary, the provision of private clubhouse facilities in the podium of the future development would only discourage the new residents from interacting with the existing residents in the area.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:45 p.m.]

[Professor K.C. Chau, Ms Christina M. Lee, Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

43. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m.

44. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session.

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr K.F. Tang

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)  
Transport Department  
Mr David C.V. Ngu

Assistant Director (Regional 3)  
Lands Department  
Mr John K.T. Lai

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

#### **Agenda Item 4**

##### Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

45. The following PlanD's representatives, the representers/commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### *PlanD's representatives*

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon 2 (STP/K2)

##### *Representers, commenters and their representatives*

R8 – 周小姐

R16 – 成惠湘

R21 – 陳瑋然

R35 – 吳煒彬

R36 – 陳楚思

R41 – Asmiley

R58 – 鄧滿蘭

R67 – 廖小姐

R71 – 羅浩豪

R89 – 許謹穎

R95 – 黎文浩

R98 – Vycky Ho Wing Yin

R110 – 梁敬生

Ms Hui Kun Wing Helen	] Representers and
Mr Leung King Sang	] Representers' representatives
土家 –	]
Ms Tjhan Pauline Jessica Hillary	]
Ms Chan Chor See	]
土家/維修香港 –	]
Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham	]
Mr Ng Wai Pan	]

R111 – 彭美芳及林傲俊

Mr Lam Ngo Chun - Representer

C1 – URA

Mr Mike Kwan	] Commenter's representatives
Mr Matthew Law	]

C11 – 武文鋒

Mr Mo Man Fung - Commenter

C12 – Chan Chun Hei

Mr Chan Chun Hei - Commenter

46. The Chairman extended a welcome to the PlanD's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. He then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.



R8 – 周小姐

R16 – 成惠湘

R21 – 陳瑋然

R35 – 吳煒彬

R36 – 陳楚思

R41 – Asmiley

R58 – 鄧滿蘭

R67 – 廖小姐

R71 – 羅浩豪

R89 – 許謹穎

R95 – 黎文浩

R98 – Vycky Ho Wing Yin

R110 – 梁敬生

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Hui Kun Wing Helen made the following main points:

- (a) with reference to the comments of the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) on the representations at Annex V of the Paper, it was stated that after considering the operational need of individual shops and the complexity involved in the ‘shop-for-shop’ arrangement, URA considered that cash compensation would be more flexible and better suit the shop operators. However, upon redevelopment, the area would be transformed into different types of residential/commercial areas with high property rent/price, the local shops could no longer survive in the locality;
- (b) through an audio recording, a local fast food shop operator expressed the worry on the insufficient compensation from URA for her to re-establish the business elsewhere. A newspaper also recorded similar worry from the operator of a local hair salon. According to the 2011 Urban Renewal Strategy, URA had the responsibility to assist the shop operators affected by its redevelopment project to re-establish their businesses in the locality;

- (c) the findings of the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) report by URA that no shop in the development scheme area had special character worthy of retention was not agreeable. While the local shops in To Kwa Wan might not be long-established, those shops had a close and long social relationship with the local community, and were selling daily commodities affordable to the local community; and
- (d) URA should invite the local residents and shop operators to participate in the planning of the development scheme to work out a design with local shops they would like to preserve.

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

48. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Wai Pan made the following main points :

- (a) a bottom-up approach had been adopted by the District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) Study for Kowloon City which conducted a large number of consultation forums/workshops to solicit the local views and recommended areas in the district for retention, preservation and redevelopment. URA should adopt the same approach in the current case;
- (b) the Board and URA should go to the neighbourhood and meet with the local community in the evening to hear their views, rather than asking them to submit written representations and attend the hearing held in the day time on a weekday; and
- (c) they had organized activities for the local residents to sketch out their views of the future development in To Kwa Wan and the activities had good responses. Given the long time span of the redevelopment process, URA should have sufficient time to solicit local views.

49. Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham made the following main points:

- (a) the role of the Board and PlanD should not be limited to the preparation of the land use plan for a development. The focus should be put on building

up a better community and the views/comments of local residents should be taken into account throughout the planning process;

- (b) the current development scheme provided a good opportunity for the local residents and stakeholders to be involved in the replanning of the area to resolve traffic issues, to provide public open space, and to retain shops with local character. URA should be more open to allow public participation in the process;
- (c) a number of issues should be further considered. For example, whether the Kwai Kee Soya shop and local convenience stores selling traditional commodities could be regarded as having special character; whether the proposed new through road was needed given that the traffic condition of only one road junction would be improved; whether the proposed 274 car parking spaces and four coach parking spaces were necessary; and whether it was a policy that URA could only redevelop its sites into commercial/residential development for sale in private market; and
- (d) while they were not opposing the redevelopment as it would improve the living condition of the old urban area, URA should take the opportunity to discuss with the local community and stakeholders in the planning of To Kwa Wan.

#### C1- URA

50. Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:

##### *Local Consultation*

- (a) the development schemes/projects commenced by URA in To Kwa Wan/Kowloon City were to take forward the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City recommended under the DURF Study. In fact, consultation with the local community on the urban renewal projects had already been commenced in the DURF Study although the boundaries of the development scheme/projects were not delineated at that time to avoid speculation;

- (b) the proposed communal car park and the new through road system formed part of the comprehensive planning of the area although the proposal was not taken forward through the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zoning mechanism. The large “CDA” approach, like in the Lee Tung Street and Kwun Tong Town Centre cases, was not well received by the urban renewal concern groups and the community. The current district-based planning approach adopted by URA would allow a more organic redevelopment in that a number of smaller development schemes/projects could be commenced in phases so as to facilitate rehousing arrangement and re-establishment of the social network;

#### *Car Repairs Workshops*

- (c) the SIA report had already pointed out that out of 71 shops in the development scheme area, 25 were used as workshops including metal hardware processing and car repairing. It had also highlighted the difficulties for those workshop operators to find suitable premises to re-establish their businesses. However, it would not be appropriate for those workshops to re-establish themselves within the residential neighbourhood due to the noise nuisance and fire safety concerns. The SIA report stated that if those operators could not find suitable premises and need to close down their businesses, URA would offer ex-gratia allowance;

#### *Local Shops*

- (d) under the current design of the development schemes/projects in the area, there would not be any large podium, thus eliminating the possibilities of having mega stores or large shopping malls;

#### *Coach and Car Parking Spaces*

- (e) the 274 car parking spaces were the upper limit of provision set out in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. While some might consider the provision excessive, the District Council (DC) considered it insufficient and requested more;

- (f) as for the provision of the four coach parking spaces, such spaces were included into the development scheme on request of the Transport Department (TD). DC also had diverse views on whether the provision was sufficient. URA was open-minded on whether such spaces should be included in the development scheme;

*Compensation and Mixed Housing*

- (g) URA followed the compensation package set down by the Legislative Council in 2001 which were much higher than the prevailing market value of the units. He doubted if it would be value for money to use the site for public housing development. For joint venture development, URA had already required the developers not to include luxurious facilities/design, and for those sites developed by URA itself, it would only provide basic housing facilities. The housing units would be sold at market price; and
- (h) while it was understood that the affected tenants/owners were concerned on the amount of compensation offered, the cash compensation could only be confirmed after the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) had approved the development schemes/projects. URA would continue to liaise with the local community and stakeholders to alleviate their concerns.

C11- Mo Man Fung

51. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mo Man Fung made the following main points:

- (a) at present, the local roads like Hung Fook Street, Ngan Hon Street, Kai Ming Street and Wing Kwong Street were very quiet amid the tranquil residential developments. On the other hand, Chi Kiang Street and Sung On Street had undesirable traffic conditions mainly because roadside coach parking was allowed. Coaches brought along tourists to the expensive chocolate shops there and were frequently parked or waited along the road, thus blocking the carriageway and causing nuisance to the residents;

- (b) the provision of four coach parking spaces in the development was not supported as it would turn the area from a tranquil and pedestrian friendly space into a commercialized area full of busy traffic. It would also displace local shops, encourage the proliferation of shops selling expensive goods for tourists and fuel up properties rent/price; and
- (c) the four coach parking spaces was proposed to be converted into bicycle parking spaces for residents to encourage the use of cycling which in turn would help ameliorate the traffic congestion problem and reduce reliance on Mass Transit Railway, and build up a sustainable vibrant community. He also proposed to delete all roadside coach loading/unloading bays and the road junction design that would allow the use of coaches as they would facilitate the proliferation of chocolate shops in the tranquil residential neighborhood and lead to properties speculation in the area.

C12 - Chan Chun Hei

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Chun Hei made the following main points:

- (a) he was living in the Hong Kong Island and found To Kwa Wan an interesting place of unique character;
- (b) a residential community only needed small local roads. The need for a new through road as proposed was doubtful as the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) report indicated that the anticipated traffic flow of the proposed new through road at the junction of Kai Ming Street/Wan On Street Extension was very low. The road width of 11m was also unnecessary if not for accommodating coach traffic. The new through road with busy traffic would not be conducive to the design intention of encouraging small shops at street level as claimed by URA. The new through road should be converted to a pedestrian precinct to provide a comfortable environment for shopping and people interaction;
- (c) the existing community had its own unique activities and well established social network which should be maintained. Even the residents were

rehoused and compensated, they would be living in various areas and could not re-establish the social network. URA should invite the local residents to participate in the design of the area for building up a community;

- (d) the Board should consider the suggestions of a representer to re-provision the affected car repair workshops under flyover or in a designated place;
- (e) Wang Chau could be resumed for public housing development, and URA should clarify on what basis URA could only develop its sites for properties to be sold in private market; and
- (f) some people preferred the traditional Tong Lau before redevelopment rather than the western style modern buildings upon redevelopment. The planning of the development scheme would affect the next generation and the young generation should be involved in the planning of the community.

53. As the presentations from the representers, commenters and their representatives were completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members. The Chairman explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The question-and-answer session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

#### *Need for Redevelopment*

54. Some Members raised the following questions on the need for redevelopment:

- (a) how to address the expectations of the local residents on redevelopment;
- (b) site selection criteria for redevelopment adopted by URA, and whether lack of sanitary fittings and fire safety installations was the main consideration; and
- (c) given that the buildings were dilapidated and residents were living in a poor condition, the representers/commenters were invited to elaborate on their grounds of opposition to the redevelopment.

55. In response, Mr Mike Kwan, the representative of C1, made the following main points:

- (a) he understood that the affected residents/owners, especially the elderly living in old buildings without lift, in fact welcomed URA's development schemes/projects as their living condition could be improved; and
- (b) URA would select buildings for redevelopment based on the building conditions, building age, planning merits anticipated, opportunity for the buildings to be developed under market force and resource availability in URA. In fact, buildings without sanitary fittings were rarely found nowadays. For buildings with fire safety concerns, they would be referred to the URA's building rehabilitation team for immediate action. In general, old buildings with no lift and obvious concrete cracks and spalling would be identified as possible sites for redevelopment.

56. Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham, representers' representative, said that they did not oppose to the redevelopment of the dilapidated buildings but considered that URA should allow the local residents and stakeholders to participate in the planning and design of the area.

*Planning and Design of the Development Scheme*

57. The Vice-Chairman and some Members raised the following questions on the planning and design of the development scheme:

- (a) the rationale for the provision of four coach parking spaces in the development scheme;
- (b) the need for the new through road and the communal car park;
- (c) whether the design could retain some of the existing local characters and provide more open space for the resident to interact; and
- (d) ways to improve the walkability of the area.

58. In response, Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:



- (a) URA did not propose any coach parking spaces in the initial proposal. Four coach parking spaces were included in the development scheme only upon TD's request;
- (b) the new through road was required to cater for the increased population arising from the development schemes/projects in the area. As stated in the TIA report, with the new through road, the traffic condition at the critical junctions would not be adversely affected, after taking into account the additional traffic generated from the redevelopment projects in the area. The width of 11m for the new through road was required to meet the current standard for the use of refuse collection trucks and delivery vehicles associated with the shops/residential units, not only for use by coaches;
- (c) the existing physical character of the area could be maintained to a certain extent by retaining the two cul-de-sacs at both Hung Fook Street and Kai Ming Street, which currently served as an informal activity space in the neighbourhood. Although a new through road would be added in the area, the existing local roads would still be retained. While the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services considered that the provision of open space in Kowloon City was sufficient, URA would provide and manage/maintain an at-grade public open space of about 300m<sup>2</sup> at the junction of Kai Ming Street/Wing Kwong Street after demolition of Evier House; and
- (d) at present, pedestrians from Bailey Street had to walk through the narrow alleys to Wing Kwong Street. The new through road with footpaths would facilitate pedestrian access. The provision of underground communal car park would minimize the number of at grade ingress/egress points for individual sites which could enhance the walkability of the area.

59. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, also said that 2.5m-wide footpath would be provided on both sides of the new through road, Ngan Hon Street and Hong Fook Street with sufficient road crossing facilities to enhance walkability of the area.

60. Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham and Ms Chan Chor See, R36, also made the following main points :

- (a) according to their understanding, the 274 car parking spaces were to serve the future residents of URA's developments in the area. However, they were worried about the traffic impact to be generated; and
- (b) the communal carpark design was supported as it could reduce the number of ingress/egress points in the area. Although URA said at the Town Planning Board meeting on 7.10.2016 that the car parking spaces would not be sold to non-residents, there was concern that such spaces would be sold to the residents for profit.

61. Mr Lam Ngo Chun, R111, supplemented that URA should consider the request of the car repair workshop operators for incorporating car repair workshops in the proposed community car park.

*Retention of Shops with Special Character*

62. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions on the retention of shops with special character:

- (a) the criteria in assessing whether a shop had special character that were worthy of retention; and
- (b) whether URA would offer options to the owners of those shops identified as having special character to return to the locality or move out with cash compensation.

63. In response, Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) the examples of shops with special character included those in the 'sports shoe street' in Mong Kok and the hundred-year-old shops in Peel Street. Tailor-made shop units would be reserved in those development schemes for shop owners to return to the locality and operate their original businesses. Such arrangement could not be applied to each scheme/project as it not only prolonged the construction period of the development, but also was not welcomed by some shop owners since they needed to commit to return upon redevelopment. Most of those owners would prefer cash compensation,

which was 35% above the prevailing market value of their units, so that they could re-establish their businesses nearby as soon as possible;

- (b) for shops identified as having special character, options would be offered to the owners either to return to the locality upon redevelopment or to receive cash compensation and move out. As the redevelopment process often lasted for 8-10 years, some owners who first agreed to return might withdraw subsequently; and
- (c) age of the shops was not the only consideration in identifying a shop with special character. URA would also refer to the findings of the SIA report. In the current case, only a soya product shop at Ngan Hon Street might be considered as having some special character.

64. Mr Ng Wai Pan, R35, Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham and Ms Hui Kun Wing Helen, R89, also made the following main points:

- (a) URA should not assess the value of local shops by their ages and business type. The special character of local shops was related to its social bonding with local community. The wood factory, and sauce and soya products shops in the area also had special character and could only be accommodated in the old buildings where the ground floor premises had high ceiling and with low rent. Such businesses were rich in heritage and cultural values; and
- (b) URA should discuss with relevant stakeholders in identifying shops with special character. Local shops should be retained as far as possible, and URA should offer an option for the shop owners to retain their shops in the development scheme.

#### *Car Repair Workshops*

65. In response to the Vice-Chairman's question on whether it was appropriate to retain the car repair workshops in a residential neighbourhood as they were incompatible uses, Mr Lam Ngo Chun and Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham made the following main points :

- (a) a substantial number of car repair workshops were operating in the ground floor units of the old buildings in the area as the premises were large enough for their operation. Given the nuisance of the operation, it might not be appropriate to locate car repair workshops in a residential neighbourhood. However, the Government should have a policy to re-provision them in suitable locations/premises; and
- (b) under the DURF Study, a site in Kwai Chung was recommended to accommodate the displaced car repair workshops, but the proposal was not within URA's purview.

#### *District-based Planning Approach*

66. In response to a Member's question on the district-based planning approach, Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) URA had previously implemented piecemeal redevelopments with site areas just of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> - 2,000m<sup>2</sup> in some districts. Due to the small site constraint, only pencil-type buildings could be built with car parks, loading/unloading bays and mechanical rooms provided at street level, and open space provided on the podium. Such design only allowed a few shops at street level which had adversely affected the street ambience in the locality, and offered limited planning merits for the district; and
- (b) under the district-based planning approach as in the current To Kwa Wan case, the area could be planned in a holistic manner with the provision of an underground communal car park, a new through road for the area and a large at-grade public open space. Shopping and other activities could be retained at street level to maintain the street ambience.

#### *Rehousing Arrangement and Provision of Public/Subsidized Housing*

67. Some Members raised the following questions on rehousing arrangement and provision of public/subsidized housing:

- (a) whether the 'Flat-for-Flat' scheme was well received;

- (b) whether URA should provide affordable housing for the public at its sites; and
- (c) whether there was any policy that the properties developed at URA's sites could only be sold in private market.

68. In response, Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) URA had provided rehousing flats for the affected owner-occupiers under the 'Flat-for-Flat' scheme since 2012. However, so far less than 10 owners had opted for the scheme as most owners preferred cash compensation so that they could purchase a flat immediately;
- (b) since URA used public money to offer compensation to the affected owners/tenants, there should be thorough discussion in society and community consensus should be reached on whether it was appropriate for the land acquired at such a high cost to be developed into public/subsidized housing. As URA was not tasked to provide public/subsidized housing, agreement with the Hong Kong Housing Authority or Hong Kong Housing Society on such provision should also be reached; and
- (c) under the current policy, affected tenants, if eligible, could be allocated with public rental flats. Affected tenants in a redevelopment project would usually move into the public housing estates in the same district so that their social network could be maintained to a certain extent. He understood that those who were not eligible for public housing usually raised strong concern on the redevelopment. URA's social worker team had liaised with those tenants to offer assistance, and if there was a genuine need, those tenants could move into URA's rehousing flats in Kennedy Town and Mong Kok.

69. Mr Tom C.K. Yip also said that sites in in Mok Cheong Street, Ko Shan Road and Kai Tak had been identified for public housing. The provision of public housing in the district would be enhanced with the forthcoming projects in those areas.

#### *Local Consultation*

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

- (a) how the local consultation conducted by URA could be improved; and
- (b) the local consultation to be conducted by URA in the future.

71. In response, Mr Mike Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) to strengthen the liaison between URA and the local residents, URA's neighbourhood centre was moved into Sunshine Plaza which was at the central location of the district. For the ethnic minorities, URA had conducted a meeting specifically for them with the provision of simultaneous translation service to enhance communication. In the past, URA generally commenced its liaison with the affected residents/owners after the approval of the development schemes/projects by CE in C. In the current case, URA had advanced the liaison work and took initiative to contact the affected residents with priority given to those with special needs such as the elderly singletons/doubletons and ethnic minorities; and
- (b) he understood that the main concern of the affected residents was the amount of cash compensation they would receive, but it could only be worked out when the DSP was approved by CE in C. URA would keep liaising with the affected residents and relevant stakeholders during the redevelopment process.

72. Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham and Ms Chan Chor See also made the following main points:

- (a) they had attended URA's local consultation meetings and noted that the discussions with the local residents/owners focused mainly on the rehousing, compensation and redevelopment process. They considered that URA should have more discussion with the local community and let the residents participate in the planning and design of the development;
- (b) it was understood that language barrier problem encountered by the ethnic minorities was gradually addressed with the efforts of URA. However, information accessibility of the ethnic minorities was still problematic, especially for those who moved into the concerned buildings after URA published its development schemes/projects. URA should consider changing

their rehousing policy in that instead of forcing the affected residents to move out, redevelopment should be undertaken in phases and the affected residents could be rehoused in-situ;

- (c) in addition to residents living in the development scheme/project area, residents in the surrounding area would also be affected by the nuisance arising from the redevelopment. URA should also involve them in the consultation; and
- (d) they understood that some of the issues were beyond URA's ambit. Similar to the DURF Study, an urban renewal forum involving members of the public, affected residents, professionals and departments/bureaux should be set up to work out a development scheme that could benefit different sectors of the community.

*Others*

73. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) the rationale of the 100mPD building height (BH) restriction for the site noting that the BH restriction in the vicinity was 120mPD;
- (b) vacancy rate of the shops in the area;
- (c) whether the new through road was included in the site area for the calculation of gross floor area (GFA); and
- (d) why a commercial podium was required if URA's intention was to have street-level shops to maintain the street ambience.

74. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following main points with the aid of a PowerPoint slide:

- (a) BH restrictions were stipulated on the Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) in 2008. The representation site was located in a residential cluster where the BH restriction was generally at 100mPD to the east of Ma Tau Wai Road and 120mPD to the west in the inland area with higher site levels. The residential area to the north of the site, falling within another OZP, was also subject to a BH restriction of 100mPD. The area further south of Bailey Street was a

business cluster with majority of sites zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” or “Commercial” which were subject to higher development intensity and BH restriction of 120mPD. In general, a stepped BH profile descending from inland to the waterfront was adopted in the area; and

- (b) there was no information in hand on the vacancy rate of the shops in the area.

75. Mr Mike Kwan also made the following main points:

- (a) as the land for the new through road was private lots acquired by URA and zoned “R(A)” on the OZP, it was included into the site area for GFA calculation; and
- (b) non-domestic plot ratio (PR) of 1.5 was allowed for the “R(A)” zone on the OZP, a three-storey podium was usually required in the development to fully utilize the non-domestic PR.

76. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in the absence of the representers and commenters and would inform them of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and PlanD’s representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Mr H.F. Leung left the meeting during the question-and-answer session.]

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

77. The deliberation session was reported under confidential cover.

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left the meeting during the deliberation session.]



**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Chuen Lung & Ha Fa Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW-CLHFS/1 (TPB Paper No. 10286)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

78. The Secretary reported that the following Members have declared interests on the item for having affiliation with Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R247), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)(R249) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (C5):

Dr C.H. Hau - being a member of HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK

Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] basis from time to time

79. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

80. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 9.12.2016, the draft Chuen Lung and Ha Fa Shan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW-CLHFS/1 was exhibited for public inspection. A total of 253 representations and 5 comments were received.

81. As the representations and comments were interrelated and related to the conservation and development of the OZP area, it was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board). The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

82. To ensure the efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for July 2017.

83. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer and commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of representer and commenter attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/20

(TPB Paper No. 10287)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

84. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interest on the item for owning properties in Kowloon Tong and having affiliation with Ms Mary Mulvihill (R5/C1):

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - living in the City University of Hong Kong's quarters in Kowloon Tong

Ms Christina M. Lee ]

Mr David Y.T. Lui ] owning properties in Kowloon Tong

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen ]

Ms Janice W.M. Lai - her spouse owning properties in Kowloon

Tong

Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] contract basis from time to time

85. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Ms Christina M. Lee, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

86. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 13.1.2017, the draft Kowloon Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K18/20 was exhibited for public inspection. A total of 7 representations and 1 comment were received.

87. As all of the representations and comment were of similar nature, it was recommended that the representations and comment should be considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board). The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

88. To ensure the efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for July 2017.

89. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comment should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer and commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of representer and commenter attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on the Draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-CS/1  
(TPB Paper No. 10290)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

90. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interest on the item for having affiliation with Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R1), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)(R2), Designing Hong Kong (DHK) (R3) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R4):

- |                   |   |  |
|-------------------|---|--|
| Dr C.H. Hau       | - | being a member of HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK |
| Mr K.K. Cheung    | ] | their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time                  |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai  | ] |  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of DHK                       |

91. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Dr C.H. Hau, Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting.

92. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 10.2.2017, the draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-CS/1 was exhibited for public inspection. A total of 6 representations and no comment were received.

93. As the representations were interrelated and related to the conservation and development of the OZP area, it was recommended that the hearing of the representations be

considered collectively in one group by the full Town Planning Board (the Board). The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

94. To ensure the efficiency of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for July 2017.

95. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representations should be considered collectively in one group by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer, subject to confirmation of the number of representer attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TT/1A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval

(TPB Paper No. 10288)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

96. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation with Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R1), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)(R2) and Designing Hong Kong (DHK) (R4):

Dr C.H. Hau - being a member of HKBWS and a past member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - personally knowing the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of DHK

97. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members could stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting.

98. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. Since the representation consideration process had been completed, the draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP ) No. S/NE-TT/1A was now ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

99. After deliberation, the Board:

- (a) agreed that the draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung OZP No. S/NE-TT/1A and its Notes at Annexes I and II of the Paper respectively were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) endorsed the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tai Tan, Uk Tau, Ko Tong and Ko Tong Ha Yeung OZP No. S/NE-TT/1A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land use zonings on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) agreed that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

**Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

100.       There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.