

CONFIDENTIAL

[downgraded on 23.6.2017]

**Minutes of 1142nd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 2.6.2017**

Agenda Item 4

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

Deliberation Session

1. Mr Ivan C.S. Fu declared an interest on the item for having current business dealing with the developer in a URA project in Central. Members noted that Mr Fu had not raised questions in the question-and-answer session, and agreed that he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. The Vice-chairman declared an interest on the item for being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and a group of HKU students had submitted representation (R111) but he had no involvement in the representation. Members agreed that the interest of the Vice-chairman was indirect and could stay in the meeting.

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left the meeting at this point.]

2. Members also noted that some Members had not attended the presentation session in the morning, and agreed that they should refrain from participating in the deliberation.

3. The Vice-chairman and some Members made the following main points:

(a) it was noted that the representers and commenters did not object to the redevelopment of the site, but were concerned about issues like inadequate consultation, reprovisioning of car repairs workshops etc which were more on the implementation aspect. No amendments to the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) were therefore required;

- (b) with the gradual increase in the number of old and dilapidated buildings and the number of people living in undesirable conditions, URA's urban renewal projects were supported and should be expedited.
- (c) the major function of URA was to undertake urban renewal rather than dealing with the provision of public housing in general. Most of the issues raised by the representers/commenters were about broader issues which were outside the remit of URA;
- (d) the proposed development scheme could improve the living environment of the area and the proposed new through road could cater for the increased traffic arising from the redevelopment as well as enhance the walkability of the area. The provision of a communal carpark for URA's projects/schemes in the area was supported; and
- (e) URA should be advised to continue to communicate with the local community and relevant stakeholders to address their concerns on URA's development schemes/projects.

4. Regarding the four coach parking spaces proposed in the development scheme, Mr David C.V. Ngu, Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon), Transport Department, said that double parking of coaches frequently occurred along Sung On Street when the coaches were waiting for the tourists while shopping. To address the short-term coach parking need, two sites at Bailey Street and Wa Shun Street were currently used for temporary coach/goods vehicles parking pending permanent development of the sites. Such arrangement was supported by the Kowloon City District Council members. As those sites were located near the waterfront, the Harbourfront Commission had recently been consulted and agreement was given to extend the temporary parking use for another year. The Tourism Commission in conjunction with the tourism trade also assisted in advising the concerned coach drivers and tour guides to park in those temporary sites. To cater for the long-term need for coach parking, the Transport and Housing Bureau currently had a policy that commercial vehicles, including coach, parking spaces should be flexibly provided in new development when opportunity arose. It was agreed by URA that four coach parking sites would be provided in the current development scheme.

5. Members in general considered that there was no need to amend the DSP and agreed that the grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had adequately been responded to in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.4 of the Paper.

6. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representations No. R1 to R17 and R20.

7. The Board also decided not to uphold Representations No. R18, R19, R21 to R123, and considered that the draft DSP should not be amended to meet the representations. The reasons were:

- “
- (a) the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) will facilitate redevelopment of the representation site for a better living environment with the provision of an underground car park to serve the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) projects in the wider area. The “Residential (Group A)8” zoning for the site is considered appropriate;
 - (b) the proposed underground car park at the representation site and proposed road improvement works would improve the pedestrian and traffic circulation in the area without generating adverse traffic impact (R18, R22, R28 to R36, R58, R96, R108 and R110);
 - (c) there is sufficient provision of open space in the area to serve the local residents (R22, R28 to R30, R36, R40, R50, R62, R64 to R66, R69, R70, R72, R74 to R78, R80, R81, R83, R86 to R91, R93, R94, R98, R99, R104, R105, R108 and R109);
 - (d) the development scheme at the representation site with appropriate building height restriction and suitable mitigation measures would not generate unacceptable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and infrastructural aspects (R65, R85, R99, R104 and R105);
 - (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the DSP

have been fully followed. The exhibition of the DSP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (R35, R103, R109 and R110); and

- (f) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition are outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and the purview of the Town Planning Board (R18, R22, R23, R25, R28, R33, R35, R36, R38, R39, R41, R57, R62, R72, R73, R76, R78 to R80, R86, R87, R92, R94, R106, R109 to R123). ”

8. The Board also agreed to request URA to consider provision of some of the social welfare facilities as requested by government departments in their projects in the area in the detailed design stage, and to further consult the relevant stakeholders and local community on ways to retain the social network of residents as well as assisting long-time business operators to re-establish their businesses in the locality.