

CONFIDENTIAL

[downgraded on 25.8.2017]

**Minutes of 1148th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 4.8.2017**

Agenda Item 4

[Closed Meeting]

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.]

Deliberation Session

6. The meeting noted that, other than the minutes of meeting, the video recording of the hearing session held on 15.6.2017 was sent to Members on 16.7.2017.

7. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests on the item, as shown on the visualizer, was reported in the minutes of the meeting on 15.6.2017. The declaration of interests on the item was as follows :

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a non-executive director of Urban
(*as Director of Planning*) Renewal Authority (URA), and a member of
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 Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with URA and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM)
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Cheung Kong Holdings Limited for the URA Peel Street/Graham Street project and AECOM
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA and past business dealings with AECOM
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firms having current business dealings
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] with URA
- Mr Philip S.L. Kan] being a director of the Board of the Urban
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung] Renewal Fund of URA
- Professor S.C. Wong] having current business dealings with AECOM
(*Vice-Chairperson*)]
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai]
- Dr C.H. Hau]
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with URA
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with AECOM
- 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

8. Members noted that Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Thomas O.S. Ho, K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai, Dr C.H. Hau and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since the interest of Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee, Patrick H.T. Lau, Ivan C.S. Fu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon were direct, the meeting agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members agreed that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Dr F.C. Chan could stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project or their properties did not have a direct view of the representation site. Members also noted that Mr Franklin Yu and Ms Christina M. Lee had not yet arrived to join the meeting and their interest were indirect.

[Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee, Patrick H.T. Lau, Ivan C.S. Fu, Sunny L.K. Ho, Stephen H.B. Yau, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

9. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background as follows :

- (a) the draft URA Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 28.10.2016, a total of 348 representations and 8 comments were received. Among the 348 representations, nine indicated support for redevelopment in general, 337 opposed and two provided views/expressing concerns;
- (b) the DSP area was zoned “Residential (Group A)7” (“R(A)7”) subject to a maximum total plot ratio (PR) of 9, a maximum domestic PR of 7.5 and a maximum building height (BH) of 120mPD; and
- (c) the hearing session of representations/comments on the draft URA Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DSP was held on 15.6.2017.

10. The Secretary then went through the major points made by the representers and commenters in their written and oral submission, and the responses of relevant government departments.

Supportive Representations and Comments

11. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters supported redevelopment in general as the existing buildings were in dilapidated conditions and the redevelopment would increase the housing supply and improve environment of the area. Nonetheless, they considered in-situ re-provisioning of local shops and local re-housing should be arranged prior to redevelopment so that local character could be retained. The supportive grounds had been noted by relevant government departments.

Adverse Representations and Comments

Type of Housing

12. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following points on the housing type to be provided under the DSP:

- (a) They opposed high-density residential development and considered that the new flats were unaffordable for the local residents and would push up rents and displace the current residents;
- (b) public and subsidized housing and/or affordable private housing should be built instead. Consideration should also be given to development of youth hostel; and
- (c) URA (C1), the project proponent, stated that under the current government policies, URA could only redevelop for commercial/residential development for sale in the private market.

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

- (a) there was no restriction under the DSP on the type of housing and URA had indicated that small to medium size flats would be provided for the private market; and

- (b) the proposed maximum PR and BH were the same as the previous “R(A)” zone for the site and other “R(A)” zones in the OZP. The development scheme was generally in line with the planning intention of “R(A)” zone and would facilitate redevelopment of old buildings in dilapidated conditions to improve the living environment.

[Ms Christina M. Lee and Dr Wilton W.T. Fok arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Inclusion of Chun Tin Street

14. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to the inclusion of Chun Tin Street into the DSP:

- (a) the closure and inclusion of Chun Tin Street for development was not in the public interest but simply for increasing URA’s profit;
- (b) inclusion of the street would increase development scale and population which would lead to traffic congestion and pedestrian/vehicular conflicts;
- (c) the proposed vehicular turning area was small and its carriageway and pavements were narrow. Chun Tin Street should be retained as an emergency vehicular access (EVA) for the area;
- (d) the current street conditions could be improved by closing down the recycling shops and regulating illegal parking;
- (e) closure of the Chun Tin Street would affect the local residents, livelihood of the local elderly, social network, production chain, recycling shops, and hence prospect of the recycling industry;
- (f) inclusion of Chun Tin Street for site area and gross floor area (GFA) calculation would contravene the Buildings Ordinance (BO); and

- (g) URA stated that the inclusion of Chun Tin Street would allow better utilization of land resources to address the housing demand. The extended site would also provide opportunity for improvement of the existing road and pedestrian network. It was currently inconvenient for vehicles to exit/enter Chun Tin Street, causing pedestrian safety and traffic management problems. The proposed scheme would utilize the space of the street for pedestrian passageway and building setbacks and thereby improve pedestrian safety and traffic conditions. The new vehicular turning area with pedestrian walkways would improve the pedestrian linkage and serve as EVA. In response to local concerns, the pedestrian walkway fronting Fook Wan Mansion would be further widened to 3m and the width of the pedestrianized area between the site and the adjoining Development Project (DP) would be about 9m.

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

- (a) The expanded site area would offer opportunity to improve the existing road network and pedestrian environment, and concerned departments had no objection to the closure of Chun Tin Street and inclusion of the street in the site area;
- (b) the recycling business should be suitably channelled to other locations such as within the industrial buildings in the area; and
- (c) at the detailed design stage, Buildings Department would examine the submitted building plans in accordance with BO.

Impacts on Fook Wan Mansion

16. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to impacts on Fook Wan Mansion :

- (a) the technical assessments submitted by URA did not fully reflect the

adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion;

- (b) the closure of Chun Tin Street would affect the vehicular access and EVA to Fook Wan Mansion. The proposed vehicular turning area and adjoining pedestrian precinct were narrow and not directly connected to the entrance of Fook Wan Mansion;
- (c) the vehicular turning area and multiple car park entrances in front of Fook Wan Mansion would affect pedestrian safety and cause noise and air pollution;
- (d) the Government should take up management of the new road to reduce the running cost and allow more effective control on illegal parking;
- (e) the structure of Fook Wan Mansion might be affected during construction. Mosquito and noise from the construction site of redevelopments nearby had already caused nuisance;
- (f) the larger scale redevelopment including Chun Tin Street would affect air ventilation, sunlight penetration and views of Fook Wan Mansion;
- (g) the use of curtain wall design for the commercial podium would cause sunlight reflection onto the buildings nearby, increase the heat in the area, and affect the privacy of the existing residents in the surrounding;
- (h) URA had responded that :
 - (i) the structure of Fook Wan Mansion had not been affected by the construction work at the adjoining DP. Nonetheless, free assistance/support including building repair and stabilisation services had been offered to residents of Fook Wan Mansion. URA would keep monitoring the impact of the construction works; and

- (ii) curtain wall was only a preliminary schematic design subject to further refinement at the detailed design stage.

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

- (a) URA had submitted technical assessments to support the Development Scheme (DS) and concerned departments had no adverse comment;
- (b) the proposed vehicular turning area with a width of 26m and a carriageway of 7.3m would comply with the EVA requirements under the BO;
- (c) the vehicular turning area would be for public use, and managed and maintained by URA and appropriate conditions might be included in the concerned land lease. A pedestrian passageway would be designated along the existing Chun Tin Street;
- (d) Fook Wan Mansion was included in the environmental assessment (EA) and the findings had been accepted by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP). With implementation of mitigation measures, the environmental impacts during construction would be minimised. Besides, environmental impacts were subject to control of the relevant pollution control ordinances; and
- (e) according to URA's air ventilation assessment, Chun Tin Street was not a major air path. Measures including a 26m-wide building separation from Fook Wan Mansion were proposed to enhance air ventilation and minimise visual impact.

Traffic and Transport Matters

18. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to traffic and transport matters:

- (a) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) was questionable as it had not fully taken the real situation into account. Traffic flows and traffic impact might have been underestimated;
- (b) the redevelopment and road proposals would increase traffic flow and cause pedestrian/vehicular conflicts. The capacity of the surrounding road system could not handle the additional traffic;
- (c) the widened pavement of about 5m with at-grade landscaping at Sung Chi Street was insufficient to accommodate the pedestrian flow of the area;
- (d) the widening of Sung Chi Street from one-way to two-way would have adverse impact on the existing pedestrian environment and the operation of some business which required frequent on-street loading/unloading (L/UL) of heavy goods vehicles (HGV);
- (e) the proposed 15 car parking spaces for the retail uses at the site and adjoining DP was insufficient. The reprovisioning of only 7 out of 12 existing metered car parking spaces displaced from Chun Tin Street was not justified and the reprovisioned spaces were far away from Fook Wan Mansion and would be open for the use by the public;
- (f) it was proposed to connect the two basement car parks within the site and adjoining DP to minimize impact on the local shops. A car park design without car lift would save maintenance cost and avoid changes to the existing traffic arrangement;
- (g) no provision of HGV L/UL bays in the redevelopment would result in illegal parking of delivery vehicles;
- (h) URA had responded that :
 - (i) all pavements around the vehicular turning area had complied with the minimum width of 2.5m as required by the Transport

Department (TD) and would be further widened to 3m in response to the request of local residents;

- (ii) the TIA report (including the reprovisioning arrangement for the metered parking) was accepted by the Government. There would be 29 car parking spaces provided at the adjoining DP while an underground car park with 19 ancillary car parking spaces would be provided in the site in accordance with the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG); and
- (iii) there was currently no plan to link up the two basements as they were under two separate projects and covered by separate land leases. The implementation programme of the two projects were also at different stages and construction at the adjoining DP was more advanced.

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

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

- (a) the TIA had taken into account the traffic of all developments completed before 2028 and demonstrated that the critical junctions in the vicinity would have spare capacity to accommodate the increase in traffic flow;
- (b) the TIA had concluded that there would be no adverse traffic impacts with the implementation of the proposed road improvement measures;
- (c) L/UL bays for light goods vehicles would be provided on the widened Sung Chi Street and a L/UL bay for HGV would be provided in the adjoining DP; and
- (d) based on the utilisation rate obtained in the survey submitted by URA, five of the 12 metered parking spaces would not need to be reprovisioned.

The remaining seven metered parking spaces would be reprovisioned at nearby streets. TD considered that the reprovisioning arrangement had already taken into account the parking demand of the area.

Open Space and Community Facilities

20. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to open space and community facilities :

- (a) there was insufficient open space and community facilities in the area. Sports ground and/or other recreation facilities and Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities should be provided; and
- (b) URA had stated that about 1,000m² for community facilities was reserved in the adjoining DP and there was a planned neighbourhood elderly centre of around 450m² in the Kai Ming Street DP.

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

- (a) local open space would be provided in accordance with HKPSG. The current provision of open space in Kowloon City had met the HKPSG standard;
- (b) provision of GIC facilities was assessed in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and relevant departments. For the Hung Hom District, the provision of major GIC facilities was generally sufficient; and
- (c) URA would be invited to consider including more GIC facilities in its projects at the detailed design stage.

Type of Commercial Uses

22. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters considered the redevelopment would replace the small local shops with large shopping centres and chain stores that lacked variety and character, and not affordable to the local residents. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had responded that there was no restriction on the types of shops to be provided as long as they complied with the Notes of the DSP. URA had indicated that shops would be provided at street level in the commercial podium as far as possible to create a vibrant street environment.

Social and Community Network

23. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters considered URA would redevelop up-market flats and shops which would not be affordable and would uproot the local community network. Hence, local characteristics and sense of neighbourhood would be lost. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had made the following responses :

- (a) the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) conducted by URA had revealed that about 50% of owners and 30% of tenant households considered that there would be positive/no impact on social network. The social service team of URA would provide advice on compensation, rehousing and identification of replacement premises for affected businesses and on tenancy matters; and
- (b) URA should be invited to further consult the relevant stakeholders and the community on the compensation and rehousing arrangements.

Public Consultation and Engagement

24. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to public consultation and engagement:

- (a) the previous Chun Tin Street/Sung Chi Street DP was withdrawn

disregarding the normal consultation procedures. URA failed to involve the public during the planning process; and

- (b) URA had not incorporated into the proposed scheme the public views/objections collected, including local rehousing and reasonable compensation, and minimizing impact on local people.

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

- (a) URA had duly followed the public consultation procedures set out under the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance, Urban Renewal Strategy and the Town Planning Ordinance to implement the project; and
- (b) URA had engaged the affected residents/tenants regarding the progress of the project and compensation arrangements.

Implementation, Compensation and Acquisition

26. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points relating to implementation, compensation and acquisition:

- (a) URA should adopt 'people first' and 'bottom-up' approach. There should be 'flat for flat' and 'shop for shop' arrangement, local rehousing and/or public housing for the affected residents. The compensation provided by URA was unreasonable and the acquisition process was unjust;
- (b) affected residents should be settled before redevelopment and phased redevelopment should be considered;
- (c) URA should adopt the development strategy suggested in the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum Study to create a diverse community, but it failed to consider the current local situation in population mix and housing needs;

- (d) in response, URA had stated that :
- (i) subject to government approval, URA could provide “flat for flat” rehousing as an alternative to money compensation. URA, Hong Kong Housing Authority and Hong Kong Housing Society would prioritize providing nearby vacant public estate units for local rehousing. URA currently did not have the policy for “shop for shop” arrangements; and
 - (ii) URA was proceeding with area planning study using a district-based renewal approach to improve the district holistically through local community planning and redevelopment.

27. The meeting also noted that the issues of phased redevelopment, compensation, rehousing and feasibility of reprovisioning of small street shops should be addressed by URA under their existing policies and were outside the ambit of the Ordinance and purview of the Board.

Representers/Commenter’ Proposals

28. The meeting noted that some representers and a commenter had made the following proposals:

- (a) to rezone the site to “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Chun Tin Street Phased Redevelopment Project” and redevelop the site together with the adjoining DP while retaining Chun Tin Street. Under that proposal, two residential/commercial blocks could be constructed at the adjoining DP site and one residential/commercial block at the site with the provision of community facilities, open space, pedestrian connection. It could be implemented as a phased redevelopment with the adjoining DP to be developed first to provide rehousing for residents and reprovision business operators (R11 and R12);
- (b) to construct an additional building at the proposed vehicular turning area,

and demolish Fook Wan Mansion for open space to serve as a buffer area for the adjacent residential buildings or to provide a connecting road between Sung Chi Street and Ma Tau Wai Road (R243); and

(c) to retain Chun Tin Street and allow a 10m-wide pedestrian/vehicular connection abutting Fook Wan Mansion between Chun Tin Street and Sung Chi Street (R233 to R236 and C2).

(d) in response, URA had stated that :

(i) if Chun Tin Street was retained, Sung Chi Street could not be widened and had to remain as a one-way street. The increased traffic would likely overload Sung Chi Street. The configuration of the site without inclusion of Chun Tin Street would be narrower and the development would be closer to Fook Wan Mansion resulting in greater visual impact; and

(ii) 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.

29. The meeting also noted that the relevant government departments had responded that the proposed inclusion of Chun Tin Street into the DS would offer opportunity to improve the road network, facilitate better environment for pedestrian and integration with the adjoining DP as well as allow better utilization of land resources to provide more flats.

30. After going through the major grounds and issues, Members generally noted that the major concerns from the representers and commenters were relating to the closure of Chun Tin Street and the potential adverse impacts on Fook Wan Mansion, there were also various alternative proposals put forward by the representers/commenters. The Vice-Chairperson then invited Members to express their views.

31. Members in general agreed with the proposed closure and inclusion of Chun Tin Street into the DS on the grounds that (i) Chun Tin Street was a dead-end street. Its

inclusion into the DS could improve the living environment, traffic arrangement and pedestrian environment; (ii) the expanded site area would offer opportunity to improve the building design, land use mix, green coverage, as well as allowing a better utilization of land resources; (iii) taking the Lee Tung Street redevelopment scheme as an example, redevelopment had brought improvement to the pedestrian environment, created a vibrant streetscape, benefitting the nearby residents; (vi) it was currently inconvenient for vehicles to exit/enter Chun Tin Street causing pedestrian safety and traffic management problems.

32. The Vice-Chairperson and a Member suggested that the URA should consider the urban renewal strategy for the Kowloon City/To Kwa Wan district in a holistic manner as it was an old urban district with many existing buildings in dilapidated conditions. A more comprehensive planning approach should be adopted for redeveloping the site and its surrounding area, including the adjoining Fook Wan Mansion as well as other old buildings in the vicinity.

33. Regarding Chun Tin Street and the concerns of Fook Wan Mansion residents, the Vice-Chairperson and some Members made the following points/suggestions:

- (a) the existing residents' right of access should be respected;
- (b) pedestrian walkway in front of Fook Wan Mansion should be further widened as far as possible to ensure a proper entrance to the building;
- (c) the feasibility of adding a lay-by at the vehicular turning area near the entrance of Fook Wan Mansion should be explored for their convenience;
- (d) to further widen the space between the site and the adjoining DP and maintain it as a pedestrianized street in recognition of the history and memory of Chun Tin Street for the local residents; and
- (e) URA should be advised to continue their dialogue with the local residents to address their concerns.

[Mr Dominic K.K. Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

34. On the aspect of road layout and underground car park, the Vice-Chairperson and some Members made the following points/suggestions:

- (a) the junction design of the proposed vehicular turning area and Sung Chi Street should be improved to ensure smooth traffic flow;
- (b) connection of the underground car parks with the adjoining DP should be explored so that a combined vehicular entrance could be used instead. That would minimise disruption to traffic and pedestrian movement, and reduce the potential impact on the residents of Fook Wan Mansion; and
- (c) consideration might be given to including the car parks of the site and the adjoining DP in the communal carpark scheme proposed by URA in the area.

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide showing the URA projects in the area, the Secretary pointed out that in considering the URA Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street DSP No. S/K9/URA2/1, an underground car park was proposed to accommodate parking and L/UL facilities ancillary to URA developments/redevelopments within the 'Wider Area' which covered the URA DS and DPs to the north of the current DS. The current DS and the adjoining DP were located further south and were outside the boundary of the said 'Wider Area'.

36. A Member said that there were similar proposals located in Causeway Bay where planning approvals to connect basement car parks had been given by the Board. Noting that some of the buildings in those approved applications were in different phases of development and some were even completed development, the proposed basement car park connection for the two URA developments should not be technically infeasible. URA should further explore the feasibility of the proposal to minimise the number of vehicular entrances and improve the pedestrian environment.

37. Members also generally considered that the technical feasibility and practicality of implementation of the alternative proposals had not been demonstrated, and there was no strong justification for amending the DSP.

38. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representations No. R1 to R9. The Board decided not to uphold Representations No. R10 to R348 and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet those representations and the reasons were :

- “(a) the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) will facilitate redevelopment of the area for a better living environment. The “Residential (Group A)7” zoning for the representation site is considered appropriate;
- (b) the inclusion of Chun Tin Street into the development scheme (DS) will allow for design flexibility, better pedestrian environment and connectivity with the adjoining development project (DP), as well as better utilization of land resources for increasing housing supply (R13 to R248, R250 to R254, R256 to R259, R345 and R347);
- (c) ancillary car parking and loading/unloading facilities will be provided in the DS. Sung Chi Street will be widened and a vehicular turning area will be provided to cater for traffic of the DS and the adjoining developments including Fook Wan Mansion after the closure of Chun Tin Street (R229, R260, R266, R269, R275, R277, R302, R323, R326, R338, R340, R341, R344 and R347);
- (d) the DS at the representation site with appropriate building height restriction and suitable mitigation measures would not generate unacceptable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and infrastructural aspects (R227 to R229, R231, R237, R238, R251 to R254, R259, R260, R266, R269, R275, R277, R302, R323, R326, R332, R335, R338, R340, R341, R344, R345, R347 and R348);
- (e) the technical feasibility and the practicability of implementation of the submitted alternative proposals has not been demonstrated (R11 and R12, R233 to R236, and R243);

- (f) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the DSP have been duly followed. The exhibition of the DSP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (R224 to R226 and R230); and
- (g) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition are outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and the purview of the Board (R246 to R248, R250 to R252, R257, R261, R263 to R267, R274, R275, R279, R281, R282, R299, R300, R305, R310, R311, R314, R316 to R319, R322, R323, R325, R327, R335, R337, R339, R343, R345 and R347).

39. The Board also agreed that URA should be requested to consider further improvement to the detailed design of redevelopment scheme and road layout, examine the feasibility of connecting the two underground car parks at the representation site and the adjoining DP, consider providing more social welfare facilities as required by government departments in their projects in the area, and further consult the relevant stakeholders and local community on ways to retain the social network as well as to assist business operators to re-establish themselves in the locality.

40. Members noted that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29A, the Board's decision on the DSP upon hearing of representations and comments in respect of a DSP under the Ordinance would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting.