

**Minutes of the 1155<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 19.1.2018**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director (1), Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department  
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

**In Attendance**

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Jeff K.C. Ho

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1155<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 15.11.2017 and 22.11.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1155<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15.11.2017 and 22.11.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Closed Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/29

(TPB Papers No. 10354 and 10355)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

2. The meeting noted that other than the minutes of meeting, the video recordings of the hearing sessions held on 15.11.2017 and 22.11.2017 were sent to Members on 23.11.2017.

3. The Chairperson briefly recapitulated the background of representations/comments on the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K13/29 as follows:

- (a) the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP No. S/K13/29 was exhibited on 13.4.2017;
- (b) during the exhibition periods, a total of 8,457 valid representations and 63 comments were received. The hearing sessions were held on

15.11.2017 and 22.11.2017; and

- (c) representations and comments were heard in two groups. Group 1 was mainly related to the Wang Chiu Road (WCR) public housing site and school site under Amendment Items A and B respectively with other items while Group 2 was mainly related to the Kai Tak Mansion (KTM) site under Amendment Item C.

4. The Chairperson said that deliberation of the two groups' representations and comments would be conducted separately. As there were fewer number of representations and comments in Group 2, deliberation on Group 2's representations and comments would be conducted first.

#### Group 2

5. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests on Group 2, which had been reported at the hearing session on 15.11.2017, was updated/consolidated as shown on the visualizer. The declaration of interests on Group 2 was as follows:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - his firm having current business dealings with Urbis Limited (Urbis) and past business dealings with Albert So Surveyors Limited (ASL)

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu ] having current business dealings with Ramboll  
Ms Janice W.M. Lai ] Environ HK Limited and Urbis

Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with Urbis

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being a Council and Court Member of Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)

Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with

Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] HKBU and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau - being Chairman of the Social Work Advisory Committee of the Department of Social Work in HKBU

Ms Christina M. Lee - being a Court Member and part-time student of HKBU

6. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Stephen H.B. Yau, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Ms Christina M. Lee had no direct involvement in the project, they were allowed to stay in the meeting. The interest of Mr Franklin Yu was considered indirect and the meeting agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

7. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary recapitulated the major points made by the representers and commenters in their written and oral submissions, and the responses of relevant government departments.

#### Supportive Representations and Comments

8. Three representers (R1(part) to R3(part)) supported Amendment Item C without giving reasons. The supporting views had been noted by relevant government departments.

#### Adverse Representations and Comments

##### *Adverse Impacts*

9. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters (R10/C62(part)) had made the following major points on adverse impacts arising from Amendment Item C:

- (a) there would be significant air ventilation and heritage impacts on an over-developed district;
- (b) the proposed mitigation measures on the visual impact were ineffective. Mitigation measures should be adopted to address the visual impact on the historic ambience of the ex-Royal Air Force Station (ex-RAF) Compound; and
- (c) there would be air ventilation and traffic issue on the neighbourhood as well as visual impact on the ridgeline of Kowloon Peak.

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

- (a) the building height (BH) of 140mPD was visually compatible with the surrounding and in line with the stepped BH profile, and would allow room for incorporation of good design measures;
- (b) design measures to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed developments on the historic ambience of ex-RAF Compound were proposed; and
- (c) the KTM site would be setback from Kwun Tong Road to form a lay-by for passenger loading/unloading, which would help alleviate the traffic congestion along Kwun Tong Road.

*Building Height*

11. The meeting noted that a representer and some commenters (R8460/C40 and C41 to C49) had made the following major points relating to the proposed building height restriction (BHR) of 140mPD:

- (a) a representer (R8460), which was the owner of KTM objected to the BHR of 140mPD as the notional scheme prepared by the Planning Department (PlanD) would require a larger podium at the expense of public space and air permeability. Since Choi Tak Estate nearby had a BHR of 160mPD, there was no justification to adopt a BHR of 140mPD;
- (b) an alternative scheme of 160mPD comprising two 35-storey residential towers over a 6-storey podium for hotel and retail at a plot ratio (PR) of 9 was proposed. They claimed that the alternative scheme would reduce site coverage, which would improve at-grade greening and reduce street frontage. With higher BH, there would be more flexibility for building design to provide mitigation measures and enhance wind flow at pedestrian level. The proposed podium landscaped garden would allow more open view and more public open areas. An alternative pedestrian pathway to the adjacent historic buildings would be provided to improve local connectivity. The proposed scheme would adopt a setback from Kwun Tong Road for the provision of a bus bay;
- (c) according to the visual impact assessment (VIA) under the alternative scheme, the stepped BH profile and views could be generally maintained. Whilst PlanD had not carried out VIA and air ventilation assessment (AVA) for a scheme of 150mPD or 160mPD, the representer considered that the alternative scheme was compatible with the surrounding areas. They also considered that the alternative scheme could not be pursued through an application for minor relaxation. This was because minor relaxation of BHR would normally not exceed 10%, meaning that for a BHR of 140mPD, it could only be relaxed to 154mPD, which was insufficient to cater for their proposed BH of 160mPD; and



- (d) there would not be adverse visual impact, even if the KTM site was developed up to a BH of 180mPD. The future development would be of similar BH as No. 8 Clearwater Bay Road and there would not be any adverse visual impact on the stepped BH profile.

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

- (a) the BHR of 140mPD was formulated with relevant considerations and in line with stepped BH concept. Assessments conducted had confirmed the acceptability of the BHR of 140mPD from visual and air ventilation aspects;
- (b) a taller BHR of 160mPD/170mPD was adopted for Choi Tak Estate because it was located on higher platforms at 41mPD and 60.5mPD;
- (c) the presenter had not demonstrated that the alternative scheme was acceptable from planning, building and transport aspects; and
- (d) PlanD's notional scheme had demonstrated that the BHR of 140mPD could accommodate the permitted development intensity with room for design measures to mitigate visual and air ventilation impacts. Moreover, planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR could be submitted to demonstrate the planning and design merits and acceptability of the proposal. There was no prescribed limit on the extent of minor relaxation of BHR and consideration would be given to the planning and design merits of individual case. If the BHR was relaxed to 160mPD on the OZP on the basis of the alternative scheme proposed by presenter, there was no mechanism to ensure that the alternative scheme would indeed be implemented.

13. The meeting noted that some commenters (C41 to C49 and C50 to C60(part)) including Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC) provided comments on transport and other facilities. They suggested providing a public transport interchange (PTI) or bus-bus interchange (BBI) and other facilities including public car parking spaces, covered loading and unloading areas, clinic, retail and/or leisure facilities at the KTM redevelopment or other locations.

14. The meeting also noted that the Transport Department (TD) had assessed the traffic condition in the area and there were proposals to enhance the existing BBI facilities at San Po Kong. Various public transport services were available in the area. While provision of community facilities, such as clinic in the area was sufficient according to the requirement of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), retail facilities were always permitted in the lowest three floors of the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone covering the KTM site.

15. After going through the major grounds and issues, Members generally noted that the concerns from the representers and commenters were mainly related to the visual, air ventilation and traffic impacts on the area, and there was an alternative proposal put forward by the representer. The Chairperson said that the grouping of issues under the above main aspects served only as an aide memoire for reference to facilitate discussions. Members would be free to raise any issues and aspects as they saw fit. She then invited Members to express their views.

16. Some Members considered a higher BHR on OZP for the KTM site was not justified. While the representer’s assessment had concluded that the proposed redevelopment would not generate adverse visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas, the proposed BHR of 160mPD was considered not in line with the intended stepped BH profile and excessive when compared with the surrounding residential developments.

17. While some Members appreciated the design merits and features of the alternative scheme proposed by the representer, including reduced site coverage to allow visual and air permeability, adopting stepped building profile and providing open view to

the Grade 1 historic buildings of the ex-RAF Compound behind, they were concerned that there was no mechanism to ensure that the alternative scheme would indeed be implemented if the BHR was relaxed to 160mPD on the OZP to meet the representation. If the representer would like to pursue a taller BH based on a specific scheme, a s.16 planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR could be submitted to the Board to demonstrate the planning and design merits and the overall acceptability of the proposal. Members generally agreed that the BHR of 140mPD could accommodate the permitted development intensity under the “R(A)” zone. The Board could consider the planning and design merits for minor relaxation of BH based on a specific scheme at the planning application stage.

18. Members generally considered that the major grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10354 and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting. Members agreed that the stipulation of BHR of 140mPD on the “R(A)” site under Amendment Item C was appropriate and no amendment was required.

19. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representations No. R1(Part) to R3(Part). The Board also decided not to uphold Representations No. R10(part) and R8460 and considered that the OZP should not be amended and the reasons were :

- “(a) in setting the BHR of 140mPD for the site, due considerations have been given to the permitted development intensity under the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone, the intended BH profile for the area and the room for incorporation of design measures to mitigate the possible visual and air ventilation impacts. The BHR of 140mPD is considered acceptable (R10 and R8460); and
- (b) the BHR of 160mPD proposed by the representer is considered not in line with the intended stepped BH profile for the area and excessive when compared with those for the residential developments in the

surrounding areas. If the representer would like to pursue a taller BH based on a specific scheme, a s.16 planning application for minor relaxation of the BHR could be submitted to the Board (R8460).”

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

Group 1

20. The Secretary said that Members’ declaration of interests on Group 1, as shown on the visualizer, was reported at the hearing sessions on 15.11.2017 and 22.11.2017. The declaration of interests on Group 1 was as follows:

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning  
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of  
Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA)

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of Home  
(*as Chief Engineer* Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the  
(*Works*), *Home Affairs* Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA  
*Department*)

Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of  
HKHA

Ms Janice W.M. Lai ] having current business dealings with HKHA

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau ]

Dr C.H. Hau ]

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho ]

Mr K.K. Cheung ] their firm having current business dealings with

Mr Alex T.H. Lai ] HKHA and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract  
basis from time to time

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having past business dealings with HKHA and current business dealings with Masterplan Limited

Mr Franklin Yu ] having past business dealings with HKHA

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu ]

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of the Housing Department (HD) but not involved in planning work

21. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr H.F. Leung, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Ms Janice W.M Lai had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had just left the meeting. The meeting agreed that the interests of Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan were direct and they should be invited to leave the meeting. Members also considered that the interests of those other Members who had declared interests were indirect and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left the meeting at this point.]

22. To facilitate deliberation, the Secretary recapitulated the major points made by the representers and commenters in their written and oral submissions, and the responses of relevant government departments.

#### Supportive Representations and Comments

23. The meeting noted that some representers and a commenter (R1 to R8, R9(part) and C1) supported Amendment Items A and/or B related to rezoning three sites at WCR for “R(A)” and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), which would better utilize land to meet the pressing demand for housing and school. They also supported Amendment Item D1, which involved rezoning to reflect the as-built site conditions. The

supporting views had been noted by relevant government departments.

Adverse Representations and Comments

24. The meeting noted that some representers/comments ((R9(part) to R8459, C2 to C39 and C50 to C63(part)) objected to Amendment Items A, B, D1 and D2 and their views were grouped under various aspects to facilitate discussion.

*In-situ Retention/Reprovisioning of Christian Action(CA)'s Premises*

25. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on retention/reprovisioning of CA premises:

- (a) the New Horizons Building (NHB) was used by CA for over 30 years to provide a wide range of social services and training. Demolition of NHB would cause disruption to the services. There was a wide support for in-situ retention/reprovisioning of CA services;
- (b) the current HKPSG was inadequate as CA's services were not fully reflected in the HKPSG requirements;
- (c) short notice was given for the relocation. The proposed reprovisioning site was a primary school premises and its setting and facilities were not suitable for CA. CA's previous request for an alternative site in the vicinity had been turned down, and the request to reprovision some services within the WCR development was not responded to;
- (d) NHB was strategically located and serving six public/subsidized housing estates. If CA was relocated to Choi Wan (II) Estate, it would only serve two nearby public housing estates. The reprovisioned premises at Choi Wan (II) Estate was far away from the people currently being served by CA; and

- (e) the reprovisioned premises would incur an additional annual cost of \$4 million on rent/maintenance, imposing significant financial burden on CA and adversely affecting the service users. Moreover, relocation to Choi Wan (II) Estate would increase administration costs by 40%. Some services would have to be terminated for inadequate space and funding. There was no justification to relocate CA's services to premises requiring rent payment.

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

- (a) CA had been using NHB on a temporary basis since 1998. The temporary government land allocation had been extended to 30.6.2018;
- (b) the major services provided by CA were not monitored and subvented by SWD. Although the Labour and Welfare Bureau (LWB) had rendered assistance in identifying a temporary reprovisioning site, there was no guarantee that the site would be of the same size as NHB;
- (c) a to-be-vacated school premises at Choi Wan (II) Estate had been identified and being considered by CA. The proposed premises could generally accommodate CA's retraining services and headquarters office; and
- (d) if the reprovisioning arrangement to CA was acceptable, the Choi Wan (II) Estate site could be available on 1.9.2018. Since Phase 2 of the public housing development was subject to the relocation of CA, no firm development programme was yet available. Relevant departments had been consulted on facilities to be provided in the WCR public housing development. The Social Welfare Department

(SWD) had provided a list of welfare facilities for consideration by HD.

*Preservation of Buildings*

27. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on preservation of buildings:

- (a) NHB was built in the 1970s with unique architectural style. The building also formed part of the ex-RAF Compound and Vietnamese refugees camp, and was worthy to be preserved; and
- (b) the Hong Kong Fire Services Club (HKFSC) should be retained for its historical value, providing leisure facilities for the officers and maintaining an open view for the area.

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

- (a) the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had been consulted and they advised that since the prevailing assessment criteria were available only for historic buildings before 1950, the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had deferred the grading assessment of post-1970 buildings, including the NHB; and
- (b) the HKFSC was not occupying a historic building and it would be reprovisioned at a site in Jordan.

*Supporting Infrastructure, Government, Institution or Community (GIC) and Retail Facilities*

29. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on supporting infrastructure, GIC and retail facilities:



- (a) the existing GIC and retail facilities in the area were insufficient. More facilities should be provided;
- (b) higher population density would adversely affect the living quality in the area. There was a lack of comprehensive planning for public housing development; and
- (c) a municipal services building should be provided to accommodate GIC and market facilities.

30. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that the planned provision of GIC facilities in the area was generally sufficient. A school and a number of GIC and retail facilities would be included in the future development at WCR sites.

#### *Secondary School*

31. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on school development:

- (a) there were many vacant schools in the area. An additional school at WCR was not necessary;
- (b) the proposed school site close to Kwun Tong Road was not suitable as mitigation measures were required to address the noise and air ventilation problem; and
- (c) the Education Bureau (EDB) had no implementation programme for the proposed secondary school and hence there was no urgent need to vacate CA and demolish NHB.

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

- (a) although there was a surplus of school provision purely according to HKPSG, EDB advised that a secondary school site had to be reserved in the area to meet the long-term education needs. In particular, EDB had to take into account the need for new school premises to accommodate schools now operating from sub-standard school premises, apart from factors such as additional population, school places demand and educational initiatives;
- (b) mitigation measures would be provided for the proposed school to meet the statutory environmental requirements; and
- (c) the development programme of the proposed school would hinge on site availability. It would normally take about six years from planning to completion of a school project. Assuming that the site might be available in 2020, EDB would commence the pre-construction preparation and planning shortly. Subject to availability of the site and funding approval, the new school could be available by 2023.

#### *Open Space Provision and Greenery*

33. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points on provision of open space and greenery:

- (a) there were insufficient open space and recreational facilities in the area;
- (b) the Hong Kong Rugby Union (HKRU) raised concern on the reduction of the “Open Space” (“O”) zone restricting options for provision of recreational facilities. Rugby training grounds were in high demand; and

- (c) Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (Hong Kong 2030+ Study) had included initiatives to promote a healthy city and enhance public space and facilities by increasing open space per capita to 2.5 m<sup>2</sup> per person.

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

- (a) there was a surplus of open space for the Kwun Tong district and the Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP, which met the requirements of HKPSG as well as Hong Kong 2030+ Study's initiative on higher open space requirement; and
- (b) since soccer pitches in Kwun Tong were available for playing rugby, there was no imminent need for an additional rugby pitch in WCR. LCSD would take into account various factors for planning and development of future facilities.

#### *Traffic and Transport*

35. The meeting noted that some presenters/commenters had made the following major points on traffic and transport aspect:

- (a) the proposed development would overload the surrounding road networks. Traffic from WCR relied on Kwun Tong Road and Lung Cheung Road and traffic conditions might not improve upon implementation of the junction improvement works;
- (b) the planned Trunk Road T2 and the proposed Central Kowloon Route (CKR) would not be completed in time to ease the traffic congestion resulted from the population increase;

- (c) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) assumed that most residents would take public transport or walk to MTR stations and it had probably not taken into account the taxi services demand. The pedestrian flow was underestimated. The cumulative traffic impacts from developments in Tseung Kwan O, Kai Tak and Kowloon Bay areas were not assessed in the TIA;
- (d) the public transport services had been overloaded due to the additional demand in Kai Tak. MTR service was inadequate and might not be able to cope with the increased population; and
- (e) Kwun Tong Road was not safe to have bus stops en-route. Transport nodes including drop-off area, enhanced bus/mini-bus schedule/routes and additional MTR exit should be provided at WCR site.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left this session of the meeting during Secretary presentation.]

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

- (a) TIA, which was accepted by TD, had taken into account the planned/committed developments in the area. It was concluded that most critical junctions would be operating within capacities with the implementation of the proposed junction improvement schemes. The proposed developments would have no adverse traffic impact;
- (b) Trunk Road T2 and CKR were scheduled for completion by 2025. With the improvement works, the local road network would be operating within its capacity even if the CKR was not completed as scheduled;
- (c) the TIA anticipated that the future residents would take various modes of transport services including railway services. TD and public

transport operators would closely monitor and strengthen the provision of public transport services. With new services and strengthening of existing services, public transport provision in the area was sufficient to cope with the additional population;

- (d) a lay-by would be provided by setting back the development site of WCR for loading/unloading of passengers; and
- (e) BBI schemes were already in place for a number of bus routes operating in the area. The Government would strive to identify suitable locations for setting up new BBIs or enhance the services and facilities of the existing BBIs. TIA indicated that an additional PTI to serve the proposed public housing development was not necessary.

#### *Parking Facilities*

37. The meeting noted some representers/commenters had alleged that there were a lack of parking spaces in the area and illegal parking had endangered pedestrian safety. The surplus parking spaces in Kai Yip Estate were reserved solely for its residents. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that the upper bound of parking provision in the HKPSG had been adopted to provide sufficient parking facilities for future residents. The illegal parking problem could be resolved by proper enforcement of control.

#### *Pedestrian Connectivity*

38. The meeting noted some representers/commenters had claimed that the pedestrian subway from the WCR sites to Ping Shek Estate and MTR Choi Hung Station had already reached its capacity and were congested, and should be enhanced to cope with future demand. Moreover, the connectivity with MTR Choi Hung Station and Kai Tak Station should be improved by installing covered walkway. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that there were pedestrian connections to the adjacent MTR stations including a subway across Kwun Tong Road to MTR Choi Hung Station and

at-grade crossing facilities to MTR Kai Tak Station, which would cater for the future needs. Moreover, upon the completion of Shatin-Central Link (SCL), the future residents and nearby pedestrians could walk directly to MTR Kai Tak Station. HD would also provide covered walkway within the development to facilitate pedestrian connectivity.

#### *Environmental, Air Ventilation and Visual Impacts*

39. The meeting noted some representers/commenters had raised that the proposed developments would have adverse impacts on the adjacent Caritas Family Crisis Support Centre (FCSC) in terms of privacy and safety as well as adverse environmental, air ventilation and visual impacts on the surrounding. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that comprehensive assessments including AVA and visual appraisal were conducted to confirm that the public housing development at WCR would not lead to adverse visual and air ventilation impacts. An environmental assessment would be prepared at the detailed design stage to assess the potential noise impact and mitigation measures would be proposed. HD was refining the detailed design of the public housing development to minimize the possible impacts on the FCSC.

#### *Alternative Sites for Housing Development*

40. The meeting noted some representers/commenters had suggested that alternative housing sites such as the Kai Tak Development Area, sports grounds near Richland Gardens, East Kowloon Cultural Centre or Fanling Golf Course could be considered for public housing development. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that the suitability of pursuing housing development at other sites would be considered separately. The East Kowloon Cultural Centre was under construction, and Kowloon Bay Sports Ground or soccer pitches/cycling ground were major sports facilities serving the district. There was no justification to rezone these sites for housing development.

#### *Public Consultation*

41. The meeting noted some representers/commenters had criticized that the public

consultation process was inadequate. The meeting also noted government departments' responses that the statutory and administrative procedures in public consultation had been followed, including consulting KTDC on the OZP amendments and exhibition of the draft OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments. The public also had opportunities to express their views at the hearing sessions.

*Other Views*

42. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following major points in other aspects:

- (a) the WCR sites were more suitable for private housing, subsidized sale flats or hotel development;
- (b) a community farm, i.e. Urban Oasis, in the area should be retained; and
- (c) no social impact assessment (SIA) had been undertaken for the relocation of CA, which currently served the local residents.

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

- (a) the WCR sites were considered suitable for housing and school development to meet the pressing need of the community. HD would consider the provision of subsidized sale flats in Phase 2 of the development;
- (b) only a small portion of the Urban Oasis would be affected by the public housing development. Upon termination of the adjoining temporary government depot, the possibility of extending the Urban Oasis would be explored; and

- (c) although no SIA was conducted, the GIC facilities were generally sufficient in meeting the HKPSG requirements for the planned population in the area. SWD would plan for appropriate facilities in new public housing or other GIC developments to serve the community.

*Representers/Commenters' Proposals*

44. The meeting noted that some representers/commenters had made the following proposals:

- (a) to retain the NHB in-situ or identify alternative site/premises for CA;
- (b) to retain the existing NHB site for CA, then rezone the rest of the WCR sites (i) for public housing development providing about 4,310 flats or (ii) for public housing and school developments providing about 2,920 flats;
- (c) to use the WCR sites for open space development;
- (d) to rezone the eastern portion of the WCR sites to "O" to accommodate a rugby pitch; and
- (e) the BHR of the WCR sites should be reduced to not exceeding that for Richland Gardens, i.e. BHR of 100mPD.

45. The meeting also noted that government departments had responded to the representers' proposals, which were similar to the responses already covered under the abovementioned issues.

46. After going through the major grounds and issues, Members generally noted that the major concerns from the representers and commenters were mainly related to the



retention/reprovisioning of CA's premises, preservation of buildings, the need for the secondary school site, provision of GIC facilities and open space, traffic and transport issues, environmental, air ventilation and visual impacts, and there were also alternative proposals put forward by the representers/commenters. The Chairperson said that the grouping of issues under the above main aspects served only as an aide memoire for reference to facilitate discussions. Members would be free to raise any issues and aspects as they saw fit. She then invited Members to express their views.

#### *CA's Contribution and Optimal Land Use*

47. While CA's services and their contributions to the society over the years were acknowledged, the Vice-chairperson and some Members opined that CA's concerns over the impact of reprovisioning on their operation, development plan and finance were not directly relevant to the Board's considerations for the land use zonings of the WCR sites. Moreover, even if the Board were to decide that the land use zoning for the NHB site should be kept as "G/IC", this would not mean that CA, out of all possible users of sites with "G/IC" zoning, would have a claim to remain in-situ. Furthermore, CA had been accommodated in the NHB only on a temporary basis. Once a permanent use for the WCR sites had been proposed, it would not be unreasonable to terminate or reprovision the temporary use for better utilisation of land resources.

#### *Need for Housing and School Developments and GIC Facilities*

48. Members generally supported the proposed school and public housing development with provision of GIC facilities. There was an urgent need for public housing provision in Hong Kong, and suitable sites in the urban area were particularly rare. While vocational training provided by CA could be provided in alternative locations, the WCR sites, which were near MTR stations and public transportation, was most suitable for public housing developments to meet the pressing need of the community. Some Members also suggested providing more GIC facilities in particular elderly facilities at the proposed public housing development in order to meet the needs of the community. The WCR sites should be comprehensively planned to include housing, school and GIC facilities.

49. Some Members opined that although there were some vacant school sites in the area, EDB had taken into account a host of factors, in particular the need for replacing existing sub-standard schools, and confirmed that a school site had to be reserved in the area to meet the long-term educational needs. Moreover, Kwun Tong was a district with a large population and sufficient school premises were required. The sub-standard schools were generally obsolete without sufficient facilities, which might have adverse impact on students. The sub-standard schools should be replaced and the use of those sites to be vacated could be reviewed. They could be considered for housing developments to meet the housing need.

50. Some Members suggested that the Government could explore innovative building design of GIC complex allowing some GIC facilities to be put on top of school campus given the scarce land resources. The Chairperson said that as mentioned in the Policy Agenda of the 2017 Policy Address, in order to consolidate and provide more GIC facilities and make optimal use of the limited land resources, a 'single site, multiple use' model in multi-storey developments on government land would be pursued where appropriate.

#### *Retention/Reprovisioning of CA's Premises*

51. Members generally considered that there was no ground to insist on in-situ retention of CA's services at the NHB but noted that the proposed reprovisioning premises for CA at Choi Wan (II) Estate was smaller than NHB. Some Members considered that CA could accommodate their existing services at different locations, e.g. by relocating retraining services to an alternative location while reprovisioning social services for the local community in the reprovisioned site. Some floorspaces could also be reserved in the future public housing development at WCR sites for reprovisioning CA's existing social services and GIC facilities, which would be beneficial to both CA and the local community.

52. Some Members were concerned whether the development/phasing programme would allow continuity of CA operation/services during the relocation process. The

Chairperson responded that the Government had been proactive in liaising with CA on the appropriate arrangement for achieving seamless reprovisioning of their facilities.

*Preservation of Buildings*

53. Members noted that the NHB was pending assessment by the AAB and the AAB had deferred the grading assessment of post-1970 buildings, including the NHB. While noting the history of NHB, some Members did not consider the building worth preserving. Some Members also considered that the Board should follow AAB's professional judgement in grading historical buildings in general. There was no strong justification for retention of the building, noting that preservation of the NHB would lead to a reduction in flat production by about 600 units. That said, it was acknowledged that NHB formed part of the ex-RAF Compound and Vietnamese refugees camp, and Members generally supported AMO's suggestion to salvage some representative features of NHB in the future development, if feasible. Concerned departments, including HD and Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) should be invited to consider Members' suggestion at the detailed design stage.

54. In summary, Members agreed to convey the following views to the concerned government bureaux and departments for consideration:

- (a) LWB should continue to liaise with CA and make its best endeavours in addressing the latter's needs in the relocation arrangement. The arrangement should facilitate continuity of CA's services with minimum disruption;
- (b) HA should consider reserving floorspaces in the future public housing development at WCR sites for existing organization(s) including CA which had been providing social services in the area for a long period of time, and should enhance provision of elderly facilities; and

- (c) HD and ArchSD should consider salvaging and incorporating some representative features of NHB in the future development at the detailed design stage, if feasible.

55. Members generally considered that the major grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10355 and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

56. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representations No. R1(part) to R3(part), R4 to R8 and R9(part). The Board also decided not to uphold Representations No. R9(part), R10(part) to R8459 and considered that the OZP should not be amended and the reasons were :

**“Items A and B**

- (a) land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong is scarce and there is a need for optimizing the use of land available to meet the pressing demand for housing land. The proposed public housing development at the representation sites is compatible with the surrounding environment, and sustainable from traffic, environment, air ventilation and visual perspectives;
- (b) after taking into account a host of factors, particularly the need for new school premises to re-provision existing sub-standard school premises, apart from other factors including additional population, school places demand and educational initiatives, it is confirmed that a school site should be reserved in the area;
- (c) the New Horizons Building is neither a graded nor a proposed graded historic building. There is no strong justification for retention of the building, which would undermine the comprehensive planning and design of the proposed public housing and school developments at the WCR sites. Representative features of NHB could be salvaged and

incorporated in the future development at the detailed design stage, if feasible (**R9, R13 to R1045, R1050 to R1283, R1285 to R8453**);

- (d) there is sufficient provision of open space in the area to meet the demand of the planned population. It is considered appropriate to rezone the WCR sites for public housing and school developments to meet the needs of the community (**R10 to R831, R967, R971, R1001, R1071, R1077, R1085 to R1086 and R8455**);
- (e) the provision of major GIC facilities in the area is generally sufficient. Part of the WCR sites is reserved for development of a secondary school to meet the needs of the community, and appropriate GIC facilities will be provided in the proposed public housing development to serve the local residents (**R9, R13 to R1154, R1157 to R1281, R1285 to R1293, R1309 to R1491, R1503 to R1734, R1737 to R1738, R1748 to R1754, R1757, R1762 to R1770, R1772 to R1780, R1782 to R1787, R1789 to R1798, R1804 to R1823, R1826 to R1829, R1831 to R1860, R1862 to R1897, R1899 to R1928, R1930 to R1937, R1939 to R1981, R1983 to R2008, R2010 to R2019, R2021 to R2029, R2032 to R2043, R2046 to R2048, R2051 to R2082, R2084 to R2094, R2096 to R2101, R2103 to R2119, R2121, R8454 and R8458**);
- (f) upon implementation of the recommended road improvement proposals and enhancement of public transport services, the proposed public housing development would not have adverse traffic impacts on the surrounding areas (**R10 to R11, R13 to R1156, R1158 to R1281, R1285 to R1287, R1898, R1915, R2090, R2106 to R2111, R2115 to R2116, R8454 and R8456**);
- (g) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The views received were duly considered and responded to by the concerned

Government bureaux/departments in the process. The exhibition of the OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (**R13 to R831, R984, R996, R999, R1001, R1018, R1020, R1051, R1052, R1055 to R1056, R1061, R1104 to R1106, R1126 and R1158 to R1281**); and

**Items D1 and D2**

- (h) Amendment Items D1 and D2 are to reflect the existing drainage facility and road use on the representation sites, and the rezoning will not materially affect the provision of open space in the area (**R11**).”

57. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 11:55 am.