

**Minutes of 1143<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 15.6.2017**

**Present**

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)  
Transport Department  
Mr Simon H.W. Lau

Assistant Director (Regional 3)  
Lands Department  
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

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

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

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

Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

**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.)

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Jeff K.C. Ho (a.m.)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Urban Renewal Authority Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/K9/URA1/1 (TPB Paper No. 10289)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese]

1. 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). AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of URA. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having business dealings/affiliations with URA or its consultant, 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<br>Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung        | ] being a director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund of URA  |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau                              | - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM   |

Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firms having current business dealings with  
Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] URA

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Cheung  
Kong Holdings Limited for the URA Peel Street/  
Graham Street project and AECOM

Ms Janice W.M. Lai ] having current business dealings with AECOM  
Dr C.H. Hau ]

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA and  
past business dealings with AECOM

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with URA

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM

Professor S.C. Wong - being the Chair Professor and Head of Department  
(*The Vice-Chairman*) of Civil Engineering of University of Hong Kong  
where AECOM has business dealings with some  
colleagues and has sponsored some activities of  
the Department before

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

2. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the special meeting.

3. As Messrs Philip S.L. Kan and Wilson Y.W. Fung had no involvement in the subject development scheme (DS), the meeting agreed that they could 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 (the Site), and the interests of Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr Franklin Yu were indirect, the meeting agreed that they should also be allowed to stay in the meeting.

4. The Vice-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 and comments in their absence.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. 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*

R5 - 鍾麗嫦 Sandy

R9 - Tang Cheung Sing

R12 - 社區文化關注

R249 - 陳瑋然

R251 - 吳煒彬

R252 - 土家 - 陳楚思

R254 - 許謹穎

R255 - 吳耀鏗

R256 - 林卓賢

R265 - 蕭朗宜

R270 - 羅浩豪

R276 - 鄧滿蘭

R282 - 魏豪震

R304 - 廖小姐

R328 - 黎文浩

R331 - Vycky Ho Wing Yin

Mr Tang Cheung Sing	] Representers and
Mr Ngai Ho Chun	] Representers' representatives
Ms Hui Kun Wing, Helen	]
Mr Lam Cheuk Yin	]
土家/維修香港 -	]
Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham	
土家/社區文化關注 -	]
Ms Tjhan Pauline Jessica	
Hillary	]
維修香港 -	
Mr Ng Wai Pan	]
土家 -	
Ms Chan Chor See	

R21 - 李懷

R107/R348 - 楊玉嬋

R112 - Yeung Wai Man

R137 - Wong Siu Lun Keith

R165 - 關南玲

R193 - 李偉昆

R194 - 李富榮

R195 - 盧敏玲

R196 - 李家宏

R207 - 葉華昌

R219 - 羅順忠

R220 - 張桂蘭

R221 - 廖承恩

R240 - 楊允金

R243 - 許澤生

R245 - 許玄駿

C2 - 楊玉嬋及福運大廈關注組

福運大廈關注組 -	] Representers, Commenter and
Ms Yeung Yuk Sim	Representers' representatives
Mr Hui Chak Sang	]
Mr Yeung Wai Leung	]

R84 - 楊曉東

R141 - 黃劍雄

R142 - 黃麗燕

R147 - 何崇志

R153 - 何寶琪

R183 - 陳春梅

R184 - 胡嘉恩

紅土家/福運大廈關注組	] Representer and Representers'
Mr Yeung Hiu Tung	representative

R140 - 曾財娣

Ms Tsang Choi Tai	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

R143 - 黃麗芬

Ms Chim Man Ting	- Representer
------------------	---------------

R155 - 何燕霞

R156 - 陳英才

Mr Tang Heung Wing	- Representers' representative
--------------------	--------------------------------

R166 - 麻孫芳

Ms Ma Sun Fong	- Representer
----------------	---------------



R175 - 詹秉禮

Mr Jim Ping Lai - Representer

R197 - 馮少華

R242 - 許少薇

青年新政 - Representers' representative

Ms Yau Wai Ching

R198 - 單國倡

R199 - 盧敏貞

R201 - Choy Chuk Nam

R202 - Chow Hui Yan

紅土家 -

Mr Yu Chun Ning - Representers' representative

R241 - 陳小鳳

Ms Chan Siu Fung - Representer

R244 - 許序康

Mr Hui Chui Hong - Representer

C1 - URA

Ms Mable Kwan ] Commenter's representatives

Mr Edwin Choy ]

C3 - Chan Chun Hei

Mr Chan Chun Hei - Commenter

6. The Vice-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.

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

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the preparation of the draft URA Chun Tin Street/Sung Shi Street DSP No. S/K9/URA1/1, the URA projects in the area, the redesigned local transport and road network, the views and proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10289 (the Paper).

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

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Ms Christina M. Lee and Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of DPO/K.]

R155 - 何燕霞

R156 - 陳英才

10. Mr Tang Heung Wing made the following main points:

- (a) a new vehicular turning area would be provided in the northern portion of the DS to provide access for the Site and the adjoining developments. He noted that URA would take up the management and maintenance of the vehicular turning area which would be permanently opened for public use. He

suggested that the Government should take up the management of the new road, which would not only reduce the running cost for URA but also allow more effective control on illegal parking by the Police; and

- (b) closure of Chun Tin Street would affect the access to Fook Wan Mansion and reduce public space in the area. Chun Tin Street was currently a public space with no restriction on access and activity while the open space to be provided within the Site would be subject to control by URA or its management company. He was concerned that barriers might be installed to impede the use of the space by the public, and considered that Chun Tin Street should be retained.

R166 - 麻孫芳

11. Ms Ma Sun Fong said that she had been residing at Fook Wan Mansion for 42 years. She purchased a unit of Fook Wan Mansion because it was south facing and Chun Tin Street was very quiet with little traffic at that time. It was safe for kids to play along the street until recycling shops moved in, which caused noise nuisance and affected pedestrian safety. Notwithstanding that, Chun Tin Street should be retained.

R197 - 馮少華

R242 - 許少薇

12. Ms Yau Wai Ching made the following main points:

- (a) given the tenement buildings within the Site were more than 50 years old and in dilapidated conditions with no lift, residents would look for 'demand-led redevelopment' even if URA did not identify the Site as a Development Project (DP) site. The community would have no objection to the DS if the redevelopment could help revitalize the local economy, affected residents could live in new flats of the DS or have reasonable compensation, and surrounding residents would not be adversely affected;

- (b) there had not been adequate consultation. URA had abruptly withdrawn the previous KC-008 proposal (Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DP) and disregarded normal consultation procedures. URA only repeatedly stated details of the redevelopment proposal and technical findings but had not incorporated the public views/objections collected during the five briefings, i.e. providing local rehousing and reasonable compensation, and minimizing impact on local people, etc. into the DS. Previous URA redevelopment projects such as the redevelopment in Peel Street had the same problem. URA only based on some figures to quantify the needs of the affected residents but lacked any qualitative assessment on their actual situations. Both URA and the Board did not consider the current situations of affected people with empathy. Since URA had a lot of resources, it should be responsible for assessing the feasibility of alternative proposals submitted by the local concern groups;
- (c) URA's goal on redevelopment projects, i.e. improving community planning and road network, could not be achieved by developing unaffordable luxury flats without provision for local rehousing. Previous redevelopment project in Lee Tung Street, Wan Chai had manifested the deficiencies of URA's current policy. The character of the whole Lee Tung Street was destroyed after the redevelopment. That redevelopment project only resulted in the construction of high-end residential blocks. Those newly built luxury flats and shops were not affordable to the original residents and business operators and they were then evicted from the area. It was foreseeable that the redevelopment in Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street for residential developments with commercial uses on lower floors would repeat the same problem as Lee Tung Street redevelopment. There should be a better option for redevelopment in Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street, which would better cater for the affected residents and business operators;
- (d) technical assessments for the DS had not been fully completed. Building design of the URA's notional scheme had not yet proved to be in compliance with the Buildings Ordinance. The current air and noise pollution would be deteriorated arising from the redevelopment project.

Meeting relevant government regulations/requirements, including environmental impact assessment (EIA), did not mean that no problem would be generated from the DS; and

- (e) building structure of adjoining buildings, in particular Fook Wan Mansion might be affected by construction of the DS or other redevelopment projects in the area in the long run. She requested URA to comprehensively study/evaluate the impacts on Fook Wan Mansion and the surrounding buildings arising from the URA redevelopment projects during construction stage and the arrangement in case of emergency.

R241 - 陳小鳳

13. Ms Chan Siu Fung made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Fook Wan Mansion. URA had not comprehensively considered the impacts of DS on Fook Wan Mansion residents. Local residents' views from Fook Wan Mansion would be blocked and the new vehicle turning area would induce noise impact. Her living environment would be deteriorated; and
- (b) she did not object to the redevelopment, but required that adequate measures should be adopted to minimize the impacts on Fook Wan Mansion residents and maintain their living standard. She also considered that Chun Tin Street should be retained.

R244 - 許序康

14. Mr Hui Chui Hong who was a resident of Fook Wan Mansion said that mosquito and noise from the construction sites of redevelopments nearby had caused nuisance to daily life of him and his family, e.g. he could not focus on his study. The relevant government departments should be responsible for resolving these problems.

R5 - 鍾麗嫦 Sandy

R9 - Tang Cheung Sing

R12 - 社區文化關注

R249 - 陳瑋然

R251 - 吳煒彬

R252 - 土家 - 陳楚思

R254 - 許謹穎

R255 - 吳耀鏗

R256 - 林卓賢

R265 - 蕭朗宜

R270 - 羅浩豪

R276 - 鄧滿蘭

R282 - 魏豪震

R304 - 廖小姐

R328 - 黎文浩

R331 - Vycky Ho Wing Yin

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tang Cheung Sing made the following main points:

*Holistic Planning Approach*

- (a) the representers were from four local parties, namely 「維修香港」, 「土家」, 「社區文化關注」 and 「紅土社區達人」, based in To Kwa Wan. They had been collecting local views regarding URA redevelopment projects in the area for more than four years;
- (b) URA had commenced eight redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan between 2013 and 2016, which would induce significant changes to the community in the coming 10 years;
- (c) considering that redevelopment would provide opportunities for improving the safety and environmental hygiene of the area, the local people generally did not object to redevelopment. They had reservation

on the DS as it had yet to consider comprehensively the impacts of redevelopment projects in the wider context;

- (d) private flats built in URA redevelopment projects were unaffordable luxury flats. Those projects would not contribute to improving the living environment of the affected residents. Public rental or subsidized housing should be built instead to address the housing needs. Moreover, sufficient social welfare facilities and public open space especially for the elderly and ethnic minorities should be provided;
- (e) the redevelopment with high-end flats/shops and opening of a new MTR station would push up prices/rents for current flats/shops in the area and displace the current residents. The original community network of the residents and shop operators would be uprooted. Rehousing the affected residents to other districts would adversely affect the existing community networks. They should be locally rehoused and settled before redevelopment took place. The local shops should be retained and not be replaced with high-end shops, which were not affordable to the local residents;
- (f) good pedestrian connectivity should be retained. Closure of Chun Tin Street would reduce public space, increase traffic flow, cause traffic congestion, and increase pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. More justifications on how the DS would bring benefit to the local residents should be provided; and
- (g) the planning process should be a bottom-up process respecting the needs of the existing residents.

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

*Traffic Problems*

- (a) URA had submitted a traffic impact assessment (TIA) in support of the

DS. Some data was missing and hence the reliability of the TIA was questionable. The TIA had not fully taken into account the real situation, i.e. traffic flows of opposite directions, on-street parking and loading/unloading activities. The estimated traffic flow at peak hours in 2028 as well as the traffic impact arising from the DS might be underestimated;

- (b) based on the TIA and his own calculation on the future traffic flow at Sung Chi Street, it was estimated that the traffic flow would be increased by five times as a result of the DS. Together with the proposed additional carparks, five existing car repair workshops and about twenty shops in the area, it was expected that the capacity of the local road network could not accommodate the additional traffic, and the existing traffic congestion would be worsened; and
- (c) the design of the proposed underground car park and vehicle turning area within the Site was not desirable, which would cause difficulty in maneuvering, in particular for heavy goods vehicle and fire engine, and hence long waiting/queueing time for car park users was anticipated. It was estimated that the proposed car lift design and vehicle turning area could not accommodate the needs at peak hours. The pedestrian flow was already very high at the moment, and the width of future Chun Tin Street was considered too narrow. There were car accidents at junction of Hok Yuen Street and Sung Chi Street recently. The increased traffic flow due to the DS would worsen the traffic congestion and pedestrian environment in the area, and hence cause more traffic accidents. It was questionable whether URA could effectively manage the vehicle turning area and avoid the said traffic problems.

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

[Mr Edwin W.K. Chan joined, while Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting at this point.]

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



*Housing Type*

- (a) under the previous KC-008 proposal (Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DP), which had been withdrawn, the possibility of providing subsidized sale flats should have been explored according to a Legislative Council Panel Paper in 2015. The subject DSP had proposed permanent closure of Chun Tin Street and inclusion of it for development, which would generate additional gross floor area (GFA) of 2,600m<sup>2</sup>. The DSP was proposed for URA's interest but not meeting the need for subsidized housing;
- (b) URA and PlanD might argue that subsidized housing would usually be proposed on land allocated to the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). It should be noted that the requirement for providing subsidized sale flats was specified in some Notes or Explanatory Statements (ES) of Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) and there were precedents that private developers were obligated to build subsidized sale flats under lease. Tai Hang Sai Estate and Kornhill Gardens were two of the successful examples. URA could work with HKHA to provide some subsidized sale flats in some redevelopment projects in To Kwa Wan. For instance, URA could transfer a portion of the resumed land to HKHA for public housing development or purchase some subsidized sale flats from HKHA for rehousing the local residents. URA should make reference to those precedents and explore the feasibility of providing subsidized sale flats in the DS;
- (c) considering that there were about 200,000 people currently awaiting public rental housing, more public rental and subsidized housing should be built to address the housing need. It was expected that those newly built luxury flats in the DS would not be affordable to the local residents and there would be lesser and lesser available land for public rental and subsidized housing in the urban area. There had been no public housing built in To Kwa Wan for more than 50 years. Existing public housing estate in Hung Hom such as Lok Man Sun Chuen, Ka Wai Chuen, Chun Seen Mei Chuen and Ma Tau Wai Estate, etc. were built more than 30 years ago and their tenants were getting old. Concerned government departments should have a holistic

plan for the future of the area including reserving sufficient land for redevelopment of these public housing estates in the future; and

- (d) given URA had gained huge profit from its previous redevelopment projects, it should take the opportunities to provide some public rental and subsidized housing in its future projects with a view to enhancing the living environment of the local community.

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

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ngai Ho Chun and Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham made the following main points:

*Affected Recycling Shops*

- (a) there were two recycling shops in Chun Tin Street. Their business had effectively reduced community waste and promoted recycling industry, which was neglected in Hong Kong. Some local elderly collected paper waste to these recycling shops regularly and made a living. Waste collected in the recycling shops would be sorted, processed, packaged and then sold to Mainland China. Specific machines and skilled labour were required for operation of the recycling shops. Chun Tin Street was a cul-de-sac providing sufficient loading/unloading spaces for working vehicles. The recycling shops were also serving the nearby industries, which had a large amount of electronic wastes. Closure of Chun Tin Street would affect not only those two recycling shops, but also the living of the local elderly, the social network, the production chain as well as the prospect of Hong Kong's recycling industry. Those recycling shops would be displaced after redevelopment. Whether the URA redevelopment projects were people-oriented and improving people's living quality were questionable. The recycling businesses should be reprovisioned in the DS;
- (b) three territorial landfills would be fully occupied in 2020. The Government should promote recycling industry and help those affected

recycling shops as it could release the pressure on the landfills and help revitalize the local economy. According to an Environmental Protection Department's Report, Monitoring of Solid Waste in Hong Kong 2015, the amount of solid waste generated in Hong Kong was ranked first amongst Asian cities. The recycling industry could help reduce waste, making a contribution to the environment;

- (c) he had interviewed Mr Lu, the owner of one of recycling shops in Chun Tin Street. Mr Lu had been working in the recycling industry for more than 30 years. His recycling shop in Wan Chai was displaced in a redevelopment project some years ago. He then moved to Chun Tin Street. He was over 40 years old with no other technical skill and would become jobless if his recycling shop was displaced again;
- (d) the general public did not prefer polluting business/offensive trade located near their residences in Hong Kong. Making reference to Seoul, South Korea, recycling shops could provide some one-stop services connecting with the local community. Public should not perceive the recycling shops and waste collectors/recyclers with prejudice. Recycling shops currently provided job opportunities for local people in particular lower-class people so they could make a living, which was beneficial to the society;
- (e) although the existing recycling shops in the area were not in a good condition, they could be upgraded after the redevelopment. A new green building concept promoting those local recycling shops to be a community recycling centre should be considered. Their functions could include waste collection, waste recycling, recycling of food residues for community farm and reuse of waste for artistic products, which Jockey Club had been sponsoring similar projects in other areas. Some collected waste could also serve as resources for recycling energy;
- (f) URA should incorporate the above concepts into its redevelopment projects, which would not only reduce local waste effectively but also beautify the environment benefiting the community; and

- (g) their concerns were not only about compensation or in-situ re-provisioning of business operators affected by a redevelopment project, but also about how to comprehensively plan for a community. As URA had incurred a lot of public resources, its redevelopment schemes should be more focus on the local concerns and public interests.

[Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting at this point.]

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

*Impacts to Surrounding Community*

- (a) the proposed road network would not only affect the residents and businesses within the Site but also those in the immediate surroundings outside the DSP. For instance, a commodity shop and a millstone shop providing tools for local beancurd factories were located in Sung Chi Street. Widening of Sung Chi Street from a one-way to two-way street would have adverse impact on the pedestrian friendly environment of Sung Chi Street as well as the business of those shops;
- (b) a video was played to show the concern of a timber shop owner, Mr Lau, about the traffic arrangement proposed under the DS on the operation of his shop, in particular the loading/unloading arrangements;
- (c) a timber shop and a decoration shop had been operating in Sung Chi Street for more than 10 years. Their business operations required frequent loading/unloading using heavy goods vehicles or vehicles of more than 30 tonnes. The proposed traffic arrangement would have impact on their operations although they fell outside the DSP boundary. It should be noted that a redevelopment project would have impact on the wider area;
- (d) it was noted that the redevelopment projects in the area had caused increase in price/rent of shops at Sung Chi Street near Chun Tin Street. A

series of factors including local character of the neighbourhood, the local residents' spending power, nature of local shops and surrounding land uses should be considered in the planning process; and

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (e) as shown in a video played at the meeting, there was no conflict among pedestrians, cyclists and drivers in Sung Chi Street. Cycling as an environmental friendly transportation mode should be promoted. After widening of Sung Chi Street as proposed under the DS, pedestrians would no longer have the priority. The new vehicular turning area would increase the traffic flow causing pedestrian safety and traffic problems. In terms of transport planning, the DS should comprehensively consider the local character, street character and operation of local shops in the surrounding area.

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

*Comprehensive TIA and Traffic Arrangement*

- (a) he doubted whether the TIA had taken into account the capacity of mass transit railway and other URA redevelopment projects currently carried out/to be carried out in the surrounding area, e.g. redevelopment projects in Ma Tau Wai Road and Hung Fook Street. A comprehensive TIA for the area was required; and
- (b) while it was understood that the proposed car lift design under the DS could provide more car parking spaces, such design would cause traffic problems/accidents. He proposed to connect the two basement car parks under the DS and Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street DP (adjoining DP) with a single ramp in/out to minimize impact on the local shops. The car park design without car lift would save maintenance cost and avoid change to the existing traffic arrangement due to the proposed closure of Chun Tin Street and widening of Sung Chi Street.

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Cheuk Yin made the following main points:

*Role and Responsibility of URA*

- (a) he noted that land had been granted to URA, non-profit-making organizations, HKHA and Housing Department (HD) through private treaty grant by the Lands Department (LandsD). Based on the record provided at LandsD's website, those sites were mainly granted for URA redevelopment projects, educational, government quarters and public rental/subsidized housing, etc. with a nominal premium of \$1,000. However, a site at Kai Tak, i.e. De Novo, was granted to URA at market premium of about \$1.4 billion. In response to Legislative councillor Dr Hon Fernando Cheung Chiu-hung's question in 2016, LandsD explained that the market premium for De Novo was to reflect the purpose of the development for "flat-for-flat". While the DS would provide "flat-for-flat" units like De Novo, granting the Site to URA with a nominal premium instead of market premium should be justified; and

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) with lower land premium/development cost, URA should be able to provide more affordable housing for the low income citizens. LandsD and the Board were responsible for monitoring development of the DS and should impose requirement for providing subsidized sale flats at the Site. The Board previously had required the provision of housing for low income citizens under the lease of Tai Hang Sai Estate. With that precedent case, it should be feasible to impose similar lease clause to the subject DSP so that URA would be required to provide some affordable housing.

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

*Representers' Proposal*

- (a) she was a member of 「社區文化關注」 and 「紅土社區達人」 comprising professionals with architecture, planning and transport backgrounds and they targeted for sustainable redevelopment;
- (b) with reference to the previous four land sale records in Kai Tak, it was estimated that land premium of the Site was about \$1.78 billion including an additional area arising from the proposed closure of Chun Tin Street, or about \$1.18 billion when excluding Chun Tin Street, and the land premium of the adjoining DP was about \$2.43 billion. Chun Tin Street was a public street belonging to Hong Kong citizens, however, URA had paid nothing to acquire that street, which would generate additional floor spaces for 160 flats;
- (c) since January 2015, they had been meeting the neighbours in the area regarding the previous KC-008 proposal (Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DP) and the subject DSP;
- (d) they had submitted a proposal for a combined development of the adjoining DP and the subject DSP. The proposal demonstrated that even with limited resources, a feasible scheme with phased redevelopment and mixed housing, keeping the original social network and with creative open space design could be formulated. Since the site of the adjoining DP was currently vacant, they proposed to develop it first for rehousing the affected residents arising from redevelopment of the Site. Apart from private housing, public rental housing and home ownership scheme were provided in their proposal. The proposed development parameters of the adjoining DP and those of the subject DSP were considered and it was confirmed that their proposal was financially viable even without provision of additional units from closure of Chun Tin Street;
- (e) in order to retain the original social network, the local businesses such as recycling shops should be maintained. Although there was a concern about the environmental hygiene of those shops, redevelopment would

provide an opportunity to address those local problems. With more resources, URA should be able to provide a better scheme;

- (f) the proposal they submitted was sustainable and the community had been engaged in its formulation. Its ideas of providing affordable flats, street shops selling affordable goods, community farming, local market, open space podium, pedestrian connectivity, mixed housing and retaining the social network, etc. would truly serve the affected residents and local people; and
- (g) she noted that some Board Members had visited an underground central waste disposal system in Potsdamer Platz, Berlin, Germany. At the meeting of the Board held in October 2016, URA was requested to make reference to the overseas experience for its redevelopment project. She requested the Board to incorporate the requirement of installing underground recycling facilities in the Notes of the DSP.

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

*Street Shops*

- (a) PlanD's response to the representations as set out in the Paper stated that reprovisioning street shops in the DS was feasible as long as the type of commercial uses complied with those stipulated under the Notes of the DSP. URA should respond to the request for providing street shops and relevant requirements should be imposed in the Notes of the DSP;
- (b) the requirement of providing street shops was incorporated into the Notes or ES of some OZPs, e.g. Kai Tak, Tseung Kwan O and Hung Shui Kui. Two storeys 'Shop and Services' use had already been provided in Kai Ching Estate, Kai Tak. Even if the requirement was merely incorporated into the ES of the OZP, which was a non-statutory document, future developers would make reference to it. Similar requirement could also be imposed in the land lease, if necessary. Provision of retail frontage



was also required under the Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen OZP for enhancing to the at-grade street vibrancy and local character;

- (c) street shops in To Kwa Wan would be convenient to the local residents and promote street vibrancy, while shopping malls in the area, e.g. Chatham Gate had a very high vacancy rate;
- (d) local people's needs and preferences should be taken care of and a portion of the Site should be reserved for community facilities to address their needs; and
- (e) she had grave concern on pedestrian safety in the area due to increase in number of coach parking spaces. They had raised their concern in the previous meeting of the Board held on 2.6.2017 when discussing another URA redevelopment project in the area.

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

*URA's Compensation Package*

- (a) with a nominal premium, URA would save \$4.2 billion development cost from acquiring the Site and the site of the adjoining DP. Although URA was benefited from resuming land with a nominal premium, it had not shared the benefit for the public interest. Its compensation package was not enough for the affected residents to be locally rehoused, which was unfair to them, while those qualified to be rehoused in public rental housing estate would have no choice to be rehoused locally and had to move away from their original neighbourhood; and
- (b) URA only based on the technical assessments conducted, e.g. the TIA or social impact assessment, to quantify the needs of the affected people, without considering the real situation faced by those people. The compensation and rehousing policy of URA was questionable.

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

*The Board's Responsibility*

- (a) they did not object to the redevelopment but queried the rationale and benefit of closure of Chun Tin Street and widening of Sung Chi Street. The Board should be held responsible to decide whether Chun Tin Street should be closed;
- (b) they queried whether any appropriate requirement/restriction could be imposed if closure of Chun Tin Street was inevitable. The Board should monitor URA redevelopment projects to ensure a people-oriented and sustainable approach had been adopted, and the community had been engaged; and
- (c) URA would pay nothing to acquire Chun Tin Street, which would generate additional floor spaces for 160 flats. There was a URA redevelopment project in Kwun Tong and 66% of the project site was public area. URA had taken up a lot of public resources but not redeveloping in the public interest. Continuity of the current unsustainable redevelopment process with no long-term vision would create more or worsen current social problems.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:35 p.m.]

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

26. The meeting was resumed at 1:45 p.m.

27. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-chairman

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),  
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon), Transport Department

Mr. Simon H.W. Lau

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

**Agenda Item 1 (Continued)**

[Open Meeting]

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

28. The following government representatives, and representers/commenters or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

***Government representatives***

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

***Representers/Commenters or their representatives***

R5 - 鍾麗嫦 Sandy

R9 - Tang Cheung Sing

R12 - 社區文化關注

R249 - 陳瑋然

R251 - 吳煒彬

R252 - 土家 - 陳楚思

R254 - 許謹穎

R255 - 吳耀鏜

R256 - 林卓賢

R265 - 蕭朗宜

R270 - 羅浩豪

R276 - 鄧滿蘭

R282 - 魏豪震

R304 - 廖小姐

R328 - 黎文浩

R331 - Vycky Ho Wing Yin

Mr Tang Cheung Sing	] Representers and
Mr Ngai Ho Chun	] Representers' representatives
Ms Hui Kun Wing, Helen	]
Mr Lam Cheuk Yin	]
土家/維修香港 -	]
Mr Lai Ka Chun Abraham	
土家/社區文化關注 -	]
Ms Tjhan Pauline Jessica Hillary	
維修香港 - Mr Ng Wai Pan	]
土家 - Ms Chan Chor See	]

R21 - 李懷

R107/R348 - 楊玉嬋

R112 - Yeung Wai Man

R137 - Wong Siu Lun, Keith

R165 - 關南玲

R193 - 李偉昆

R194 - 李富榮

R195 - 盧敏玲

R196 - 李家宏

R207 - 葉華昌

R219 - 羅順忠

R220 - 張桂蘭

R221 - 廖承恩

R240 - 楊允金

R243 - 許澤生

R245 - 許玄駿

C2 - 楊玉嬋及福運大廈關注組

福運大廈關注組 -  
Ms Yeung Yuk Sim - Representer, Commenter and  
Representers' representative  
Mr Yeung Wai Man ] Representer, Representers' and  
Mr Hui Chak Sang ] Commenter's representatives  
Mr Wong Siu Lun, Keith ]  
Mr Lee Man Tung ] Representers' and Commenter's  
Mr Yeung Wai Keung ] representatives

R84 - 楊曉東

R141 - 黃劍雄

R142 - 黃麗燕

R147 - 何崇志

R153 - 何寶琪

R183 - 陳春梅

R184 - 胡嘉恩

紅土家/福運大廈關注組 -  
Mr Yeung Hiu Tung - Representer and  
Representers' representative

R140 - 曾財娣

Ms Tsang Choi Tai - Representer

R143 - 黃麗芬

Ms Chim Man Ting - Representer

R155 - 何燕霞

R156 - 陳英才

Mr Tang Heung Wing - Representers' representative

R166 - 麻孫芳

Ms Ma Sun Fong - Representer

R197 - 馮少華

R242 - 許少薇

青年新政 – Ms Yau Wai Ching - Representers' representative

R198 - 單國倡

R199 - 盧敏貞

R201 - Choy Chuk Nam

R202 - Chow Hui Yan

紅土家 - Mr Yu Chun Ning - Representers' representative

R241 - 陳小鳳

Ms Chan Siu Fung - Representer

C1 – Urban Renewal Authority (URA)

Ms Mable Kwan ] Commenter's representatives

Mr Edwin Choy ]

C3 - Chan Chun Hei

Mr Chan Chun Hei - Commenter

29. The Vice-chairman extended a welcome and invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

30. The representatives of Hung To Alliance and Fook Wan Mansion Concern Group requested that the total speaking time of 210 minutes allotted to them be divided among themselves. Noting that no objection was raised by other attendees, Members agreed to accede to their request.

R21 - 李懷

R107/R348 - 楊玉嬋

R112 - Yeung Wai Man

R137 - Wong Siu Lun, Keith

R165 - 關南玲

R193 - 李偉昆

R194 - 李富榮

R195 - 盧敏玲

R196 - 李家宏

R207 - 葉華昌

R219 - 羅順忠

R220 - 張桂蘭

R221 - 廖承恩

R240 - 楊允金

R243 - 許澤生

R245 - 許玄駿

C2 - 楊玉嬋及福運大廈關注組

31. Mr Yeung Wai Keung made the following main points:

- (a) while there was no objection to redevelopment under the previous KC-008 proposal (i.e. Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street Development Project (the withdrawn DP)), he objected to the current KC-008A proposal (i.e. the Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street Development Scheme (DS)) as it involved permanent closure of Chun Tin Street which was the major access for the residents of Fook Wan Mansion;
- (b) the proposed high-rise development in the DS with over 30 storeys would adversely affect Fook Wan Mansion in terms of air ventilation, sunlight penetration and access including emergency vehicular access (EVA);
- (c) at present, emergency vehicles could gain access to the entrance of Fook Wan Mansion directly from Chun Tin Street. Although a new vehicular turning area was proposed in the northern portion of the DS to provide access for the Site and the adjoining developments including Fook Wan Mansion, the vehicular turning area was small and its carriageway and pavements were narrow. Given that at least four fire engines were warranted in a fire-fighting operation, he worried if those



vehicles could access Fook Wan Mansion via the new vehicular turning area. The fire safety of Fook Wan Mansion would be jeopardised; and

- (d) Sung Chi Street was a narrow street with a width of only 7.3m. As there were several vehicle repair and timber workshops along the street, kerbside parking and loading/unloading activities were frequent. The road and carparking proposals, including widening of the southern section of Sung Chi Street, provision of a vehicular turning area and employment of a car lift system for the basement car park at the Site, would entail an increase in traffic flow and cause traffic congestion along Sung Chi Street.

R198 - 單國倡

R199 - 盧敏貞

R201 - Choy Chuk Nam

R202 - Chow Hui Yan

32. Mr Yu Chun Ning made the following main points:

- (a) the local residents did not object to redevelopment but to the proposed closure of Chun Tin Street as it would directly affect the existing access to/from Fook Wan Mansion and cause inconvenience to the residents;
- (b) URA should consider other options of redevelopment which would have the least impacts on the existing buildings and residents in the vicinity. Access to the existing buildings was not affected in other URA projects in the Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan;
- (c) despite that some members of the Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) and local residents had raised concerns over the current KC-008A proposal, URA insisted on proceeding with the DS and closure of Chun Tin Street;
- (d) an alternative proposal (KC-008B) involving the retention of Chun Tin

Street had been put forward by the local residents to demonstrate that the closure of Chun Tin Street was unnecessary but it was rejected by URA for insufficient data and assessments. However, as the local residents had limited resources, it was unfair to place the burden of collecting data and conducting assessments on them;

- (e) the underlying objective of incorporating Chun Tin Street into the DS was to increase the site area for development and hence gross floor area (GFA) and profit. It was estimated that the URA would gain a profit of about \$0.6 billion from the DS. One of the core values of URA was 'people-oriented'. URA was not a private property developer and should not carry out redevelopment projects for profit maximisation and at the expense of local residents;
- (f) residents in the surrounding would suffer from the adverse impacts of construction works of the DS which would last for about ten years;
- (g) the proposed high-rise development in the DS and the Ma Tau Wai Road/Chun Tin Street DP (the adjoining DP) would have adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion in terms of air ventilation, sunlight penetration and views, and would result in wall effect and urban heat island effect;
- (h) widening the southern section of Sung Chi Street would increase the traffic flow along the street. Benefit of the proposed street widening was doubtful;
- (i) URA had made a profit of about \$4.5 billion from various redevelopment projects during 2015 to 2016. Due to the participation of private developers in redevelopment projects, those private flats provided in URA's projects were all luxury flats not affordable by the general public. As illustrated in the example of Lee Tung Street, while a pedestrianised area was created upon redevelopment and closure of the street, the project had pushed up the flat price and shop rents in the

locality and displaced the local shops with up-market and chained shops. It was worried that the current DS, with the proposed closure of Chun Tin Street, would follow suit; and

- (j) the history, social network and sentiments of local communities should not be neglected during the planning and urban renewal processes. The closure of Chun Tin Street would have damaging effect on the history and memory of the street. URA should pay due respect to the views and aspirations of the local residents and consider reverting to the previous KC-008 proposal or adopting the alternative proposal put forth by the residents.

R84 - 楊曉東

R141 - 黃劍雄

R142 - 黃麗燕

R147 - 何崇志

R153 - 何寶琪

R183 - 陳春梅

R184 - 胡嘉恩

33. Mr Yeung Hiu Tung made the following main points:

*History of Chun Tin Street*

- (a) historically, Chun Tin Street and the adjoining areas fell within an area called Hok Yuen Kok in the Hung Hom District where two heavy industries, i.e. the Green Island Cement and Hok Yuen Power Station, were located and was mainly resided by 'hok' people and coolies;
- (b) the name 'Chun Tin Street' was given by a merchant and the street was gazetted as a private dead-end street in 1955. During the 1950s to 1980s, Chun Tin Street had been associated with crime and lawbreaking problems. However, since the mid-1980s, the crime problem had been

gradually improved due to increased patrolling by the police and installation of public infrastructures. There was also no known traffic accident along the street and it was a harmonious community;

- (c) after the building collapse incident at Ma Tau Wai Road in 2010 and the commencement of development at the adjoining DP, with the police patrol checkpoint at Fook Wan Mansion relocated, Chun Tin Street had again become disorderly, some local shops vacated, usage by heavy vehicles increased and illegal parking problem prevailed. The crux of the problems was lack of management by the Government. It was strange that those problems had not been mentioned in the withdrawn DP but only in the current DS;

[Mr H.W. Cheung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

*Resumption of Chun Tin Street*

- (d) according to the prevailing policy, URA would only be charged for a nominal premium of \$1,000 for an approved lease modification or land exchange proposal. In the present case, URA could resume Chun Tin Street at a premium of \$1,000 but in return benefit from a substantial increase in site area and GFA. It was unreasonable that URA was conferred with excessive power such that it could develop any land subject to a payment of a minimal premium;
- (e) while the residents of Fook Wan Mansion supported the previous KC-008 proposal gazetted in January 2015, it was subsequently withdrawn by URA in May 2016 without any justifications. The withdrawal of an URA project for including a public street in a republished DS was unprecedented. Substantial time and resources had been wasted in publishing the proposal and conducting public consultation. URA had also misled KCDC members by alleging that the previous proposal would proceed just two weeks before it was withdrawn;

- (f) it was illogical to use 'financial loss' as a justification for including Chun Tin Street in the DS as URA had made a huge profit of about \$4.5 billion during 2015 to 2016;
- (g) while the old buildings along both sides of Chun Tin Street were in deteriorating conditions, URA had once considered that a comprehensive redevelopment of the buildings along Chun Tin Street was undesirable as it would adversely affect the vehicular access to Fook Wan Mansion;
- (h) the disorder state of Chun Tin Street should not be a valid reason for resumption of the street. As the existing recycling and vehicle repair workshops along Chun Tin Street would be displaced upon redevelopment, the street environment would be significantly improved;
- (i) the presence of Chun Tin Street allowed sunlight to penetrate onto Fook Wan Mansion. Such sunlight penetration could not be expected from the new vehicular turning area in the DS, even with the provision of a building separation distance of 26m between Fook Wan Mansion and the proposed development;

*Transport Related Issues*

- (j) there was no public car park in the area except for the one at Bailey Street. The twelve existing metered parking spaces along Chun Tin Street were serving the needs of Fook Wan Mansion and the nearby residents. Upon closure of Chun Tin Street, those carparking spaces would be displaced and reprovisioned at various locations along Bailey Street, Hok Yuen Street and Gillies Avenue North which were farther away from Chun Tin Street causing inconvenience to the current users;
- (k) the proposed circulation in the vehicular turning area in the DS was in anti-clockwise direction and would create confusion to drivers. As

Sung Chi Street was frequently used by heavy vehicles and kerbside loading/unloading activities had been actively taking place, the vehicular turning area and widening of Sung Chi Street would result in traffic congestion and cause increased pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. As an alternative, consideration could be given to retaining Chun Tin Street and providing a turning head at its end, noting the car park entrance of the adjoining DP would also be at Chun Tin Street;

*Others*

- (l) the Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street site was previously earmarked for subsidized housing. URA should consider providing public or subsidised housing instead of private housing in the DS to alleviate the housing shortage problem;
- (m) URA should not undertake urban renewal of the area incrementally. The prolonged redevelopment process would result in adverse impacts on the local community in terms of traffic, environmental and social network lasting for a very long time; and

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (n) if the DS was approved, conditions should be imposed by the Board as and where appropriate.

R21 - 李懷

R107/R348 - 楊玉嬋

R112 - Yeung Wai Man

R137 - Wong Siu Lun, Keith

R165 - 關南玲

R193 - 李偉昆

R194 - 李富榮

R195 - 盧敏玲

R196 - 李家宏

R207 - 葉華昌

R219 - 羅順忠

R220 - 張桂蘭

R221 - 廖承恩

R240 - 楊允金

R243 - 許澤生

R245 - 許玄駿

C2 - 楊玉嬋及福運大廈關注組

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Hui Chak Sang made the following main points:

- (a) many of the local residents had expressed objection to the permanent closure of Chun Tin Street;
- (b) the construction works at the adjoining DP had already generated substantial noise nuisance and disturbance to the residents of Fook Wan Mansion. With the implementation of the current DS, the residents would suffer further from adverse impacts in terms of noise, air ventilation and fire safety;
- (c) he collected signatures from the residents of Fook Wan Mansion and 90% of the owners had jointly submitted an application for the Demand-led Redevelopment Project (Pilot Scheme)(Demand-led Scheme) to the URA but the application was not successful; and
- (d) he proposed an alternative scheme which involved the construction of an additional building at the new vehicular turning area in the DS, and the resumption and demolition of Fook Wan Mansion for open space to serve as a buffer area between the redevelopment and those existing residential buildings to the further north or as a connecting road between Sung Chi Street and Ma Tau Wai Road. Such alternative

scheme would benefit all stakeholders including URA, residents of Fook Wan Mansion and those existing residential buildings to the further north.

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Yeung Yuk Sim made the following main points:

- (a) she and her close relatives were all residents of Fook Wan Mansion;
- (b) they objected strongly to URA's proposal to close Chun Tin Street. They had sent letters to the Public Complaints Office of the Legislative Council (LegCo) to complain against URA and concerned government departments including the Fire Services Department (FSD), Environmental Protection Department (EPD), PlanD, Buildings Department (BD), Transport Department (TD), and Lands Department (LandsD) which were acting unreasonably and unfairly. It appeared that URA and the Government were having business collusion and had completely disregarded the problems and requests of the residents of Fook Wan Mansion;

*Fire Safety*

- (c) they were dissatisfied with FSD for not providing any valid comment on the fire safety aspect relating to Fook Wan Mansion. The future passage between the commercial podia of the DS and the adjoining DP was narrow and not wide enough for access by fire-fighting vehicles. The proposed development would put the nearby residents and business operators in danger in case of fire incidents;
- (d) Chun Tin Street was about 10m wide and should be retained as an EVA for the area;

*Environmental Impacts*



- (e) they were dissatisfied with EPD for not providing detailed comments on the environmental assessment (EA) submitted by URA. The potential adverse environmental impacts on Fook Wan Mansion were not included in the EA. It was questionable why Fook Wan Mansion was not identified as one of the noise sensitive receivers. Besides, no baseline study was conducted before project commencement;
- (f) no scientific data had been provided in the EA to demonstrate that there was no adverse environmental impact on the residents of Fook Wan Mansion. The findings relating to air and noise pollution were also not provided to the general public. The EA should be revised taking into account the potential environmental impacts on the residents of Fook Wan Mansion;

*Air Ventilation and Visual Impacts*

- (g) most of the building façade of Fook Wan Mansion would be blocked by the proposed development in the DS, which would create wall effect, cause visual impacts, and worsen air ventilation in the area;
- (h) while the DS with a maximum building height of 130mPD proposed by URA was not supported by PlanD, the current DS with a maximum building height of 120mPD would result in a larger site coverage, and thus the proposed building would be located closer to Fook Wan Mansion. The reduced building separation between Fook Wan Mansion and the proposed development would increase the overcasting effect and aggravate the visual impact on Fook Wan Mansion;
- (i) as the technical assessments submitted by URA had not fully addressed the adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion, it was questionable why the air ventilation and visual assessments were accepted by PlanD;

*Natural Lighting/Sunlight Penetration*

- (j) BD should provide detailed responses on the potential adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion in respect of natural lighting and sunlight penetration. BD had previously advised that the proposed extinguishment and inclusion of Chun Tin Street for site area and GFA calculation would contravene the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and that only windows facing a street with a width of not less than 4.5m could meet the requirement for provision of natural lighting. It was disappointing that BD now indicated that they would only provide detailed comments on those aspects at the design stage;
- (k) the use of curtain wall design for the commercial podium would cause serious sunlight reflection onto the buildings nearby, increase the heat in the area, and affect the privacy of the existing residents in the surrounding;

*Transport Related Issues*

- (l) the closure of Chun Tin Street was unnecessary and unreasonable and inclusion of the street for redevelopment was an excuse for maximizing profit for URA. It would destroy the local environment and affect the provision of transport facilities;
- (m) she was surprised that TD had no comment on the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by the URA. The parking utilisation survey was carried out by URA on 7.1.2016 when the construction work of the adjacent DP had just commenced and about 43% of the usage was generated from the construction site. The timing for the survey was inappropriate and the data collected was inaccurate as the parking spaces in the area had already been taken up by construction vehicles. Besides, conducting a parking survey for only one day was insufficient and undesirable;
- (n) according to the redevelopment proposals for the DS and the adjoining DP, there would be a 3-storey commercial podium along each side of

Chun Tin Street. The proposed provision of 15 carparking spaces for the retail uses at the two sites was insufficient;

- (o) based on the findings of the parking utilisation survey, the existing 12 carparking spaces at Chun Tin Street would be reprovisioned by seven on-street carparking spaces. Those reprovisioned spaces in Bailey Street and Gillies Avenue North were located far away from Fook Wan Mansion and would be for the use by both the local residents as well as the general public. As for the two existing on-street loading/unloading (L/UL) bays at Chun Tin Street, they would be deleted as URA claimed that they would not be required by the future businesses at the Site. The responses provided by URA were questionable and contradictory since, for example, supermarkets would also require L/UL facilities for delivery of goods. Such arrangement would result in heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) using the proposed vehicular turning area and Sung Chi Street for L/UL activities, thus overloading the road capacity and aggravating the traffic condition of the area. Moreover, as the vehicular turning area was located directly in front of Fook Wan Mansion, the vehicular access and pedestrian safety of the building would be adversely affected;
- (p) the proposed vehicular turning area was too small for heavy vehicles. If the turning area was to be enlarged, the current DS had to be amended and the proposed development might have to shift southwards towards Hok Yuen Street. The impact and implication of such amendment should be examined and addressed at an early stage, and the need and feasibility for the closure of Chun Tin Street should be reviewed;
- (q) TD's observation that the demand for lorry parking spaces in Hok Yuen Street was greater during night time was questionable. The existing carparking spaces at Chun Tin Street were often fully occupied and blockage of Chun Tin Street by HGVs was commonly found during day time. TD should re-assess the TIA report submitted by URA including

the need for the closure of Chun Tin Street, and provide more detailed comments in respect of the traffic impact of the DS;

*Management of the Vehicular Turning Area*

- (r) the vehicular turning area should not be a privately owned space. At present, the residents of Fook Wan Mansion were enjoying free access to/from Chun Tin Street which was a public street. It would be unreasonable to the residents if they had to pass through an area managed by URA to gain access to their own building or Sung Chi Street. Even though URA had committed to open the vehicular turning area for public use at all times, there would occasionally be maintenance work at the turning area thus affecting free access to and from Fook Wan Mansion; and
- (s) on behalf of the Yeung's family (R240) living in Fook Wan Mansion but was unable to attend the representation hearing, she said that local sentiments should be taken into account by the Board and Chun Tin Street should be retained as it formed part of the history and memories of the local residents.

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

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Siu Lun, Keith made the following main points:

- (a) he moved into Fook Wan Mansion in 2015. Since the commencement of construction works at the adjoining DP in 2016, Chun Tin Street had been subject to increased illegal parking, adverse air impact and hygiene problems due mainly to the lack of proper management. The vehicular access to Fook Wan Mansion was often blocked by HGVs serving the recycling workshops on Chun Tin Street. Moreover, the

noise generated by the construction works of the adjoining DP was a constant nuisance to the residents of Fook Wan Mansion. Complaints had been lodged to the LegCo, KCDC and the police but to no avail;

- (b) there was injustice in the planning and redevelopment process in the current case. While the bad management and poor conditions of Chun Tin Street were caused by URA, they were adopted as a justification to close Chun Tin Street and incorporate it into the DS;
- (c) the subject DS, which involved the closure of Chun Tin Street, the widening of Sung Chi Street and the provision of a new vehicular turning area, would not improve the living conditions of residents and the local environment but only facilitate the redevelopment projects and profit maximisation of URA;
- (d) the residents of Fook Wan Mansion only objected to the closure of Chun Tin Street but not the redevelopment of old buildings along the street. It was disappointing that URA had deployed tactics to exaggerate the conflict between the residents of the old buildings and Fook Wan Mansion during the public engagement exercise;
- (e) after completion of redevelopment on the Site and the adjoining DP, Fook Wan Mansion would have a building age of over 50 years. It was however uncertain if Fook Wan Mansion would still be considered eligible for redevelopment after the completion of those new developments in the surrounding. After all, the residents of Fook Wan Mansion were the only suffering group during the urban renewal process of the area;
- (f) Chun Tin Street should be retained as the street environment would be improved upon redevelopment after the recycling workshops were displaced. The local residents had prepared an alternative development proposal KC-008B that proposed to retain Chun Tin Street, and allow for a pedestrian/vehicular connection to link up Chun Tin Street and Sung

Chi Street. Such proposal would have the benefits of retaining the local shop character and improving the traffic condition of the area. Moreover, if Chun Tin Street was retained, implementation of the redevelopment of Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street could commence much earlier as the redevelopment was not subject to local objection;

- (g) the design of the new vehicular turning area would bring about inconvenience to the residents of Fook Wan Mansion. It was uncertain whether any lay-by would be provided at the vehicular turning area for Fook Wan Mansion. Moreover, the management responsibility of the proposed vehicular turning area had not yet been sorted out; and
- (h) the metered parking spaces along Chun Tin Street were currently used by the residents of Fook Wan Mansion as well as the general public. It was uncertain whether the car parking spaces within the DS would be opened for public use in the future.

37. Mr Lee Man Tung made the following main points:

- (a) after the building collapse incident in 2010, the residents of Fook Wan Mansion had supported the redevelopment of old buildings along Chun Tin Street. However, what those residents had in return was the proposed closure of Chun Tin Street by URA;
- (b) the increase in flat number and flat size under the current KC-008A proposal would lead to a substantial increase in traffic flow and cause traffic congestion in the area;
- (c) the main objective of including Chun Tin Street for redevelopment was profit maximization. It was believed that upon completion of the statutory planning process, the design of the proposed development at the DS would be changed to provide luxury housing; and
- (d) the closure of Chun Tin Street would bring about inconvenience to the

residents of Fook Wan Mansion in particular the elderly people.

38. Mr Yeung Wai Man made the following main points:

- (a) a memorial garden should be provided in the DS to memorialise the building collapse incident in 2010;
- (b) consideration should be given to providing subsidised housing and youth hostel facilities in the DS to meet the housing demand from the low-income people and the youth respectively; and
- (c) given the advancement in building technology, the proposed development in the DS would likely have a long lifespan, and thus its adverse impacts on the surrounding residents would last for a very long time.

39. Mr Yeung Hiu Tung made the following main points:

- (a) the Site fell within the boundary of the Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The social impact assessment (SIA) for the DS was misleading as it regarded the Site as locating in To Kwa Wan. The history and characteristics of the two districts were totally different;
- (b) during construction of the adjoining DP, Fook Wan Mansion had been subject to severe air, noise and vibration impacts as well as hygiene and mosquito problems;
- (c) given the tall podium of the proposed development in the DS and its proximity to Fook Wan Mansion, the noise and air emissions generated from the proposed development would have adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion;
- (d) the proposed vehicular turning area was located close to the entrance of Sung Kit Street which was a popular dining place. The turning area

would therefore cause increased conflict between vehicles and pedestrian; and adversely affect the traffic flow along Sung Chi Street and Hok Yuen Street resulting in traffic jams;

- (e) the provision of car parking spaces in the DS was inadequate. While the existing metered parking spaces along Chun Tin Street would be displaced, the reprovisioned spaces located at Bailey Street and Gillies Avenue North were not close to Chun Tin Street. Moreover, those parking spaces might be occupied by other local residents and not available to residents of Fook Wan Mansion. The addition of on-street parking spaces might also aggravate the traffic condition in the concerned areas;
- (f) although a new public space would be created in the DS, its use and function might be limited as there would be restrictions imposed on the opening hours and permitted activities. Moreover, after the greening and plantings were put in place, the actual width of the pedestrianized area might become very narrow;
- (g) after closure of Chun Tin Street, it was uncertain whether the address of Fook Wan Mansion, i.e. 'No. 25-25D, Chun Tin Street', would still be valid;
- (h) it was unfair that URA was empowered to resume Chun Tin Street at a low premium. Chun Tin Street represented the life, spirit and memory of the residents of Fook Wan Mansion and also Hung Hom District. Conservation of local history and culture should be a material planning consideration in assessing the redevelopment proposal;
- (i) resumption of Chun Tin Street was unnecessary. Not all dead-end street required closure to facilitate redevelopment. As shown in the case of Amoy Street in Wan Chai, a turning head could be provided at Chun Tin Street to facilitate vehicle turning. There were other dead-end streets in Hung Hom such as Sung On Street and Tsing Chau



Street, the traffic condition of which was not poor;

- (j) the DS with such a small area could not be regarded as a community redevelopment. Redevelopment of the Chun Tin Street area should be carried out comprehensively so as to achieve better planning and to minimise conflict between local residents;
- (k) urban renewal should be carried out to meet the needs of the local residents and to minimise adverse impacts on the local community. Local residents however no longer had trust in URA as the latter had broken its promise several times; and
- (l) Members should pay a site visit to Chun Tin Street in order to obtain a better understanding on the issues involved.

40. As the representers or their representatives had finished their oral submissions, the Chairman invited the commenters or their representatives to make their oral submission.

#### C1 – URA

41. Ms Mable Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) URA welcomed the support of some representers to the DS and would like to provide further elaboration on the objective and details of the proposed DS to address representers' concerns;

#### *Inclusion of Chun Tin Street*

- (b) the inclusion of the existing Chun Tin Street which was a dead-end road into the DS would allow better utilisation of land resources, and help to improve the living environment, traffic arrangement and pedestrian environment of the area;
- (c) after the closure of Chun Tin Street, part of the Site would be used for a

new vehicular turning area of 26m wide and a landscaped pedestrian precinct. The segregation between vehicles and pedestrians would improve the traffic and pedestrian safety of the area;

- (d) the construction of the new vehicular turning area together with the widening of the existing Sung Chi Street, which was an one-way road of about 5m wide, would facilitate the vehicular traffic of the area to access directly to Bailey Street in the north and Hok Yuen Street in the south. The proposed road improvement measures could cope with the increase in traffic flow generated by the future developments at the DS and the adjoining DP;
- (e) the TIA conducted in support of the DS demonstrated that there would be no adverse traffic impacts on the local road network with the implementation of proposed road improvement measures;

*Impact on Affected Owners/Residents*

- (f) URA had already engaged the affected owners/residents since the commencement of the DS and continuous liaisons with them were made regarding the progress of the project and compensation arrangements;
- (g) due to the unique situation that the DS had included the properties in the withdrawn DP (i.e. KC-008 proposal), URA would provide a series of special measures in addition to the prevailing compensation policies to address the needs of the affected owners/residents within the DS. More than 70% of the affected owners/residents had already accepted the acquisition proposal;
- (h) URA had held several meetings with Fook Wan Mansion Concern Group and Owners' Corporation of Fook Wan Mansion to address the residents' concerns. As compared with the URA's withdrawn DP (i.e. KC-008 proposal), the current DS proposing a new landscaped vehicular turning area in the northern part of the Site would allow a 26m separation distance

between the proposed development of the DS and Fook Wan Mansion. The DS would improve the living environment and enhance the pedestrian safety and connection of the area;

- (i) URA's proposal to take over the management and maintenance of the new vehicular turning area with a view to improving the local environment would be subject to further discussion with the concerned parties including LandsD; and

*Technical Assessments*

- (j) the concerns raised by the Owners' Corporation of Fook Wan Mansion and other representers were duly clarified and explained in the LegCo case conference held in February 2017. Various technical assessments including TIA and EA, which demonstrated that the proposed DS would have no adverse impacts on the surrounding area, were considered acceptable by the concerned departments.

C3 – Chan Chun Hei

42. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Chan Chun Hei made the following main points:

*Responses to PlanD's views*

- (a) in response to PlanD's view that the alternative development scheme submitted by R11 and R12 were not acceptable due to the lack of supporting technical assessments, he remarked that the representers were local organizations which did not have resources to conduct an area-wide traffic assessment. Notwithstanding the above, URA failed to respond to the queries on the accuracy of its own TIA as raised by a number of representers;
- (b) concerned parties should review the need for a new TIA to demonstrate

the feasibility of the proposed development before implementation of the DS;

- (c) although PlanD considered that the issue on rehousing arrangement of the affected owners/residents was not within the purview of the Board, URA should be requested to provide such information at the subject hearing to address the representers' concerns. Consideration should be given to provide an option for in-situ rehousing of the affected residents of the DS;

*Traffic Concerns*

- (d) URA's road improvement proposal which was confined to the widening of the section of Sung Chi Street within the boundary of the DS would not help to improve the existing traffic flow of the area. URA had not explained why the remaining section of Sung Chi Street was not included in the road widening proposal;
- (e) the widened pavement of about 5m with at-grade landscaping within the DS was insufficient to accommodate the pedestrian flow of the area. Alternatively, consideration might be given to retaining and grassing the existing Chun Tin Street so as to improve pedestrian circulation and walking environment;
- (f) the shared use of the new vehicular turning area and access road by the DS and the adjoining DP, together with the poor design of the proposed car parks which involved the use of car lifts with limited manoeuvring space, would result in the queueing back of vehicles to Hok Yuen Street, and hence aggravating the traffic congestion of the area. Relevant information of the TIA should be disclosed by URA to address the concern of local residents on adverse traffic impact;

*Others*

- (g) URA should explain the rationale for preparing the current Chun Tin

Street/Sung Chi Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) when the future development of the sites could be guided by the prevailing OZP;

- (h) the proposed DS would also affect the existing residents and business operators along Sung Chi Street. Compensation and re-provisioning arrangement for those affected residents/business operators should be worked out by URA;
- (i) there was a lack of information on the planning and development of other URA DPs, such as KC-009, KC-011 and KC-012, in the same district. Relevant information should be disseminated to facilitate the public to have a better understanding of the future developments of the district; and
- (j) the Board was urged to preserve the unique urban townscape of Hong Kong which was characterised by high-rise developments intermixed with low-rise/tenement buildings. The aspirations of the relevant stakeholders should be taken into account in the future planning of the community.

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

43. As the presentation from the Government's representatives, and the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session.

#### Closure of Chun Tin Street

44. Some Members raised the following questions to DPO/K, PlanD:
- (a) whether Chun Tin Street was a public street;
  - (b) what the major considerations were in assessing whether Chun Tin Street should be closed;
  - (c) whether the closure of Chun Tin Street would contravene the BO and result

in adverse impacts in terms of air ventilation, natural lighting and building separation; and

- (d) whether the address of Fook Wan Mansion would be changed after permanent closure of Chun Tin Street.

45. In response to Members' questions, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) Chun Tin Street was a public street. If the street was retained in the redevelopment proposal, it would serve as the north-south pedestrian and vehicular access for the existing and future developments alongside but the configuration of the DS site would become narrower. On the other hand, if Chun Tin Street was incorporated into the DS, a larger site for development would be resulted thus enabling the widening of Sung Chi Street and better integration with the proposed development at the adjoining DP. That would bring about improvements to pedestrian linkage and street environment, and facilitate the provision of a public open space between the two developments for public use;
- (b) while part of the vehicular turning area had not been included in the net site area for GFA calculation in the DS, URA had agreed to take up its management and appropriate conditions might be included in the concerned land lease stipulating that the vehicular turning area could be used by the public, including residents of Fook Wan Mansion and other adjoining developments;
- (c) for compliance with the natural lighting requirement of the BO, the concerned units should face a street of not less than 4.5m in width or an unobstructed space within its own site. In the current case, as the width of the carriageway in the new vehicular turning area was 7.3m, BD had confirmed that the natural lighting requirement under BO would be complied with for Fook Wan Mansion. The design of the vehicular turning area had complied with the relevant requirements for EVA and FSD

had no objection to the proposal; and

- (d) further discussion with the relevant government departments and the residents of Fook Wan Mansion on the future address of the building upon closure of Chun Tin Street would be required.

46. Some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of Fook Wan Mansion Concern Group:

- (a) what impacts of the DS and closure of Chun Tin Street were on the access arrangement for Fook Wan Mansion; and
- (b) what their comments were if the future management of the vehicular turning area and pedestrianized area in the DS were taken up by the Government.

47. In response to Members' questions, Mr Yeung Hiu Tung (R84) said that Chun Tin Street was providing a convenient vehicular and pedestrian access for Fook Wan Mansion as the lobby of the building was directly fronting onto Chun Tin Street. There was also an existing pedestrian linkage connecting the entrance of Fook Wan Mansion with Sung Chi Street to the east. As the proposed vehicular turning area and adjoining pedestrian precinct in the DS were narrow and not directly connected to the entrance of Fook Wan Mansion, the convenience of access to Fook Wan Mansion would be adversely affected by the closure of Chun Tin Street.

48. Ms Yeung Yuk Sim (R107/R348/C2) reiterated that the local residents' objection was against the incorporation of Chun Tin Street into the DS. She said that the residents' views on the management responsibility of the vehicular turning area and pedestrianised area would be subject to further discussion with other residents of Fook Wan Mansion.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

49. Some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of URA

(C1):

- (a) what public benefits would be brought about by closing Chun Tin Street;
- (b) whether the closure of Chun Tin Street would affect the accessibility to Fook Wan Mansion;
- (c) whether the character of the locality could be enhanced upon closure of Chun Tin Street and implementation of the DS; and
- (d) what experience from street closure in the other URA projects were.

50. In response to Members' questions, Ms Mable Kwan, representative of C1, made the following points:

- (a) Chun Tin Street was a dead-end street which was not convenient for vehicle turning and liable for conflict between vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Thus, it was proposed to include Chun Tin Street into the DS to allow for the provision of a vehicular turning area, pedestrianised walkway and open space for improving the traffic and access arrangements, pedestrian safety and connectivity, and integration with the adjoining DP. The inclusion of Chun Tin Street would also enable a better utilisation of land resources by increasing the provision of flats to meet the housing demand;
- (b) due consideration had been given to the accessibility of the surrounding developments in the planning and design of the DS. As such, a new vehicular turning area with pedestrian walkway on three sides had been proposed to improve the pedestrian linkage between Fook Wan Mansion and Ma Tau Wai Road and Hok Yuen Street. In response to the concerns of the residents of Fook Wan Mansion, the section of new pedestrian walkway fronting Fook Wan Mansion would be widened to 3m. As the maximum width of the pedestrianized area between the DS and the adjoining DP would be about 9m, it would also serve as an additional EVA for the adjoining developments if required;



- (c) upon approval of the planning concept in the DS including the closure of Chung Tin Street, details of the redevelopment including the retention of local character and the address of Fook Wan Mansion would be subject to further discussion with the local residents and the concerned government departments; and
- (d) there were precedent cases where public streets were included into URA's redevelopment projects in Lei Tung Street and Hai Tan Street such that the use of land could be optimised; more pedestrianised area and open space provided; and pedestrian linkages and the urban environment improved. In the current case, the inclusion of Chun Tin Street for development was also aimed at achieving the above objectives.

### Traffic Issues

51. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of URA (C1):

- (a) what access arrangements and carparking space provisions for the proposed developments at the DS and the adjoining DP were;
- (b) what rationales were for adopting a car lift system for the basement car park; and
- (c) why the section of pavement around the vehicular turning area and fronting Fook Wan Mansion as shown on Drawing H-4 was narrower than other sections.

52. In response, Ms Mable Kwan made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), 29 carparking spaces would be provided at the basement of

the adjoining DP which would be served by two car lifts. TD had accepted the TIA report for that development and the general building plan submission had been approved by the Building Authority. As for the subject DS, according to the preliminary scheme, 19 carparking spaces would be provided at the basement which would be served by a car lift, and a waiting space would also be provided on the ground level. The preliminary design for the access arrangement and car park had been accepted by TD;

- (b) in designing the access arrangement for the basement car park, one of the considerations was to optimise the use of space for ground floor shops in order to create a vibrant streetscape. If car ramps instead of a car lift system were adopted, much of the ground floor space would become occupied for internal circulation and the objective to optimise the use of ground floor space would be defeated. A car lift system for the basement car park was therefore adopted in the DS which was accepted by TD; and
- (c) all pavements around the vehicular turning area had complied with the minimum width requirement (i.e. 2.5m) stipulated by TD. The pavements would be widened as far as practicable after balancing the need for space from different users and the objective to enhance pedestrian connectivity. For the section fronting the adjoining DP, the pavement width was 4m while the section fronting Fook Wan Mansion would be widened from 2m (as shown on Drawing H-4) to 3m in response to the request of the residents.

53. The Vice-chairman and some Members had the following questions to DPO/K, PlanD:

- (a) whether the TIA for the DS had taken into account other development and redevelopment proposals in the vicinity;
- (b) what the traffic impact of the proposed development was;

- (c) whether assessment of traffic flow at the new vehicular turning area had been carried out;
- (d) what the L/UL arrangement for the proposed development in the DS was; and
- (e) what the reprovisioning arrangement for the existing metered parking spaces along Chun Tin Street was.

54. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following points with the aid of the visualiser and some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the design year of 2028 was assumed in the TIA conducted by URA's consultant. The traffic related to any development/redevelopment completed before 2028 including the DS and the adjoining DP had already been taken into account in the assessment. According to the TIA report, the trips generated/attracted by the DS during the morning and afternoon peaks would be 52 Passenger Car Unit (PCU)/hour and 42 PCU/hour respectively. Based on these assumptions, the six critical junctions in the vicinity would have spare capacity to accommodate the increase in traffic flow in the design year. As such, the TIA concluded that the proposed development would not cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas;
- (b) the TIA had focused on traffic impact at major road junctions. The traffic flow along Sung Chi Street and at its junction with Hok Yuen Street and Bailey Street in year 2028 had been assessed in the TIA taking into account the traffic related to the developments in the DS and the adjoining DP. The traffic flow at the proposed vehicular turning area in the DS had not been separately assessed in the TIA;
- (c) while there was no HGV L/UL facility within the DS, a L/UL bay for HGV would be provided on the ground floor of the development in the adjoining DP. A swept path analysis regarding the manoeuvring of HGV within that

development had been carried out and included in the TIA report, and the findings were considered acceptable by TD; and

- (d) according to the survey result on the utilisation of metered parking spaces and L/UL facilities submitted by URA, about 43% of the metered parking spaces along Chun Tin Street was being used by the residents and business operators at the Site and the construction site of the adjoining DP. Based on such utilisation rate, it was proposed that five of the 12 existing metered parking spaces would not need to be reprovisioned as there would be car parks within the DS and the adjoining DP to serve the new developments. The remaining seven metered parking spaces would be reprovisioned on-street at Bailey Street (4 spaces), Hok Yuen Street (2 spaces) and Gillies Avenue North (1 space).

55. Ms Ma Suen Fong (R166) said that Sung Chi Street was very narrow and the proposed widening of its southern section to a dual carriageway was not feasible. She urged Members to visit the Site for better understanding of the problem.

#### Adverse Impacts on Fook Wan Mansion

56. A Member asked why Fook Wan Mansion had not been taken into account in the EA submitted by URA. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that potential environmental impacts during construction and operation of the DS had been assessed in the EA in accordance with the requirements of the relevant pollution control ordinances. For the construction stage, the EA focused on the environmental impacts brought about by construction works and proposed mitigation measures to alleviate the impacts including provision of noise mitigation measures, regulation on the operational time of construction machines, watering of construction vehicles and covering up of construction materials. Fook Wan Mansion had been included in that part of the assessment and the findings were accepted by EPD. Mr Yip continued to say that for the operation stage, the EA focused on whether the proposed development would be subject to insurmountable environmental impacts. In this regard, the EA had demonstrated that the residents of the proposed development would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts in terms of noise and air quality. Ms Mable Kwan, representative of C1, supplemented that the EA was conducted in accordance with the

relevant guidelines of EPD.

57. Noting that the proposed development in the previous KC-008 proposal was located even closer to Fook Wan Mansion, the Vice-chairman asked the representatives of Fook Wan Mansion Concern Group if they had any comments on that proposal from the natural lighting and air ventilation points of view. Mr Yeung Hiu Tung said that under the KC-008 proposal, Chun Tin Street would be retained thus enabling the natural lighting be directed onto the southern façade of Fook Wan Mansion. Thus, the local residents did not object to the previous proposal. With the closure of Chun Tin Street in the current DS, the proposed development would block the sunlight from penetrating into Fook Wan Mansion and was therefore objected to. Mr Lee Man Tung said that since requirements had been stipulated in the Deed of Mutual Covenant to make certain areas within Fook Wan Mansion accessible to the general public, natural lighting and air ventilation were not an issue even for those flats locating on the lower floors. If Chun Tin Street was to be closed, the natural lighting and air ventilation conditions would deteriorate.

58. Some Members raised the following question to the representatives of URA (C1):

- (a) whether the structure and condition of Fook Wan Mansion had been adversely affected by the construction works in the surrounding; and
- (b) whether fire engines could access Fook Wan Mansion vide the new vehicular turning area.

59. In response to Members' questions, Ms Mable Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) upon inspection by BD and URA's contractors, it was confirmed that the structure of Fook Wan Mansion had not been adversely affected by the construction work at the adjoining DP. Nonetheless, in response to the concerns of the residents, free assistance and support including the provision of building repair and stabilisation services had been offered to Fook Wan Mansion by URA's contractors. URA would keep monitoring the impact of the construction works on the building, maintain close liaison

with the residents, and offer assistance to them as and when necessary; and

- (b) given the vehicular turning area had an overall width of 26m with a carriageway of 7.3m wide, fire engines should be able to access Fook Wan Mansion for fire-fighting purpose. As compared with Chun Tin Street, the interfacing area between the vehicular turning area and Fook Wan Mansion had increased which covered most of the southern façade of the building. In cases of fire, while access to the external walls of a building by fire engines was essential, fire-fighting operations would also be carried out within the building. FSD had no objection to the DS and the vehicular turning area from the provision of EVA perspective.

“Residential (Group A)7” (“R(A)7”) Zone

60. Some Members raised the following questions to DPO/K, PlanD:

- (a) what considerations for determining and assessing the development intensity for the “R(A)7” zone were; and
- (b) the boundary and area of private lots within the “R(A)7” zone.

61. In response to Members’ questions, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following points with the aid of the visualiser and some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) part of the Site was previously zoned “R(A)” on the Hung Hom OZP prior to its incorporation into the subject DSP. Development or redevelopment within the “R(A)” zone was subject to a maximum total plot ratio (PR) of 9 and a maximum domestic PR of 7.5. In assessing the proposed development intensity under the URA’s proposal, considerations would be given to its compatibility with the surrounding developments, and the impacts of the proposed development in terms of visual, landscape, environmental, traffic and infrastructural capacity; and
- (b) in the current case, the gross site area of the DS was 2,475m<sup>2</sup>. The area

delineated by a red dotted line on Drawing H-8, which included the private lots resumed by URA and part of Chun Tin Street that would be closed and included in the DS for development, was the net area (1,636m<sup>2</sup>) which had been adopted for calculation of GFA in the DS. The area of Chun Tin Street that would become the vehicular turning area (shown as grey hatched area on Drawing H-8), part of Sung Chi Street and the pedestrian pavement on Government land had been excluded from the net site area for GFA calculation. The proposed development intensity was considered acceptable by relevant government departments.

62. Another Member asked DPO/K, PlanD whether the existing recycling business affected by development could be reprovisioned in the DS. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that uses related to recycling activities were not permitted within the subject “R(A)7” zone. Those recycling business should be suitably channelled to other locations such as within the industrial buildings in Hung Hom and To Kwa Wan, taking into account their own operational requirements and financial situation. At the territorial level, EPD had been offering assistance and support to the recycling industry including the identification of dedicated temporary or short-term sites for their operations.

#### Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space

63. A Member asked DPO/K, PlanD what criteria were used for determining the provision of GIC facilities in URA’s projects. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that in general, the provision of GIC facilities was assessed based on the existing and planned population in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and in consultation with the relevant government departments. For the Hung Hom District, the provision of major GIC facilities was generally sufficient. That said, the Director of Social Welfare had provided a ‘wish list’ of specific social welfare facilities (including residential care home and activity centres for the elderly; integrated vocational rehabilitation service centre; care and attention home/hostels for persons with various physical and mental disabilities; hostel for single persons; integrated family service centre etc.) for inclusion in the various URA projects in the area. Noting that the relevant social welfare facilities and Government uses were always permitted in the “R(A)” zone, URA would be invited to consider incorporating the said GIC facilities in their projects in the area at the detailed design stage taking into account the design

requirements stipulated in the HKPSG.

64. Some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of URA (C1):

- (a) whether any facilities for the elderly would be provided in the DS; and
- (b) what types of activities would be permitted in the public open space.

65. In response to Members' questions, Ms Mable Kwan made the following points:

- (a) in order to cater for the needs of the elderly of the locality, a floor space of about 1,000m<sup>2</sup> for community facilities and a ground floor public open space with an area of 500m<sup>2</sup> had been provided in the adjoining DP. Due to the site constraint and proximity to the adjoining DP, no GIC facilities would be provided in the subject DS. Nevertheless, given that GIC uses were always permitted within the "R(A)" zone, opportunity would be taken to providing more GIC facilities in other URA projects in the district in consultation with the concerned government departments; and
- (b) the proposed public open space was intended for use by the local community. The uses and activities permitted thereon would be subject to detailed planning and design. In this regard, URA would solicit views from the stakeholders which would be suitably reflected in its design and management.

#### Design of the Proposed Scheme

66. Some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of URA (C1):

- (a) whether underground recycling facilities could be provided in the proposed development;



- (b) whether additional basement levels would be considered in the DS to provide more carparking and GIC facilities;
- (c) whether consideration had been given to linking up the basements of the two developments in the subject DS and the adjoining DP;
- (d) why a shopping mall was provided in the DS; and
- (e) what the rationales were for curtain wall design of the podium development.

67. In response to Members' questions, Ms Mable Kwan made the following points:

- (a) the provision of underground recycling facilities was a relatively new concept and its feasibility would be subject to further examination. That said, the implementation of smart building design which involved recycling of waste-water and energy saving were being considered in URA's projects;
- (b) given the funding for URA's projects was from the public purse and the construction cost for basements was relatively high, the design of the proposed development including the provision of basement should aim at cost-effective design. In the current DS, the proposed carparking provision was in line with the requirement under the HKPSG and had been agreed by TD. Further increase in provision of carparking spaces might also entail an increase in traffic flow and potential traffic impact;
- (c) there was currently no plan to link up the basements of the two developments as the DS and the adjoining DP were two separate projects and would be covered by separate land leases. Moreover, the implementation programme of the two projects were at different stages and construction at the adjoining DP was more advanced with the foundation of the basement works already completed;

- (d) the Site was zoned “R(A)7” on the DSP within which commercial uses were always permitted in the lowest three floors of a building. It was the intention to develop the Site for a commercial cum residential development. In order to create a vibrant streetscape and to improve the pedestrian environment, shops would be provided on the ground level of the commercial podium as far as possible. Appropriate conditions would be stipulated in the future design brief of the proposed development; and
- (e) with a view to improving visual permeability, a curtain wall design had been considered as an option for the podium development as shown in the drawings submitted. Nonetheless, the current proposal was only a preliminary schematic design which would be subject to further refinement at the detailed design stage. In order to ease the representers’ concerns in relation to privacy and reflection of light, URA would further liaise with the residents of Fook Wan Mansion and consider imposing restrictions on the use of materials for the building façades.

68. Some Members asked DPO/K, PlanD whether the current proposal could be further amended and whether the design of the DS would be subject to further scrutiny by the Board. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the main consideration on the DSP should focus on whether its zoning and development intensity were appropriate. If the “R(A)7” zoning of the Site was upheld, the DSP would be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council for approval. The design of the DS would not be subject to further scrutiny by the Board. Since URA had proposed a number of design concepts in the DS which were supported by the relevant government department, the corresponding design requirements including the width of the vehicular turning area and the building set-backs would be suitably incorporated into the land grant documents. PlanD would also follow up with URA on those issues of concern by the Board and the local residents during the detailed design stage.

#### Subsidised Housing

69. The Vice-chairman asked the representatives of URA (C1) whether there had been proposal to provide subsidised housing on the Site. In response, Ms Mable Kwan said that she was not aware of any proposal for subsidized housing on the Site. According to

URA's policy, its redevelopment projects would only provide for private commercial and/or residential uses. Whether subsidised housing would be included in URA's projects was a policy issue that should be subject to consideration by the concerned bureaux and government departments.

#### Redevelopment of Fook Wan Mansion

70. A Member asked whether URA had held any discussion with the residents of Fook Wan Mansion regarding the Demand-led Scheme. In response, Ms Mable Kwan said that she was aware of any such discussion. That said, since the implementation of the Demand-led Scheme in 2011, redevelopment initiatives from building owners would be assessed by URA against a set of considerations and selection criteria. Those owners might also participate in URA's Facilitating Services (Pilot Scheme) under which URA would provide assistance to owners through facilitation service to help them assemble titles for joint sale.

#### Alternative Proposals

71. A Member asked the representatives of URA to provide comments on the alternative development proposals, i.e. the KC-008B proposal and the proposal submitted by R11 and R12. In response, Ms Mable Kwan said that under the KC-008B proposal, Chun Tin Street was to be retained and hence Sung Chi Street could not be widened and would remain as a one-way street. As such, the increase in traffic resulting from the redevelopment projects would likely overload Sung Chi Street and a bottleneck at the junction of Sung Chi Street/Bailey Street might be created. Moreover, under that alternative proposal, the configuration of the DS site would be less desirable and the development thereon would be closer to Fook Wan Mansion resulting in potential greater visual impact. In view of the above, the proposal under KC-008B had not been taken on board by URA. Ms Kwan further said that for the proposal submitted by R11 and R12, similar to the KC-008B proposal, the local traffic condition would not be improved given that Chun Tin Street was retained and Sung Chi Street could not be widened.

#### Social Impact Assessment

72. A Member asked the representatives of URA whether it was appropriate to describe the Site locating in To Kwa Wan rather than Hung Hom in the SIA. In response, Ms Mable Kwan said that the SIA had clearly stated that the Site fell within the boundary of the Hung Hom OZP. That said, the character and living environment of the Site were closer to those of To Kwa Wan which consisted mainly of old tenement buildings, rather than Hung Hom where public and private housing estates were also found. To describe more accurately the characteristics of the Site, reference in the context of To Kwa Wan was made in the SIA.

73. As Members had no further questions, the Vice-chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations in the absence of all representers/commenters or their representatives and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Vice-chairman thanked the representers/commenters and their representatives and the Government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

74. Members noted that it was late in the day and agreed to hold the deliberation session on a later date.

75. The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.