

**CONFIDENTIAL**  
**(downgraded on 30.4.2019)**

**Minutes of 1198<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the**  
**Town Planning Board held on 29.3.2019**

**Agenda Item 3**

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Urban Renewal Authority Queen's Road West / In Ku Lane Development Scheme Plan No. S/H3/URA3/1 and Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Sai Ying Pun & Sheung Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H3/32

(TPB Paper No. 10526)

---

[Closed Meeting] [Confidential Item] [The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Deliberation Session**

1. Upon the request of the Chairperson, the Secretary said that Members' previous comments related to the design of the proposed development had been forwarded to URA for consideration in the detailed design stage. At the meeting, the Chairperson said that the Board was invited to give consideration to the representations and comments and decide whether to propose any amendment to the draft DSP and draft OZP to meet or partially meet the representations.

*Internal Transport Facilities*

2. Some Members were of the view that the Development Scheme site was near the Sai Ying Pun MTR Station, the required number of car parking spaces was limited and the vehicular access at QRW would adversely affect the streetscape and traffic flow. The proposed car parking provision and associated vehicular access at QRW should thus be reconsidered.

3. In response to Members' question, Mr Eddie S.K. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer(Hong Kong), TD said that QRW was an one-way two-lane single carriageway with

various exits leading to other roads. To access the Development Scheme site via In Ku Lane, traffic would need to pass through Ko Shing Street which is a one-way one-lane single carriageway with many loading and unloading activities there. It was therefore considered more appropriate to provide two separate vehicular accesses – one at In Ku Lane for the government refuse collection point and the other one at QRW for the Development Scheme site – rather than a single access point for both garbage trucks and private cars. The car parking provision was in accordance with HKPSG requirement to meet the parking demand arising from the Development Scheme site. Not providing car parking spaces in the Development Scheme site might not help discourage car ownership but shift the parking demand to other part of the district. With regard to the concern on the streetscape of QRW, URA should keep liaising with TD about the vehicular access arrangement in the detailed design stage.

4. Some Members noted that QRW was also busy and one lane was often occupied by vehicles. The vehicular access at QRW would not be required if no car parking space was provided in the proposed development. The Chairperson said that there were diverse views in the community about the parking demand and URA had to balance the views among stakeholders including the concerned District Council. The Vice-Chairperson said that the availability of MTR service had already been taken into account in formulating the parking requirements in HKPSG. It should be noted that not providing car parking spaces was not an effective way to suppress the growth of parking demand. Members generally considered that the Board should urge URA to liaise with TD to reconsider the parking provision and access arrangement.

#### *Open Space*

5. In response to some Members' questions, the Chairperson said that Members were invited to consider the appropriateness of zoning the Development Scheme site as "R(A)23" and the development parameters including the requirements for the POS and G/IC facilities stipulated on the draft DSP. To allow flexibility for improvement to the design of the proposed development, it might not be appropriate to impose detailed design requirements on the DSP, which was a statutory plan. To follow the established practice, Members' view on the design and layout of the open space would be forwarded to URA for consideration. Should the design and layout be revised, URA would have to consult C&WDC.

6. A Member considered the minimum area requirement of the POS sufficient. Some Members considered that URA should liaise with LCSD and consider incorporating the adjoining Li Sing Street Playground in the development to achieve a better and integrated design. The layout of the POS should be designed to create usable public space for the neighbourhood and cater for the need of different stakeholders.

7. A Member pointed out that since the open space and G/IC facilities would be developed by URA before handing back to the concerned government departments, URA should take the opportunity to aim at an integrated design for creating synergy effect in the neighbourhood.

8. Members generally considered that the Development Scheme site was within a residential neighbourhood and the proposed residential use was considered appropriate. Also, the environment of the area would be improved through the proposed redevelopment. Noting Members' concerns and advice, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed that the Secretariat would write to: (a) URA and TD requesting them to reconsider the need for a vehicular access at QRW taking into account the traffic condition, pedestrian safety and streetscape, and the need for car parking provision in the Development Scheme site; and (b) URA and LCSD requesting them to provide better accessibility and permeability in designing the layout of the POS, and to integrate the POS with the design of G/IC facilities and the residential development for creating synergy effect and better utilisation of the POS in the area. Members also considered that the relevant part of the ES of the DSP i.e. paragraph 7.5 related to internal transport facilities should be amended to reflect Members' views that the requirement for a basement car park, vehicular access from QRW and loading/unloading bay should be subject to further review.

9. After deliberation, the Board noted the views of the supportive representations of **R1 to R10 of DSP** and **R1 of OZP** and decided not to uphold the views of **R11 to R13 of DSP** and **R2 of OZP**, and agreed that the draft DSP and the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“(a) the Development Scheme Plan (DSP) will facilitate the redevelopment of the DSP area for a better living environment with the provision of a government

refuse collection point cum public toilet, public open space (POS) and an Neighbourhood Elderly Centre sub-base (**R12 and R13 of DSP**);

(b) the redevelopment will reprovide the 5-a-side soccer pitch and the sitting-out area, and will not result in net loss of POS. The POS will be handed back to the Government upon completion (**R13 of DSP**);

(c) the rezoning from “Government, Institution or Community” to ‘Pedestrian Precinct/Street’ on the draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) is appropriate as it is to reflect the existing use of the land as a public access (**R2 of OZP**);

(d) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the DSP and OZP have been fully followed. The exhibition of the DSP and OZP for public inspection and the provision for submission of representations and comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (**R11 of DSP and R2 of OZP**); and

(e) implementation issues such as acquisition and compensation are outside the purview of the Town Planning Board (**R2 to R10 and R12 of DSP**).”

10. The Board also agreed that the relevant part of paragraph 7.5 in the ES of the draft DSP should be revised as set out in paragraph 8 above.

11. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B, the Board’s decisions on the DSP upon hearing of representations and comments in respect of a DSP under the Town Planning Ordinance would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting.