

**Minutes of 1223rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 3.6.2020**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

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

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Mr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr. Y.S. Wong

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Caroline C.Y. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr L.K. Wong (a.m.)
Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (p.m.)

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K10/URA1/1 and

Consideration of Representation and Comments in respect of the Draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K10/25 (TPB Paper No. 10618)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese, English and Thai.]

1. The Secretary reported that Members would consider the representations and comments in respect of the draft Urban Renewal Authority Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K10/URA1/1 (the draft DSP) and the draft Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/25 (the draft OZP). The draft DSP was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the area; and/or having affiliation/business dealings with URA (C1 of DSP), Driltech Ground Engineering Limited (Driltech) (the consultant of URA) or Ms Mary Mulvihill (R90/C10 of DSP and R1/C3 of OZP):

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being the deputy chairman of Appeal
(Vice-chairperson) Board Panel of URA

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a non-executive director of the
(as Director of Planning) URA Board and a member of its
Committee

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - being a non-executive director of the
URA Board, chairman/member of its
Committees, and a director of the Board
of the Urban Renewal Fund

Mr Y.S. Wong - being a non-executive director of the
URA Board and a member of its
Committees

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with URA
- Mr Conrad T.C. Wong - his company having current business dealings with URA for the Pine Street/Oak Street Project; living in a flat at Sa Po Road owned by his family member; and his companies owning three properties and two shops in Chi Kiang Street
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with URA and Driltech; and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with URA and Driltech; and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Philip S.L. Kan - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a former director of Hong Kong Housing Society which was currently in discussion with URA on housing development issues
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung] being directors of the Board of the Urban
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] Renewal Fund

- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, and a director and chief executive officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan
- Mr L.T. Kwok - the institution which he was serving had received sponsorship from URA
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - her company owning two shops at Nam Kok Road, Kowloon

2. Members noted that Messrs Lincoln L.H. Huang, Philip S.L. Kan, Thomas O.S. Ho, Ricky W.Y. Yu, Conrad T.C. Wong, Y.S. Wong and Raymond K.W. Lee and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that as Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung, Daniel K.S. Lau, K.K. Cheung and Alex T.H. Lai and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the draft DSP and no discussion on the draft DSP with representaters/commenters, the properties owned by the company of Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had no direct view of the site covered by the draft DSP (the Site), and the interest of Mr L.T. Kwok was considered indirect, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

3. The Chairperson said that notification 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, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

4. The following representatives of Planning Department (PlanD), representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session were invited to the meeting:

PlanD

- Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - District Planning Officer/Kowloon
(DPO/K)
- Mr Mak Chung Hang - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1 and C5 of DSP - Ng Po Keung

C2 of OZP - Ng Po Keung

- Mr Ng Po Keung - Representer and Commenter
- Ms Lee Chui Ling] Representer's and Commenter's
- Mr Cheng Yan Kit] Representatives

R90 and C10 of DSP - Mary Mulvihill

R1 and C3 of OZP - Mary Mulvihill

- Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R21 of DSP - Old District Autonomy Advancement Group (舊區街坊自主促進組)

- Mr Wu Kai Wai - Representer's Representative

R49 of DSP - Chaung Wing Yee

R69 of DSP - Ma Uraporn

R70 of DSP - Saechan Veeraray

R74 of DSP - Hengthong Tawan

R75 of DSP - Chung Malee

R76 of DSP - Wu Ka Ming (胡家明)

R77 of DSP - Cheung Kwok Fai (張國輝)

R79 of DSP - Chan Chi Keung (陳志強)

R81 of DSP - Poon Lok Man

R82 of DSP - Lau Chi Nang

R83 of DSP - Ng Yik Fai

R84 of DSP - Chan Kung Hing (陳共慶)

C9 of DSP - Rawiwan Wong

- Ms Rawiwan Wong - Commenter and Representatives' Representative

R50 of DSP - Siu Long Yee

Ms Yip Yan Ying - Representer's Representative

R60 of DSP - Yip Mei Yung

Ms Yip Mei Yung - Representer

R62 of DSP - Cheung Sin Yi

R80 of DSP – Chow Kam Wing (周錦榮)

Ms Lee Wai Yi - Representers' Representative

R64 of DSP - Ip Pui Yu

R71 of DSP - Gasing Phobsuk

Ms Ip Pui Yu - Representer and Representer's Representative

R68 of DSP - Jaroennon Parichat

Ms Jaroennon Parichat - Representer

R72 of DSP - Maneerak Raroengchon

Ms Maneerak Raroengchon - Representer

R78 of DSP - Cheung Tsz Ting

Ms Kwong Shun Yee Lydia - Representer's Representative

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She said that in light of the novel coronavirus infection and the special work arrangement for government departments, the meeting originally scheduled for 31.1.2020 for consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft DSP and the draft OZP was re-scheduled for the current meeting. The representers, commenters and their representatives had been informed that the hearing would be split into two sessions. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters, and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his or her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submissions. 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. As there were Thai speaking representers attending the meeting, simultaneous interpretation service for Cantonese, English and Thai would be provided in the meeting. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives of each session had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the PlanD's representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session of each session, representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting, while the PlanD's representatives would be invited to leave the meeting upon completion of all the Q&A sessions. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments after the completion of all the Q&A sessions and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

6. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

7. Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10618 (the Paper).

[Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stanley T.S. Choi and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting during Ms Cheng's presentation.]

8. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session to make their oral submissions.

R1 and C5 of DSP - Ng Po Keung

C2 of OZP - Ng Po Keung

9. Mr Ng Po Keung and Ms Lee Chui Ling made the following main points:

- (a) many people in the neighbourhood had been waiting for the subject urban renewal project (the redevelopment) for a long time. Although there were some private redevelopments in the area, they did not provide the community

facilities that the residents needed. The redevelopment was taken as the first step to improve the neighbourhood. It would be more desirable if the redevelopment site could cover a larger area;

- (b) upon full operation of the Tuen Ma Line of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR), there would be a station exit at Nam Kok Road. It would enhance the accessibility of Kowloon City and facilitate a better integration between the area and the new developments in the Kai Tak Development Area (KTDA). It would help avoid marginalisation of the old area;
- (c) building rehabilitation could not resolve the problems associated with the dilapidated buildings in Kowloon City. On the other hand, the redevelopment could promptly improve the living environment of the residents;
- (d) as a whole, the redevelopment was supported. However, as pointed out by some other representers, URA would affect the current provision of some social and community facilities serving the Thai community in the area. The government, institution or community (GIC) floor space proposed in the redevelopment should be used for reprovisioning of the affected social and community facilities; and
- (e) Blessing Thai Service Centre of the Alliance Church (the Alliance Church centre) (宣道會泰人恩福服務中心) operating in a commercial building within the Site would be affected by the redevelopment. The Alliance Church centre was a self-financing organisation providing social, education and other community services to the Thai community. The annual number of user-time had increased substantially in the past 10 years from 3,000 to 9,000. Relocation of the centre within the Kowloon City area was necessary so that it could continue to serve the Thai community effectively. However, there was no affordable relocation space available in Kowloon City. URA should reprovision the Alliance Church centre in-situ.

[Messrs Alex T.H. Lai and Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during Mr Ng's and Ms Lee's presentations.]

R90 and C10 of DSP - Mary Mulvihill

R1 and C3 of OZP - Mary Mulvihill

10. With the aid of visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) information on the representers and commenters assigned to each session should be provided so as to enhance transparency in conducting the representation hearing;
 - (b) PlanD should provide updated information on the provision of open space and GIC facilities on the basis of OZP. According to the information provided in 2018 during the consideration of the proposed amendments to the approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/22, there had been shortfalls in the provision of local open space and elderly facilities;
 - (c) for local open space provision, it was not correct for PlanD to say that there were plenty of open spaces in Kowloon City. The subject OZP covered the Ma Tau Kok area which had a shortfall of about 7 ha of local open space;
 - (d) the proposed sunken plaza was only part of an underground passageway to KTDA with commercial facilities and heavy pedestrian flows, which should not be regarded as a local open space for public enjoyment. Its ventilation would also be a problem. A genuine local open space instead of a passageway should be provided; and
 - (e) for GIC facilities, the elderly facilities currently provided in the area were inadequate. The Government should not rely on private developers to provide GIC facilities in private developments through land grant and land exchange to make up the shortfall. Generally, developers were not keen to do so as it would cause delay to their projects. Buying premises in private developments for GIC provision was also not a proper way to meet the demand. On the other hand, URA, as a public body, should play an active role in the provision of GIC facilities. The floor space reserved for GIC uses

in the redevelopment should be increased to help meet the shortfall in the area.

R21 of DSP - Old District Autonomy Advancement Group

11. Mr Wu Kai Wai made the following main points:

- (a) the Old District Autonomy Advancement Group was an independent organisation set up by affectees of urban renewal projects and social workers, with focuses on matters concerning urban development and distribution of land resources;
- (b) URA was a public body which had been given public money and land premium concessions. URA should properly discharge its duties to the benefit of the community, including improving the living environment of the old districts, safeguarding the interests of the residents and local businesses, maintaining the affordability of the housing in the area, and avoiding urban gentrification;
- (c) URA failed to properly rehouse the affected residents. Instead of providing rehousing blocks, URA usually built high-end residential and commercial buildings, e.g. the Lee Tung Street project, which were unaffordable to the affectees. Such projects failed to meet the objectives laid down in the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS), such as improving the living environment and preserving the social network of the community;
- (d) the redevelopment would have extensive impacts on Kowloon City as the rents and property prices in the neighbourhood would increase to an unaffordable level. The lower income group currently living in the neighbourhood would suffer; and
- (e) by processing the draft DSP, the Board had the power to determine the future of Kowloon City and the residents therein. While the Board's consideration of the DSP could provide a platform for public participation in the urban renewal process, the opportunity for public engagement was actually limited.

Taking the current hearing as an example, many residents could not come to the meeting to express their views as they had to work. The planning process was short of the voice of residents and should be democratised.

R49 of DSP - Chaung Wing Yee

R69 of DSP - Ma Uraporn

R70 of DSP - Saechan Veeraray

R74 of DSP - Hengthong Tawan

R75 of DSP - Chung Malee

R76 of DSP - Wu Ka Ming

R77 of DSP - Cheung Kwok Fai

R79 of DSP - Chan Chi Keung

R81 of DSP - Poon Lok Man

R82 of DSP - Lau Chi Nang

R83 of DSP - Ng Yik Fai

R84 of DSP - Chan Kung Hing

C9 of DSP - Rawiwan Wong

12. Ms Rawiwan Wong made the following main points:

- (a) she was a Thai who had been living in Kowloon City for some twenty years and had a close tie with the neighbourhood. The redevelopment would force her to move. She hoped that URA could rehouse her at a location near Kowloon City. Noting that the housing development at the nearby Tung Tau Estate would be completed soon, the Government was requested to reserve units there for rehousing the affected residents; and
- (b) the Government should respect the Thai culture in the neighbourhood and provide an activity centre for use by Thai people and holding events, particularly for the celebration of Songkran Festival (潑水節). It would help preserve the existing local character as “Little Thailand” in Kowloon City.

R72 of DSP - Maneerak Raroengchon

13. Ms Maneerak Raroengchon made the following main points:

- (a) she lived in Tung Tau Estate. With the child care services provided by the Social Service Supporting Centre for Ethnic Minorities of Lok Sin Tong Lee Yin Yee United Centre (Lok Sin Tong), she could work and make a living. If Lok Sin Tong was affected, it would be difficult for her to work and take care of her children at the same time; and
- (b) some landlords in the neighbourhood had increased the rent recently and told their tenants that URA would rehouse or compensate them later. With the rental increase, many shops might have to be closed. The impacts on the neighbourhood would be huge.

R68 of DSP - Jaroennon Parichat

14. Ms Jaroennon Parichat made the following main points:

- (a) the labour union for Thai she joined had about 300 members. Many members of the labour union were concerned about the redevelopment but had to work and could not attend the hearing. In addition, most of the labour union members could not read or speak Chinese or English but URA had provided no information in Thai explaining the redevelopment. Their participation in the urban renewal process was difficult;
- (b) Thai had been active in the neighbourhood and organised various cultural events and activities. URA should preserve the social network of the community and the Thai culture in the area;
- (c) URA had not fully surveyed the Thai living in the neighbourhood or listened to their views on the redevelopment. URA should conduct the freezing survey again;
- (d) the redevelopment would lead to an increase in the costs of living and rentals. It would adversely affect the Thai in the neighbourhood and some of them might be forced to move out of the area. URA should liaise with landlords in the neighbourhood to prevent a substantial rental increase; and

- (e) URA should rehouse affected residents and relocate affected businesses in-situ. The homes and shops provided by URA for the affectees should be affordable and accessible. The Board should not agree to the draft DSP unless URA could make such arrangements.

R50 of DSP – Siu Long Yee

15. Ms Yip Yan Ying made the following main points:

- (a) she represented a resident in the area;
- (b) URA's freezing survey and rehousing arrangements were not acceptable;
- (c) the freezing survey was conducted on weekdays. Many residents had left home for work. The elderly at home had not been able to provide accurate information for the survey, including the number of households in a unit. Some of the information obtained from the survey was incomplete/inaccurate. URA should promptly conduct the freezing survey again to rectify the records; and
- (d) town planning should be people-oriented. If it dealt only with the physical environment, an inhuman city would be created. The affected residents should be rehoused near Kowloon City as they were part of a close-knit community including friends, relatives and businesses. Without any assistance, it would be difficult for the affected residents to move to nearby residential buildings as the rental would increase due to the redevelopment. The redevelopment might thus cause disintegration of the community. If so, the original intentions of urban renewal and town planning would not be achieved.

R60 of DSP – Yip Mei Yung

16. Ms Yip Mei Yung made the following main points:

- (a) she was a previous resident affected by URA's Lee Tung Street project;
- (b) she supported the demand of the residents of Kowloon City that URA should preserve the social network of the local community;
- (c) URA's renewal projects typically would not preserve the original characters of the affected neighbourhoods. For example, after completion of the Lee Tung Street project, the area was no longer the "Wedding Card Street". It had become a luxurious residential development with high-end shops. As a response to the affected residents' demand for returning the "Wedding Card Street" to them upon redevelopment, URA had only placed a sculpture signifying "the fate that brings lovers together" (姻緣). Whether URA could keep its promise in the urban renewal process was questionable;
- (d) URA was a public body set up by the Government. For its operations, the Government had granted it HK\$10 billion when it was set up. In addition, no land premium payment was required for its projects and it could trigger land resumption even if it had less than 80% ownership of the affected lots. Given such support from the Government, URA should duly discharge its duties to the public, rather than making money;
- (e) so far, URA could not re-establish the social networks of the local communities through its projects. In particular, URA had not provided acceptable rehousing and relocation arrangements. That was especially important to the grassroots and elderly. For the subject redevelopment, local rehousing at Nga Tsin Wai was possible. There were also some 10 URA redevelopments in To Kwa Wan, including three completed and six or seven projects with their construction works scheduled for commencement soon. If URA could rehouse and relocate all of the affectees, the project would be less controversial; and
- (f) given that URA had caused so much suffering to the affectees in their previous projects, she objected to the subject redevelopment.

R62 of DSP - Cheung Sin Yi

R80 of DSP - Chow Kam Wing

17. Ms Lee Wai Yi made the following main points:

- (a) town planning and urban renewal involved not only the physical environment but also the people therein. URA had a duty to improve the living environment of the residents in the old districts and re-establish the affected social networks which were also related to employment, education and community support, e.g. child care. However, what URA had done so far was to clear the concerned sites for well off people to move in;
- (b) for the redevelopment, URA should provide proper arrangements for the affected grassroots and Thai within the Site. The Board should require URA to rehouse residents and relocate businesses in affordable accommodation, and re-establish the social network such that the community could continue. If URA refused to do so, the Board should not agree to the draft DSP;
- (c) URA should demolish the existing buildings within the Site phase by phase and offer the affected residents a choice of moving to the flats at the Site upon redevelopment;
- (d) an urban renewal project might cause impacts on its surrounding areas. For the subject redevelopment, the Thai community in the area had created a “Little Thailand” covering the whole Kowloon City. The redevelopment at Sa Po Road might only be a beginning. Upon full operation of the MTR Tuen Ma Line, URA and private developers might redevelop other parts of Kowloon City. The Thai community would then be substantially affected;
- (e) Mr Chow Kam Wing, R80 of DSP who worked in a vehicle repairing workshop, considered that it would be very difficult to re-establish his business at another location if his workshop was cleared for the redevelopment. He would lose his job, working partners, neighbours and quality living. URA should provide premises for relocation of the workshop. As URA had refused to meet the affected residents and business operators, the

Board should request URA to do so. In addition, the flats built by URA were usually small and not affordable;

- (f) Mr Lau Chi Nang (劉志能), who operated a pub, considered that the site for relocating his pub was very important as it would affect its customer network. However, URA did not provide any information on the location or programme for business re-establishment. The affected business operators, including himself, would have great difficulties in continuing their businesses;
- (g) Mr Ng Yik Fai (吳奕輝) working in a vehicle repairing workshop stated that there was not enough assistance provided to tenant operators which had been affected by rental increase subsequent to the announcement of the redevelopment. After the completion of the project, the rental level might rise even further. URA should be responsible for relocating the affected businesses or providing adequate compensation to them such that they could continue their businesses;
- (h) Mr Chan Kung Hing (陳共慶), who had been living in Kowloon City for decades with a strong link to the community there, requested that URA should provide local rehousing. It should also provide more GIC and recreational facilities for the residents;
- (i) the Kowloon City Urban Renewal Concern Group (the Concern Group) formed by residents and businesses in the area was of the view that the Board should not arrange the hearing meeting on a weekday. As many affectees needed to work, their right to participate in the planning process had been deprived of; and
- (j) the Concern Group considered that the Board should not agree to the draft DSP unless URA would accede to the following requests:
 - (i) to provide translation of documents for easy reference of the Thai and other ethnic minorities;

- (ii) to conduct a further freezing survey to rectify the wrong records of the previous freezing survey;
- (iii) to fulfil the objectives set out in the URS in planning the redevelopment;
- (iv) to preserve the social network of the community and local characters, in particular for the Thai community;
- (v) to provide concrete arrangements for the affected residents and shops, including construction of rehousing blocks in the area and assisting the affected businesses in re-establishing their businesses; and
- (vi) to compensate the residents and business operators registered in the freezing survey but subsequently evicted by landlords.

R64 of DSP - Ip Pui Yu

R71 of DSP - Gasing Phobsuk

18. Ms Ip Pui Yu made the following main points:

- (a) she was an organiser of a labour union for local and foreign domestic helpers;
- (b) as the hearing was held on a weekday, Gasing Phobsuk, R71 of DSP and the Chairman of the Thai Migrant Workers' Union (TMWU) Hong Kong, and many TMWU's members had to work and could not attend the hearing. The Board should make arrangements to hear their views on the draft DSP;
- (c) after the announcement of the redevelopment, the rental in the surrounding areas had already increased. The livelihood of the grassroots was being adversely affected. The redevelopment would adversely affect the neighbourhood and its local character as "Little Thailand";
- (d) when the freezing survey was undertaken, many people did not know what it was about. The survey had not been conducted properly. If the Board had a role to monitor URA, the Board should not allow URA to conduct the

freezing survey all of a sudden when many people had no idea of what the survey was about. As indicated by other representers, wrong records were found in the freezing survey;

- (e) in URA's previous briefings, they had not provided adequate assistance to the Thai community to overcome the language barrier. In addition, the briefings only focussed on compensation and rehousing. No information had been provided on URA's duties under the URS, e.g. preservation of the social networks and the redevelopment proposal;
- (f) the TMWU centre was within the Site and would be affected by the redevelopment. TMWU served a large number of Thai workers in Hong Kong. Many workers visited the centre at weekends. They were also used to gather at places near Regal Oriental Hotel. For its service recipients, TMWU could only operate in Kowloon City. In fact, TMWU had previously attempted to operate outside the area for reason of lower rental but it had not been successful as it was not convenient for the Thai workers. If the redevelopment was implemented, TMWU would have to be relocated but suitable premises in Kowloon City were not available. In that regard, besides the redevelopment plan, URA should provide the detailed relocation arrangements; and
- (g) the Board should not agree to the draft DSP as URA did not undertake any public consultation before the announcement of the plan. It also failed to provide details on the compensation and rehousing/relocation arrangements before proposing the redevelopment. The Board should review all URA's mishandlings pointed out by the representers to avoid repeating the same in the future.

R78 of DSP - Cheung Tsz Ting

19. Ms Kwong Shun Yee Lydia made the following main points:

- (a) the Board played an important role as a gatekeeper in the town planning process. It was not right to separate urban renewal from town planning in a

discrete manner as it would result in many blind spots in the system. The redevelopment should not be taken only as a compensation and rehousing issue. The planning for urban renewal should also be done properly. In fact, town planning and urban renewal should be tackled in one go. In particular, the Board should stop URA from redeveloping old areas for luxurious housing;

- (b) Maneerak, who was a grassroots resident of Kowloon City living outside the Site, had the following main views:
 - (i) many families in Kowloon City relied on the child care and other social services provided by Lok Sin Tong. With its services, parents could work to support their families. If those families had to leave Kowloon City for the redevelopment, the social services they relied on would no longer be accessible. Some of the parents might have to give up their jobs to take care of their children. Their family income might then not be able to support their livings;
 - (ii) in Kowloon City, it was easy for the Thai to seek assistance from fellow Thai at night. If they had to move out of the area, the social network could not be retained; and
 - (iii) local rehousing at a reasonable rental level should be provided. After the completion of the redevelopment, the area should still be able to provide what the Thai needed in an affordable manner;
- (c) Veeraray, who had been a business operator in Kowloon City for about 20 years, considered that the substantial rental increase caused by the redevelopment would adversely affect the business. Both URA and the Board should pay attention to such adverse impacts at the planning stage;
- (d) Methawee, who lived in the neighbourhood, opined that sites at KTDA should be reserved for re-establishment of the affected Thai businesses so that it would be easier for them to keep their customers; and

- (e) Mr Leung Wing Tat (梁永達), who had spent his childhood and been educated in Kowloon City and was now a liberal studies teacher of a secondary school in Wong Tai Sin, had the following main comments:
- (i) it was not correct for URA to claim that Kowloon City needed to be revitalised to create local characters as the area was already very vibrant with distinct local characters;
 - (ii) he had observed the sufferings of people caused by URA projects and how the projects had turned the dilapidated buildings into luxurious housing and shops which were not affordable to the affectees. In those projects, the affectees would have to leave their neighbourhoods and the original local character could not be preserved; and
 - (iii) for the current redevelopment, URA failed to conduct public consultation and the freezing survey properly. It would not be able to preserve the local characters and culture of the neighbourhood. URA should adopt a people-oriented approach to undertake further public consultation, and retain the existing residents and businesses.

20. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, and the representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session for the first session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, commenters, their representatives and/or PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

The Site and Proposed Redevelopment

Overall Planning

21. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the development restrictions imposed on the Site under the previous approved Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/24 (the previous OZP) before the gazettal of the

draft DSP;

- (b) if a private developer had acquired the land of the Site for private redevelopment, whether the redevelopment would require permission from the Board under the previous OZP;
- (c) the improvements that the draft DSP could achieve from the planning point of view;
- (d) the age and conditions of the buildings within the Site and whether there was any historic building within the Site;

GIC Floor Space

- (e) the GIC facilities to be provided at the Site;
- (f) whether it was possible to provide additional GIC floor space at the Site;
- (g) whether the affected non-governmental organisations (NGOs) could take up some of the GIC floor space;

Sunken Plaza

- (h) whether the sunken plaza would be too small for the Thai activities;
- (i) which party would be responsible for the management of the sunken plaza;

Public Vehicle Park

- (j) the need for the public vehicle park and the mode of operation of the vehicle park; and

Private Road

- (k) for the to be diverted Sa Po Road which would become a section of a private road for public use 24 hours daily, whether the future developer would manage that section of the road and, if so, whether such arrangement was common in Hong Kong.

22. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:

Overall Planning

- (a) the Site was zoned “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”) on the previous OZP, subject to a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 7.5 and a total PR of 9.0, and a maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD;
- (b) if a private developer had completely acquired the land within the Site and intended to take forward a similar redevelopment proposal without involving minor relaxation of the BH restriction under the previous OZP, the Board’s permission under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) would still be required as the redevelopment proposal included a public vehicle park. However, if the public vehicle park was not proposed, the Board’s permission would not be required;
- (c) the draft DSP would enable a comprehensive redevelopment that could provide not only ancillary car parking for future residents but also 300 public parking spaces to address the problem of insufficient parking spaces in the eastern part of Kowloon City. The comprehensive redevelopment would also include a sunken plaza to allow access from Prince Edward Road East to the Government’s subway that would link up with the planned underground shopping street in KTDA. The sunken plaza could provide a public space at various levels with sitting-out facilities, and also serve as an environmental buffer between Prince Edward Road East and the proposed residential towers. Without the plaza, the pedestrians crossing the road via the Government’s subway would ascend to the ground level via lift and escalators only. In addition, the redevelopment would provide GIC floor space of not less than 800m²;
- (d) the building age of the existing buildings within the Site ranged from 30 to over 50 years old. According to URA’s building condition survey, the buildings were generally in varied or poor conditions. There was no historic building within the Site;

- (e) there was no concrete proposal for the 800m² floor space reserved for GIC uses yet. URA would discuss further with the relevant government departments to identify the users;
- (f) as indicated in the Notes of the draft DSP, any floor space for GIC uses, as required by the Government, might be disregarded from PR calculation. There was room for URA to consider increasing the floor space for GIC uses at the detailed design stage. Such increase would not affect the provision of residential and commercial floor spaces permitted under the draft DSP. However, if the increase in floor space was substantial, URA might need to further study the technical feasibility;
- (g) there was no restriction under the draft DSP on the occupier of the proposed GIC floor space. For the affected NGOs, they might also operate in the non-domestic portion of the redevelopment;

Sunken Plaza

- (h) the proposed sunken plaza would provide open-air landscaped areas for the public at different levels. The total area was about 1,000m², which was similar to the size of Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden further southwest, i.e. the open space often used for holding Thai events and activities as indicated by some representers;
- (i) the sunken plaza would be managed and maintained by URA or its project partner;

Public Vehicle Park

- (j) in view of the illegal parking conditions in the area, the Kowloon City District Council had repeatedly asked for provision of more public vehicle parking spaces. According to the traffic impact assessment (TIA) submitted by URA, the provision of 300 public parking spaces was based on the total number of metered parking and illegal parking surveyed in the area. The Transport Department had no adverse comment on the proposal;

- (k) there was no restriction on how the public vehicle park would be operated, such as letting of the parking spaces on an hourly or monthly basis; and

Private Road

- (l) the to be diverted section of Sa Po Road would be managed and maintained by URA or its project partner. The management arrangement of a private road was not uncommon in Hong Kong. As private facilities, e.g. car parking, would be provided beneath the road, the concerned land would not be handed over to the Government and would be maintained by the project proponent in accordance with the established practice.

Freezing Survey

23. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) when URA gave notification of the freezing survey to the residents and business operators within the Site;
- (b) what errors were found in the freezing survey;
- (c) whether the wrong records of the freezing survey had been rectified; and
- (d) whether there was an appeal mechanism for wrong records, if any, in the freezing survey.

24. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, explained that URA's renewal projects were kept confidential before they were formerly announced. For the subject redevelopment, it was commenced on 22.2.2019 and the freezing survey started on the same day to record the residents and businesses within the Site at that point of time. The survey was completed within a short period of time but she had no information on the exact duration. She also had no information on the alleged wrong records of the freezing survey. Members might wish to seek clarifications from URA, which would attend the second session of the hearing as a commenter, C1 of DSP, in the afternoon.

25. Ms Lee Wai Yi, representative of R62 and R80 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) the freezing survey was undertaken in three days. As the notifications were in English and Chinese only, Thai residents and business operators had no idea about the survey;
- (b) more than 10 households were affected by the wrong records of the freezing survey. For instance, three households in one unit had been recorded as one household in the survey. Two separate businesses at the same premises had been recorded as one business. The survey had also failed to record households at a vehicle repairing workshop;
- (c) on the appeal mechanism, after the freezing survey, affected residents and businesses might provide information not recorded in the survey to URA. It would then depend on whether URA would accept such information. For the subject redevelopment, after receiving such information from the affected residents and businesses, some URA officers visited the affectees and said that they would handle the matters. However, there was so far no rectification of the wrong records and URA refused to formally meet those affectees. As the future compensation and rehousing arrangements would be based on the records of the freezing survey, those affectees had been very anxious; and
- (d) whilst URA would submit the redevelopment to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval, CE in C would not be able to handle detailed matters such as the wrong records of the freezing survey. The Board was requested to interfere and monitor the handling of such matters as part of the planning process.

The Affected NGOs and Thai Community within the Site

26. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) information about the Thai residents and business operators within the Site;

- (b) the location and floor space of the affected NGOs; and
- (c) the operation of the Alliance Church centre.

27. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) submitted by URA, out of the 401 households surveyed within the Site, there were 19 Thai households, i.e. about 5% of the total. For the 75 surveyed business operators, 6 of them were Thai operators, i.e. about 8% of the total. From site observation, there were two Thai restaurants and one Thai massage parlour within the Site;
- (b) according to the 2016 Population By-census, the total population in the whole Kowloon City District were about 410,000 and the Thai population was about 870 (i.e. about 0.2%). For the Lung Shing District Council Constituency Area covering largely Kowloon City, there was no specific information on the Thai population but out of the total population of some 15,000, the category 'Others' under the population by ethnicity, which should include Thai, amounted to some 600; and
- (c) according to those who had submitted representations, there were four NGOs operating within the Site, including TMWU; the Alliance Church centre; Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association, Hong Kong Limited; and Christian Oi Hip Fellowship Limited (Oi Hip). The latter three were operating at Kam Fai Commercial Building and the first one was operating at a unit on the second floor of 78 Kai Tak Road. There was no information at hand about the floor space currently occupied by the four NGOs.

28. Ms Ip Pui Yu, representative of R64 and R71 of DSP, Ms Jaroennon Parichat, R68 of the draft DSP, and Maneerak Raroengchon, R72 of DSP, said that the TMWU centre was at 78 Kai Tak Road within the Site. TMWU shared the unit with a resident. The floor space of the unit was about 200ft² to 300ft². TMWU provided assistance to all Thai workers, not only domestic helpers. It had a close tie with the local community in Kowloon City and took part in events such as Songkran Festival.

29. In response to a Member's question, Ms Maneerak Raroengchon, R72 of DSP, clarified that Lok Sin Tong would not be affected by the redevelopment but she was still concerned about the possible adverse impacts of the redevelopment on the NGOs in the area.

30. Members noted that the representatives of the Alliance Church centre had already left and no further information on the operation of the centre could be provided.

Thai Community in Hong Kong and in Kowloon City

31. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the number of Thai domestic helpers in Hong Kong and the total number of Thai in Hong Kong;
- (b) the Thai events that would be organised in a year and the venues for holding such events; and whether the current venues in Kowloon City were adequate for the Thai events; and
- (c) the NGOs in Kowloon City providing services to the Thai; and whether they would be affected by the redevelopment.

32. In response, Ms Ip Pui Yu, representative of R64 and R71 of DSP, and Maneerak Raroengchon, R72 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) there were currently some 2,000 Thai domestic helpers in Hong Kong while there were a total of about 11,000 Thai living in Hong Kong;
- (b) the large Thai events would be organised at intervals of about three months. They would usually be held at Tak Ku Ling Road Rest Garden, the football field at Carpenter Road Park or Argyle Street Playground. The latter two venues could provide adequate activity spaces but the first one was too small. When the Songkran Festival was celebrated, activities spread from Regal Oriental Hotel to Lung Kong Road. The parade would march through every street in Kowloon City and the starting point was at Tak Ku Ling Road Rest

Garden or Carpenter Road Park. The Thai community would also organise events to celebrate the birthdays of the former King, and the current King and Queen of Thailand, as well as the Labour Day; and

- (c) there were some service centres, like Lok Sin Tong and the Alliance Church centre, providing services to the Thai in Kowloon City. The Hong Kong Federation of Trade Unions and a few dozens of Thai organisations would also provide services to the Thai. However, the services those NGOs provided were still not enough to meet the demand. Those NGOs also did not have adequate space for their activities.

33. A Member drew Members' attention that according to the 2016 By-census, the Thai population in Hong Kong were some 10,000, and there were about 5,000 Thai domestic helpers in Hong Kong.

Compensation and Rehousing

34. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether local rehousing would be provided to the affected residents;
- (b) whether the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) played a role in the rehousing arrangement;
- (c) whether there was any relocation arrangement for the affected NGOs; and
- (d) whether URA had provided assistance to the affectees.

35. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points based on the comment in respect of the draft DSP submitted by URA:

- (a) URA had agreements with HKHA and the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) to provide rehousing units for eligible affectees of URA projects;

- (b) eligible tenant business operators and NGOs would be compensated. URA would also assist them in identifying suitable premises in the area for relocation;
- (c) for the affected NGOs, the commercial premises in the area would also be a possible relocation option; and
- (d) URA had a social service team to provide assistance to the affectees.

36. The Chairperson pointed out that in assessing the eligibility of the affectees for rehousing, the income and asset tests of HKHA/HKHS would apply. To provide a better rehousing arrangement, the Government also had an agreement with HKHS and entrusted HKHS to construct rehousing estates for eligible affectees on a non-means tested basis. One of such rehousing estates would be built in KTDA.

37. In response to a Member's question, Ms Lee Wai Yi, representative of R62 and R80 of DSP, and Mr Wu Kai Wai, representative of R21 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) the social service team for the redevelopment was from St. James Settlement. They had contacted the affectees;
- (b) the social service team had provided assistance to the affectees but could not change the planning of the redevelopment; and
- (c) the social service team was funded by URA. While the team was technically independent from URA, URA had imposed constraints on what assistance the social service team could provide to the affectees.

Planning of Kowloon City

38. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any planning for Kowloon City;
- (b) whether there was any proposal for preserving the local character of the

neighbourhood;

- (c) according to the SIA, whether the redevelopment would affect the Thai character of Kowloon City, and if so, what the impacts would be; and
- (d) whether there was any plan to link up Kowloon City with KTDA in physical and social terms.

39. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the previous District Urban Renewal Forum (DURF) study had examined Kowloon City and identified the Site as a possible comprehensive development site for mixed commercial, community and residential uses. Currently, URA was undertaking a study to explore opportunities of urban renewal in the wider district under the planning-led strategy and approach;
- (b) preservation of local character of the neighbourhood would be considered by URA at the detailed design stage;
- (c) the SIA recorded that Kowloon City was a popular dining place with a high concentration of Thai restaurants, particularly in the central part of the area. The SIA had examined how assistance, if needed, could be provided to the affected business operators; and
- (d) studies for KTDA had examined ways to enhance its pedestrian linkages with the surrounding hinterland areas. The underground shopping street in KTDA would be connected to the Site via the subway currently under construction by the Government across Prince Edward Road East. There would also be an exit of the MTR Sung Wong Toi Station at Nam Kok Road near the central part of Kowloon City. In planning the KTDA, the size of development sites had been reduced taking into account the grid pattern in Kowloon City. Colonnade design was also proposed for some lots in KTDA to echo the characteristics of the existing buildings in Kowloon City.

Role of the Board in URA Projects

40. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) noting that there was a division of functions between URA and the Board, what the role of the Board and its power were in urban renewal;
 - (b) whether the Board had the power under TPO to press URA on the compensation and rehousing arrangements as requested by some representers;
 - (c) the Board's key considerations in processing the draft DSP;
 - (d) whether there was any mechanism to address the concerns of the affectees of URA projects; and
 - (e) whether mitigation measures could be included in the SIA to require URA to address the concerns of the affectees.
41. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:
- (a) under the TPO, the Board shall prepare draft plans for the lay-out of areas of Hong Kong and specific planning restrictions regarding development intensities and land use requirements might be imposed. The Board would consider the representations and comments received during the statutory plan making process and decide whether the planning restrictions imposed in the DSP were appropriate or needed to be amended to meet the representations;
 - (b) compensation and rehousing matters were not within the Board's ambit under the TPO. The Board had no power to impose restrictions on who could live or do business at the Site;
 - (c) the Board's key role was to consider the draft DSP. In the process, the Board's main considerations included whether the area was suitable for the redevelopment and whether the development restrictions were appropriate. According to the Explanatory Statement of the draft DSP, URA would be

required to provide a public vehicle park, GIC floor space and a sunken plaza. The requirements were formulated taking into account views of relevant government departments as well as recommendations of the DURF study. Regarding the plot ratio restrictions, they were the same as the “R(A)2” zone in the surroundings. In order to provide the said public facilities including the sunken plaza in the southern part of the Site, the Metro Planning Committee agreed to a maximum BH of 120mPD for the Site which was slightly higher than that of the surrounding “R(A)2” sites, with BH of 100mPD (or 80mPD for sites smaller than 400m²);

- (d) after consideration of the representations and comments, the Board might decide to agree to the draft DSP with or without amendments. URA would proceed to implement the project, including consideration of compensation and rehousing arrangements, in accordance with the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (URAO); and
- (e) in February 2019, URA submitted the draft DSP and a planning report for the redevelopment, together with the SIA (Stage 1) report and other technical assessments, for the Board to consider whether the draft DSP was suitable for publication under the TPO. The SIA (Stage 2) report was submitted to the Board later in April 2019. Any further views on the compensation and rehousing matters and matters to be included in SIAs for future DSPs could be separately conveyed to URA.

42. The Chairperson pointed out that under the current procedures, URA had to initiate a development scheme by gazetting the redevelopment and undertake a freezing survey at the same time. Such actions only meant that URA had an intention to undertake a development scheme at a specific location but the scheme was not approved yet. If the development parameters of the scheme were not in line with the restrictions under the OZP, a draft DSP should be prepared under the URAO for consideration by the Board. If the draft DSP was agreed by the Board as suitable for publication for public inspection, the statutory public consultation procedure for plan making would be carried out in accordance with the TPO. If CE in C approved the draft DSP, URA would proceed with the necessary further actions, including providing the affectees with information on the compensation and rehousing arrangements and related assistance and URA had to submit the proposal to CE in C for

approval. In the submission to CE in C, URA had to report on the affectees it had contacted and the views of those affectees on the project, including the compensation and rehousing arrangements. CE in C would then decide whether to approve the proposal for URA's implementation.

43. In relation to the issues on compensation, rehousing and relocation, the Chairperson said that pursuant to the TPO, the Board was only empowered to prepare plans for the lay-out of such areas of Hong Kong as the Chief Executive might direct. The Board's functions were thus primarily to deal with land use matters. For the compensation, rehousing and relocation matters arising from the redevelopment, they were governed by the URAO, not the TPO. The Board was not empowered to handle such matters.

44. The Chairperson further reminded Members that URA was a commenter of the draft DSP and its representatives would attend the second session of the hearing. If necessary, Members might direct their questions to URA's representatives in the second session.

45. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the first session had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting in a separate session after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives of the first session for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

46. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:40 p.m.

[Messrs Wilson Y.W. Fung and Franklin Yu left the meeting at this juncture.]

47. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

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

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

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

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

49. The following representatives of PlanD, representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session were invited to the meeting:

PlanD

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng - DPO/K
Mr C.H. Mak - STP/K

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R59 of DSP - 楊健濱

Mr Yung Yin Kwong - Representer's Representative

R65 of DSP - Kwong Shun Yee, Lydia

Mr Wu Ka Wai - Representer's Representative

R87 of DSP - 基督教愛協團契有限公司

Mr Wong Kam Hung]
Mr Lai King Cheung] Representer's Representatives
Ms Wong Wang Kuen]
Ms Chan Suet Lan]

R89 of DSP - 香港郭汾陽崇德總會有限公司

Mr Kwok Chun Chung] Representer's Representatives

Mr Kwok Chun Shing]

C1 of DSP - Urban Renewal Authority

Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike]

Ms Kwan Mei Po] Commenter's Representatives

Ms Charice Ho]

C8 of DSP - 陳碧雲

Ms Chen Pi Yean - Commenter

50. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session to make their oral submissions.

R59 - 楊健濱

51. Mr Yung Yin Kwong made the following main points:

- (a) he represented a group of tenant operators affected by the subject redevelopment;
- (b) they had concerns on the current compensation arrangement for tenant operators adopted by URA. The ex-gratia allowance was at present three times of the rateable value of rented property, plus an ex-gratia business allowance which was 10% of the rateable value for each year of business operation, with a minimum of \$110,000 for those with 10 years or less in operation;
- (c) the freezing survey was conducted by URA in early 2019 but he was not sure if the compensation would be made according to the freezing survey registration. The tenant operators worried that if their tenant status could not be confirmed during the freezing survey, they might not be able to obtain the ex-gratia business allowance. Moreover, due to the long

implementation period, some existing tenant operators might not be able to renew the tenancy agreements with the owners or some might be asked to pay a substantially higher rent which would as a result force them to close the businesses. The current compensation arrangement had a lot of problems, including posing high risks to the financial situation and business operation of the existing tenant operators; and

- (d) he hoped that the Board could help solve the problems under the current compensation arrangement.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law returned to join the meeting and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting during Mr Yung's presentation.]

R87 of DSP - 基督教愛協團契有限公司

52. Mr Wong Kam Hung, Ms Wong Wang Kuen, Ms Chan Suet Lan and Mr Lai King Cheung made the following main points:

- (a) Oi Hip was a non-profit making body providing rehabilitation services for ex-mentally ill people, which aimed to build up a support community for their target group so as to reduce the relapse rate and to help them re-integrate into the society. Whilst Oi Hip had been providing such services for more than 30 years, it was not a subvented NGO under the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and was just one of the beneficiaries of the time-limited "Financial Support Scheme for Self-Help Organisations of Persons with Disabilities/Chronic Illness" in 2018-2020. The main sources of their funding came from fund raising and offerings, and their existing premises within the DSP area was bought on interest-free loans;
- (b) the number of people suffering from depression in Hong Kong had increased rapidly from about 1.3% of the total population in 2011 to about 9.1% in 2019 as revealed in the research conducted by the University of Hong Kong. The increasing trend was expected to be more remarkable in

light of the recent social unrest in Hong Kong and pandemic as social distance was widened and unemployment had increased;

- (c) the redevelopment would affect the operation of Oi Hip as their mental health centre was currently operating in a premises within the DSP area. Provision of mutual support and a stable environment were very essential for their service recipients in particular for those suffering from depression, and any minor change to the established social network might adversely affect their participation and recovery. As such, relocation, if unavoidable, should be within the same neighbourhood. Otherwise, the well-established relationships between Oi Hip and the schools/other NGOs in the neighbourhood as well as their new projects under planning would be affected. The implementation of some projects had already been suspended due to uncertainties about the relocation;
- (d) although some subvented NGOs also provided mental health support services in Kowloon City, the services provided by Oi Hip were quite different, which emphasised long-term caring and mutual support rather than short-term rehabilitation;
- (e) the support from the community and peers were very effective to their service recipients. Many previous recipients had now become helpers in the centre as they had similar life experiences. They helped lead small groups in activities and shared their personal recovery experience with others. Many members of Oi Hip had joined the centre for over 20 to 30 years. The familiarity and sense of security of the centre were very important for mental-illness patients and ex-patients. Their centre had been relocated to the current premises for only three to four years and the relationship and trusts between the centre and the service recipients had just been re-established. In that regard, any relocation, even just to the next street block, would take a very long time of adaptation by their members. The existing premises was at a convenient location well served by various modes of public transport as well as the future MTR stations;

and

- (f) to sum up, they did not want to move as it would affect their provision of services. Should the redevelopment be proceeded, sufficient assistance on relocation and reasonable compensation should be offered to Oi Hip.

R65 of DSP - Kwong Shun Yee, Lydia

53. Mr Wu Ka Wai made the following main points:

- (a) according to the 2011 URS, the key principles to be adopted by URA were to improve the living environment of the older urban area, preserve the social networks and local characteristics of the affected community, and adopt a public participatory approach in the urban renewal process. As URA was trusted with the use of public money and the power to acquire land via land resumption, URA should fulfil its role as a public body;
- (b) there were problems with the freezing survey. There were cases that some households, even after several attempts, were still unable to rectify the information recorded in the survey due to their absence during the survey period or misunderstanding of the questions in the survey arising from language/communication problems. As the compensation and relocation arrangements would be based upon the freezing survey results, the survey should be conducted accurately;
- (c) instead of producing luxurious flats, social space and alternative solutions to help preserve the social networks of the local community, especially for the Thai community, should be provided in the redevelopment;
- (d) designation of a DSP would often lead to increasing rents in the area, and the amount of compensation offered by URA under the prevailing policy was insufficient for relocation. As such, the affected residents and business operators should be allowed to participate in the redevelopment

process. The concern group (the Old District Autonomy Advancement Group (R21)) he belonged to had fought hard in redevelopment of Lee Tung Street for the local residents and business operators to participate in the planning process and to have a choice to stay or leave. The request for reserving certain floor spaces for the affected residents and business operators to facilitate preservation of the social network had also been agreed in that project, although such flats and shops in the redevelopment upon completion were not really affordable to the affectees;

- (e) as URA was a public body funded by public money, public space and facilities should be provided in their redevelopment projects. The proposed sunken plaza under the subject redevelopment for integration with the subway linking up with the underground shopping street at KTDA did not provide adequate usable space for public activities. Besides, it would likely become another problem case involving provision of public open space in private developments like the Times Square. There were also precedent cases that URA did not open the public space to the public as proposed. It was suggested that the proposed open plaza should be connected with the proposed Sports Stadium at KTDA such that the functions of the public space would be greatly enhanced; and
- (f) he urged URA to adopt the “people first, district-based, public participatory” approach in carrying out their redevelopment projects as set out in the URS to improve the living conditions of residents in the old districts instead of displacing people and destroying social network.

R89 of DSP - 香港郭汾陽崇德總會有限公司

54. Messrs Kwok Chun Shing and Kwok Chun Chung made the following main points:

- (a) Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association, Hong Kong Limited had held ancestral worship activities for the Kwok clan in Kowloon City

annually in the twelfth lunar month for more than 70 years since they moved from Chiu Yang to Hong Kong. Their ceremonies were previously held in Fung Wong Village and then Ho Man Tin before moving into the Argyle Street Playground in Kowloon City. The rituals mainly consisted of ancestral worship, parade and performance of Chiu Chow opera. The events also provided opportunity for clan gathering;

- (b) the ancestral worship of the Kwok clan was a rare traditional ancestor worship activity in the urban area and was included in the first Intangible Cultural Heritage Inventory of Hong Kong;
- (c) the existing premises occupied by the association at Kam Fai Commercial Building within the DSP area was used as their ancestral hall. A central and convenient location in the urban area for the association was very important for their ceremonies and performances as most of their members were elderly people. Should relocation be required, it would be difficult for them to find a suitable premises for relocation in the vicinity as most commercial buildings, and even some industrial buildings, did not have high ceiling and might not allow incense burning which was required in their ceremonies; and
- (d) they once had the opportunity to request the Government to grant a piece of land for permanent development of their ancestral hall 50 years ago, which was a common practice then. Given the financial situation of the association at that time, they had not accepted the offer. As far as the subject redevelopment was concerned, they did not want to be moved. If relocation was unavoidable, assistance/support on relocation arrangement and reasonable compensation should be offered.

C1 of DSP - Urban Renewal Authority

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike made the following main points:

- (a) although URA's representatives did not attend the first session of the hearing, they had all along viewed the broadcast of the meeting in the public viewing room and listened carefully to the concerns raised by other representers/commenters and the questions from Members of the Board during the first session. He would include in his presentation responses to those concerns and questions raised;

The Redevelopment Project

- (b) the development scheme located to the eastern part of the Lung Tong district, with a net site area of only 5,352m², was generally in line with the recommendations of the Urban Renewal Plan (URP) for Kowloon City under the DURF study which was completed in 2014. The proposed redevelopment had a number of planning merits, including (i) a split-level sunken plaza of 1,000m², (ii) re-diversion of Sa Po Road and footpath widening, (iii) a provision of 300 public car parking spaces, and (iv) not less than 800m² of gross floor area (GFA) for community uses;
- (c) under the DSP, the BH restriction had been relaxed from 100mPD in the previous OZP to 120mPD. The residential towers were located in the northern portion of the Site;

The Split-level Sunken Plaza

- (d) a sunken plaza of about 1,000m², at multi-levels with covered and uncovered areas with hard and soft landscape, would be provided for public use. The proposal was in line with the Government's planning intention to create a nodal point and to enhance the connection between the Kowloon City and KTDA;
- (e) multiple activities including commercial/retail components, event space and place-making elements could take place in the sunken plaza. Shelters

would be provided for the escalators to allow all-weather walkways. As the Site was subject to various constraints, any further increase in the size of the sunken plaza would be difficult;

- (f) the sunken plaza would integrate with the public subway linking up with the underground shopping street at KTDA. The sunken plaza would be provided with barrier-free access and the proposed linkage with the subway would be opened 24 hours daily for public passage while the plaza would be opened at reasonable hours. With the provision of the sunken plaza, the residential towers would be set back by 50m at the intersection point of DSP boundary at Kai Tak Road and Prince Edward Road East to enhance air ventilation to the old district;

Road Diversion and Public Vehicle Park

- (g) the pavement at the bus waiting area along Prince Edward Road East near the sunken plaza would be widened. The proposed re-diversion of Sa Po Road and footpath widening would help improve pedestrian circulation;
- (h) a total of 300 public car parking spaces would be provided underground to alleviate the parking demand in the eastern part of the area. Triple parking along the surrounding streets was common and often caused traffic jam and adverse impacts on road safety for pedestrians in the area. The provision of the public car parking spaces would probably absorb a portion of the on-street parking and help improve the pedestrian circulation and walkability;
- (i) URA was conducting a separate project feasibility study for the Lung Tong district covering, among others, implementation of related pavement improvement works, which was carried out under their revitalisation initiative to enhance walkability of the area. Other urban renewal strategies to improve walkability of the old districts would also be examined with the support of relevant government departments;

GIC Facilities

- (j) not less than 800m² GFA would be reserved for community and social welfare uses to meet the local needs. Funding was already available for the provision of a bare-shell for the GIC facilities which was accepted by SWD. Any additional floor space for GIC facilities could be considered if required by the Government though its feasibility would be subject to further study, taking into account the site constraints;

- (k) four NGOs, namely Oi Hip; Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association, Hong Kong Limited; the Alliance Church centre; and TMWU would be affected by the redevelopment. The former three were owner-occupiers with a total floor area of about 2,000ft² while the latter was a tenant occupying a floor area of about 200ft². As the redevelopment would be completed in about 10 years, URA would help identify suitable premises for the business/service operators to continue their operation in the same district as far as practicable. It was noted that there were a number of existing commercial and office buildings in the Lung Tong area, and thus relocation to affordable premises within the same neighbourhood should not be very difficult;

- (l) besides, some of the retail spaces on the second and third floors of the redevelopment could be reserved for community uses if needed. Should the NGOs affected by the redevelopment intend to move back to the future development, they could submit a written request to URA for consideration. A written request was necessary as according to their previous experience, the URA Board of Directors had given special approval to reserve certain space to assist the dried seafood selling operators to re-establish their business in the redevelopment project at Central and Western District to preserve the local character, but the business operators, who previously indicated interest verbally, did not take up the reserved space eventually;

Freezing Survey and Ethnic Minorities

- (m) according to the freezing survey conducted in February 2019, only 19 Thai households (5% of the total 401 surveyed households) and 6 Thai business operators (8% of the total 75 surveyed business operators) were recorded. There were also households of other ethnic minority groups including those from Pakistan, Indonesia, Singapore and South Korea;
- (n) URA was well aware that there were Thai people in the area and had organised two public briefings on 27.2.2019 to the affected parties on the redevelopment scheme with English and Thai interpreters. A separate briefing with an interpreter solely for Thai residents/operators was held on 18.3.2019 to explain the prevailing policies on compensation and rehousing to alleviate their concerns. Pamphlets in Thai Language as well as other ethnic minority dialects on the planning procedures and acquisition policies were provided to the residents and business operators of Thai and other ethnic groups, and had been uploaded to URA's website;
- (o) the social service team had already contacted the 19 Thai households and 6 Thai business operators recorded by URA. The social service team and URA would continue to provide assistance to the ethnic groups;
- (p) to preserve the local character of the Thai community, URA would consider reserving some ground floor shop spaces within the redevelopment for Thai and South East Asian cuisine restaurants;
- (q) as regards the concern about accuracy of the freezing survey, it might be due to different interpretations of a household. For example, family members living together might not be accepted as individual households by URA. In respect of the duration of the freezing survey, according to the URS, URA should conduct a freezing survey on the commencement day to determine eligibility for ex-gratia allowances and rehousing, and the survey should be completed on the same day or at most within a couple of

days; and

- (r) the subject DSP area was previously zoned “R(A)2” on the OZP and residential development was always permitted. Under the DSP, URA would redevelop the Site comprehensively. Should the Site be developed by individual private developers, pencil buildings would likely occur. It was mentioned in the comments received during the DSP submission stage that private acquisition was underway of some lots in Sa Po Road. However, such piecemeal redevelopments, without provision of GIC and/or parking facilities, were considered not desirable.

C8 of DSP - 陳碧雲

26. Ms Chen Pi Yean made the following main points:

- (a) the acquisition policy of URA discriminated owners of non-domestic properties with tenants. According to the acquisition principles adopted by URA, an owner of a non-domestic property would receive the market value of the property plus an allowance. The allowance for owners of non-domestic properties with tenants was 10% of the market value, while the allowance for owner-occupiers was 35% of its market value. In addition, the owner-occupiers were entitled to other allowances. She considered that the differential treatment between owner-occupiers and owners of non-domestic properties with tenants should be reduced;
- (b) as her business in the area was declining in the past few years, she had to rent out a portion of her shop as a source of income. It should be noted that the relocation costs were very great to those owners of small businesses, not to mention the 4% to 5% stamp duty required by the Government. The compensation offer would probably not be able to cover the related charges and moving expenses. The long relocation process would also lead to a loss of the rental income; and

- (c) the redevelopment would increase the population in the area and generate additional traffic flow. However, many existing buildings did not provide any parking facilities and triple parking on the nearby streets was commonly found during busy hours. More comprehensive planning would be required to address the traffic problems and improve the connection with other districts. The proposed 300 public car parking spaces were insufficient to meet the parking demand in the area and should be further increased. Retail spaces were rather adequate in the area and more spaces could be reserved for office and community uses as some of the office buildings within the DSP area would be displaced and the existing institutions in the buildings had to be relocated. A sunken plaza with split levels was not desirable for an area with so many elderly people.

56. As the presentation of the representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session for the second session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers, commenters and their representatives and/or the PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

The Proposed Redevelopment and Sunken Plaza

57. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the size of flat land within the proposed sunken plaza; and whether a covered plaza and more flat land could be provided so as to make the plaza a more user-friendly public space;
- (b) whether the sunken plaza was included in the calculation of local open space;
- (c) noting the site constraints of the sunken plaza, whether its entrance

connecting to KTDA was spacious enough; and whether alternative locations for such entrance had been considered, e.g. within the Kowloon Walled City site;

- (d) the width of the subway; the floor levels of the subway connecting to the commercial portion of the redevelopment; and whether shops would be provided in the subway; and
- (e) noting that the adjacent residential development was having a BH of 170mPD, whether a higher BH could be stipulated for the Site so that more space at the lower levels could be free up for development of the sunken plaza.

58. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following main points:

- (a) the sunken plaza was proposed at the southern edge of the Site to provide an additional open air space for public use, which had not been counted towards the local open space provision of 1m² per person under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG);
- (b) the subway connecting to the proposed sunken plaza would be 8m in width and no commercial use was planned within the subway; and
- (c) in general, the neighbouring residential area was subject to a maximum BH of 80mPD (or 100mPD for sites within an area of 400m² or more) under the OZP. The concerned site to the north of the DSP was subject to a BH restriction of 140mPD and the existing residential development on site with a BH of 170mPD was developed before the imposition of the BH restriction. Besides, the current BH restriction of 120mPD for the subject redevelopment was already relaxed as compared to that under the previous OZP, and was proposed by URA which should be sufficient to accommodate the proposed development intensity and was considered generally compatible with the surrounding developments.

59. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, representative of C1 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the recommendation of URP for Kowloon City, connections with the underground shopping street in KTDA and its passageways leading to the ground level should be provided in the development, an area of around 600m² to 800m² near its entrance was to be reserved for an entrance plaza to tie in with the proposed connection. As such, the intention was to provide an open-air plaza to minimise the potential impact on air ventilation and to provide a sky view for the users;
- (b) the sunken plaza would be partially sunken with landings at different levels and connections between street level and the subway. As there was a level difference of more than 10m, a terraced design with barrier-free facilities would be adopted. The staircases in the proposed terraced sunken plaza had adopted an amphitheatre design and could be used as a gathering point for the purposes of activities and performance in the area. There would be connections of the retail floor space of the redevelopment with the subway, subject to the detailed design;
- (c) according to the notional scheme, the area of the sunken plaza was about 1,090m² and was much larger than that proposed in the URP for Kowloon City. The flat land within the sunken plaza was roughly about 763m². The terraced design would have some advantages in view of the site constraints and development restrictions including the BH restriction at the Site, traffic noise from Prince Edward Road East which was almost higher than 80dB, and the potential air pollution. Besides, the provision of a sunken plaza would be more desirable than construction of noise barriers for the local residents and business operators;
- (d) with reference to the original scheme of the pedestrian subway proposed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department, the entrance and landing of the proposed subway to the Site was only about half of the size of

the currently proposed sunken plaza. In that regard, capacity problem was not envisaged; and

- (e) whilst a higher BH would allow more design flexibility, any further increase in BH should be supported by technical assessments. Besides, the geotechnical study had confirmed the feasibility of constructing a 5-level basement at the proposed redevelopment.

Traffic Aspect and the Proposed Public Vehicle Park

60. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting a portion of Sa Po Road would be closed, whether the provision of a new private road to connect Kai Tak Road was really necessary; whether the road closure and traffic re-diversion would help improve the traffic condition; and whether the potential noise and air quality impacts on the future residents would be increased;
- (b) whether the existing traffic problems would be worsened as a result of the increased public car parking spaces;
- (c) the operation mode of the public vehicle park and vehicular access arrangement of the proposed redevelopment;
- (d) whether the provision of public transport interchange (PTI) at the Site had been considered;
- (e) the location of the proposed footpath widening; and
- (f) whether the adjacent bus stops along Prince Edward Road East would create a bottle neck for traffic and pedestrian flows.

61. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, made the following points :

- (a) according to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by URA, the proposed road realignment would replace the existing acute angle at the junction of Kai Tak Road and Sa Po Road to improve the visibility for the road users. The proposed road layout was considered acceptable by the Transport Department (TD). Both Kai Tak Road and Sa Po Road were south-bounded, and the northern portion of Sa Po Road was currently providing access to the hotel opposite to the Site and formed part of a mini-bus route, closure of Sa Po Road or provision of cul-de-sac was considered not feasible by URA; and
- (b) as regards the potential traffic noise and air quality impacts, the major source of traffic noise and vehicle emission affecting the redevelopment was Prince Edward Road East which was a primary distributor, and not the proposed private road.

62. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, representative of C1 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) based on the TIA conducted, to alleviate the insufficient car parking spaces in the area, an underground public vehicle park providing 300 car parking spaces was proposed. With the proposed public vehicle park, URA would liaise with TD on the possibility of cancelling some on-street metered parking spaces in the vicinity for footpath widening to improve both the traffic flow and walking environment. As mentioned in his presentation earlier, URA was conducting a separate project feasibility study covering, among others, implementation of related pavement improvement works for the nearby streets, which was carried out under their revitalisation initiative to enhance walkability of the area;
- (b) the public vehicle park would be operated by way of hourly parking. The proposed ingress for the ancillary and public car parks would be at Sa Po

Road and Kai Tak Road respectively, while the proposed egress would be at Kai Tak Road;

- (c) there was no proposal nor requirement to include a PTI at the Site; and
- (d) a section of the footpath along Kai Tai Road near the sunken plaza would be widened and the bus waiting area would thus be enlarged to facilitate traffic and pedestrian flows.

Local Character and GIC Uses

63. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) having regard to the strong Thai culture, the existing social service provision and ancestor worship activities in the area, what implications the redevelopment would have on Kowloon City; and whether special features had been proposed in the redevelopment for preservation of such local characters, festive activities and community facilities;
- (b) whether the ground floor retail space of the future redevelopment could be designated mainly for restaurants to enhance street vitality;
- (c) information on the service provision of the two NGOs, namely Oi Hip and Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association; whether their service provision/clan activities were recognised by the Government; and to what extent the service provision and local cultural activities would be affected by the redevelopment;
- (d) given that about 8,000m² non-domestic GFA was proposed, whether 'premises for premises' for those existing NGOs to return to the redevelopment upon completion would be considered; and whether relocation within the same district would be arranged for the NGOs;

- (e) the types of GIC facilities to be provided within the redevelopment; whether there was flexibility to provide additional GIC facilities including elderly facilities; and whether rental payment from the future GIC services providers would be required; and
- (f) information on the location of community halls in Kowloon and whether the provision had met the requirement of the HKPSG.

64. In response, Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng, DPO/K, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) Oi Hip was a non-profit making body and was one of the beneficiaries of SWD's time-limited "Financial Support Scheme for Self-Help Organisations of Persons with Disabilities/Chronic Illness" for the period from October 2018 to September 2020. The scheme was subject to a biennial review;
- (b) ancestral worship of the Kwok clan was a rare traditional activity in the urban area and was included as one of the 480 items of the first Intangible Cultural Heritage Inventory of Hong Kong;
- (c) according to the Notes of the DSP, GIC facilities as required by the Government might be exempted from GFA calculation. Accordingly, the Explanatory Statement of the DSP stated that not less than 800m² non-domestic GFA was reserved for GIC facilities to meet community needs. As social welfare facilities were always permitted under the DSP, should the Board consider more GIC facilities be included in the redevelopment, URA could be requested to further liaise with concerned departments for providing more GIC facilities in the redevelopment at the detailed design stage where feasible;
- (d) URA would construct a bare-shell for provision of the GIC facilities that would be handed over to SWD, and URA would not be involved in the

subsequent allocation of the premises to the service providers; and

- (e) there were a number of community centres/halls in Kowloon City, the Tung Tau Community Centre was in closer proximity to the north and the Kai Tak Community Hall was located some 500m from the DSP. There was no set standard for the provision of community halls under the HKPSG and its provision would be assessed on a need basis as advised by the Director of Home Affairs.

65. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, representative of C1 of DSP, made the following points:

- (a) given its strategic location, the redevelopment would be a major connection between the KTDA and Kowloon City. According to the recommendations of the URP for Kowloon City, the redevelopment would provide an entrance plaza to tie in with the proposed subway connection to KTDA and to serve as a gateway to create a sense of arrival;
- (b) in URA's H18 redevelopment project in Sheung Wan (Peel Street and Graham Street), due consideration was given to the affected residents/business operators and local community at large whilst offering opportunities to retain the cultural characteristics and social network including reservation of floor space in the commercial podium for selling fresh food to create synergy with the existing street market;
- (c) in URA's Kwun Tong Town Centre project, under a very special circumstance, spaces in the future development were reserved for those occupants of the unauthorised building structures which did not have any registered titles;
- (d) the 800m² GFA reserved for GIC facilities within the redevelopment were not intended for the four affected NGOs. As mentioned before, some of the retail spaces on the second and third floors of the redevelopment could

accommodate some community uses. Should the affected NGOs intend to operate in the future development, they could submit a written request to URA for consideration; and

- (e) for the four NGOs affected by the redevelopment, only TMWU was a tenant, the other three NGOs including Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association, Oi Hip and the Alliance Church centre were owner-occupiers. Special allowance for relocation might be provided to the NGOs with approval by the URA's Board of Directors. However, whether they would return to the future development could not be confirmed yet due to the long implementation period, and more detailed arrangement could only be formulated at the acquisition stage. The detailed design would only be finalised at a later stage and the future arrangement should be negotiable among relevant parties.

66. In response to the status of the Kwok clan activities, Mr Kwok Chun Shing, representative of R89 of DSP, said that Kwok Fan Yeung Virtue-Promoting Association held annual ancestral worship of the Kwok clan in a football court of the Argyle Street Playground in Kowloon City with parade around the area. Last year, it was the 70th anniversary of their association and the celebration was sponsored by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department with a funding support of \$200,000.

67. In response to the service provision of Oi Hip, Mr Lai King Cheung, representative of R87 of DSP, said that as the users of Oi Hip would need a very long time to adapt to a new environment, relocation twice within a few years would not be desirable. Besides, the removal cost would be a burden to Oi Hip. In addition to the commercial developments in the Lung Tong district, Mr Lai would like to know whether premises in nearby areas would be covered by URA in their search of relocation premises. He further said that as Oi Hip was not a subvented social welfare organisation, it might not be entitled to the ex-gratia allowances. However, the services provided by Oi Hip were very unique and meaningful in Hong Kong and should be retained. Mr Wong Kam Hung, representative of R87 of DSP, supplemented that the funding of Oi Hip mainly came from offerings and the current subsidies from SWD would only last for two years. In other words, they had no funding for the

relocation.

Freezing Survey and Compensation

68. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) to what extent the surveyed information from the freezing survey was considered accurate by URA; how the freezing survey for the project was conducted; and whether there was an appeal system regarding the freezing survey;
- (b) the communication between URA and the affected residents/business operators; and
- (c) the relocation assistance provided by URA; whether transitional arrangement was available for those affected residents/business operators who chose to return to the redevelopment upon completion and the percentage of successful returns.

69. The Chairperson clarified that the issues of compensation and relocation were not under the purview of the Board. She believed, however, the affectees might wish to make use of the hearing to express their concerns in the presence of URA's representatives.

70. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, representative of C1 of DSP, made the following main points:

- (a) compensation offers, and eligibility for ex-gratia allowances and rehousing would be based on the information collected during the freezing survey, which was conducted to prevent possible abuses to the compensation system and to deter unfair eviction of tenants. Any subsequent clarifications received would be recorded and verified during the acquisition and ex-gratia allowance costing stages. Besides, an appeal system to resolve the disputes was available. As established principles, a property with tenant recorded at

the freezing survey would not be considered as owner-occupied property if the owner only occupied the property after the freezing survey had been conducted, and the tenants who occupied the property after the freezing survey would not be eligible for the ex-gratia business allowances. Compensation for tenants evicted after the completion of the freezing survey might still be available. Other disputes were mainly related to the interpretation of a household;

- (b) as mentioned in his presentation, URA had organised three meetings with Thai residents/business operators after the freezing survey had been completed, including two public briefings on 27.2.2019 with English/Thai interpreters, and another briefing on 18.3.2019 with an interpreter for Thai residents to explain the prevailing policies on compensation and rehousing. For those enquiries related to compensation and rehousing received by URA after the freezing survey, URA would issue formal replies after the DSP had been approved by CE in C;
- (c) besides, URA had implemented a new 'Project Engagement' Programme, with a special team taking the initiative to visit households and business operators affected by the redevelopment to explain to them the policies in details, helping them to understand the latest progress and arrangement. URA had approached most of the ethnic minorities registered in the freezing survey, and follow-up visits and referrals to the social service teams such as the St. James' Settlement would also be made. Leaflets, in Chinese, English and some ethnic minority languages, were published and distributed to affectees to explain the compensation and rehousing arrangements. The information had also been uploaded to the website of URA for public information;
- (d) URA would only issue acquisition offer to owners upon approval of the redevelopment by the Government, while offers of ex-gratia allowance to tenants would only be made after the owners had accepted the acquisition offer. For the subject project, it was expected that the acquisition offer

would be issued early next year if proceeded smoothly, but the compensation arrangement for tenants would usually be made available one to two years later;

- (e) URA would help identify suitable premises/shops for the operators in the redevelopment projects of the same district to enable the owners/business operators affected to relocate and continue operation in the same district as far as practicable. However, given the limited supply of public housing units, relocation of affected residents within the same neighbourhood might sometimes be very difficult. Nevertheless, URA would try every opportunity to relocate the affected residents of the subject project within Kowloon or East Kowloon. According to their record, most of the affected residents of URA's recent redevelopment projects in the To Kwa Wan area had been relocated to the Kai Tak, Sau Mau Ping and Anderson Road areas. URA would also assist affected tenant operators to lease and owner-occupied operators to purchase premises in the future redevelopment upon completion. URA would closely monitor the situation and continue to negotiate with the affected parties. URA would continue to explore other measures to assist the affected tenants and owners;

- (f) as regards reservation of non-domestic spaces in the redevelopment for the affected business operators, one of the major considerations was whether the concerned use was in line with the planning intention. For example, the vehicle repairing workshops in the redevelopment project in To Kwa Wan were considered incompatible with the proposed residential use. For compatible uses, reservation of space for previous businesses could be made. However, whether the businesses would return to the redevelopment upon completion would depend on their own will and preference. As mentioned before, special approval was given to reserve some spaces in a previous project to assist the dried seafood selling operators to re-establish their businesses to preserve the local character. For the subject DSP, similar arrangements might be considered for the affected use/operation which constituted a recognised local character, if the DSP was approved;

- (g) as the majority of the tenants and owner-occupiers would have adapted to the new environment during the implementation period of the redevelopment, it was quite unlikely that they would be willing to move a second time; and
- (h) URA had introduced the tracking survey on their redevelopment projects to study the impacts on affected residents and businesses who were displaced. However, tracking would last for a long span of time, and at present only the preliminary findings on the movements involved in the redevelopment project in the Kwun Tong Town Centre (KTTC) were available. As the main project of KTTC redevelopment was not yet occupied, information on the successful returns of the affected residents and businesses was not available at the moment. Also, there were cases of refusal to provide information under the tracking survey.

Other Aspects

71. As a general response to some issues discussed, Mr Wu Ka Wai, representative of R65 of DSP, said that the 'shop for shop' option was not included in URA's prevailing policies, and URA should learn the lesson from the special rent allowance adopted by the Nga Tsin Wai Village and Lee Tung Street redevelopment projects. For example, some affected business operators of the Lee Tung Street project had chosen to return to the redevelopment upon completion, however, they were given the shop spaces at the basement of the new development where the flow of people was rather limited and the business could not last for a long time. Mr Wu considered that the freezing survey had not been conducted properly. The example quoted by URA at the meeting was only a special case but the other wrong records of the freezing survey reported by him had not been examined. Besides, he cast doubts on the effectiveness of URA's proposal to introduce Thai restaurants to the redevelopment as a means to preserve the local character of the area. It should also be noted that the simultaneous interpretation service for the Thai people was only provided by URA in the briefings after the freezing survey had been conducted but not during the freezing survey.

72. In response to a question raised, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike said that under the Urban Renewal Strategy, unlike the “flat for flat” offer, the option of “shop for shop” was not offered as it was rather difficult to implement due to changing business environment. The character and operational requirements of each shop were different and they might not be compatible with the character of the Site or neighbourhood. As shops needed to build customer bases, if the relocated shop had already established a business network during the redevelopment period, it was very unlikely that the operator would move back upon completion of redevelopment. According to their past experience, cash compensation was usually the most preferred option for business operators, no matter they were tenants or owners.

73. In response to a Member’s question on the implementation programme, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike said that in general, a URA redevelopment project would take about 10 to 12 years to complete, with construction commenced in the latter half of the timeframe. The long implementation period was mainly due to the time required for land clearance and rehousing. For the current DSP, it was anticipated that a longer timeframe would be required for processing the land grant as gazettal of road works would be involved. It would also take a longer time for construction as a 5-level basement would be built.

74. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the second session had been completed. The Board would deliberate the representations and comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the PlanD’s representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives of the second session for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 10 minutes.]

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

[Closed Meeting]

75. Mr Daniel K.S. Lau declared an interest on the item as he was a member of DURF seven years ago. Mr L.T. Kwok also declared an interest as he was a member of the Kwok clan, though he joined the ceremony of the ancestral worship of the Kwok clan long long time ago and did not take part in any of their activities in recent years. Members agreed that the interests of Mr Daniel K.S. Lau and Mr L.T. Kwok were remote.

76. The Chairperson said that the issues on rehousing, compensation, business/services re-establishment and freezing survey were outside the ambit of the TPO and purview of the Board. They should be addressed by URA at the acquisition and detailed design stages under their prevailing policies. In any case, the representers and commenters had expressed their concerns at the meeting.

77. The Chairperson then briefly recapitulated the main issues to facilitate Members' discussion. She said that the subject DSP was one of the redevelopment projects recommended under the URP for Kowloon City under the DURF study in 2014 which had undergone extensive public engagement with relevant stakeholders. The redevelopment through a DSP by URA could achieve a comprehensive planning of the Site to rationalise the land uses and improve the overall living and environmental conditions. Under the DSP, a sunken plaza was proposed in the southern part of the Site leading to KTDA via a subway which connected to the underground shopping street. It would allow better connection between the old and new districts. A public car park was also proposed to alleviate parking shortage in the area, and some community facilities would also be provided within the Site to serve the local community. It was noted that the organisation of cultural activities/events would unlikely be affected by the redevelopment. Nevertheless, the Board could encourage URA to communicate better with the affected NGOs and provide assistance on their relocation. The Chairperson then invited views from Members.

78. The Secretary conveyed the views of a Member who had left the meeting before the deliberation session. The Member supported the DSP as some acquisitions were already underway in the area and relocation of the existing NGOs were unavoidable while the

redevelopment by URA would not only bring about planning gains and benefits to the local community but also secure reasonable compensation terms to the affectees under URA's prevailing policy.

79. A Member noted that the Site was subject to various development constraints and restrictions, including the BH restriction. Whilst URA had made attempt to deal with those limitations and challenges in formulating the development scheme, an increase in the space available for development would provide more design flexibility. The Member considered that the proposal was in line with the URP for Kowloon City for a mixed development with commercial, residential and community uses to facilitate the transformation of the area to a gateway leading to KTDA. The project was at a strategic location, but the scope for expansion of the DSP boundary was limited in view of the existing street pattern. Hence, a relaxation of the BH restriction, say by 5m to 10m, would provide flexibility for a better design, by freeing up more ground or lower floor space for public use. The quality of the public space and air ventilation would also be improved tremendously. The Member also considered that a subway of only 8m wide was not desirable and inclusion of commercial elements along a wider subway would add vibrancy to the area. Another Member suggested that the subway could also be a venue for art exhibition.

80. In relation to the BH issue, the Chairperson said that if a larger sunken plaza was proposed at the detailed design stage and a higher BH for the proposed redevelopment was well justified, URA could seek the Board's permission for a minor relaxation of the BH restriction upon application. A Member considered that such an arrangement was appropriate. Regarding the subway, the Chairperson said that it was a project being implemented by the Government which was already at a relatively advance stage.

81. Some Members, while supporting the DSP, considered the proposed reservation of 800m² GFA for GIC facilities was not sufficient in view of the current shortage of community facilities in the area. One of the Members noted that the 800m² GIC floor space was only the minimum provision, URA should thus be requested to take into account the changing social circumstances and community needs in providing more space for GIC facilities. Another Member suggested that some of the retail GFA could be used for providing GIC facilities, in particular those on the second and third floors, as a non-domestic PR of 1.5 for retail uses

would most likely be more than that required for such use, with due regard to the site context. The Member also considered that a comprehensive redevelopment was preferred to piecemeal redevelopments by individual private developers but the distinctive characters of the area should be properly shaped and preserved. Hence, URA should be advised to enrich the local character elements in the design of the redevelopment scheme. One Member reminded that the day care services for the elderly and services for mental health were currently the two most needed facilities in the old urban districts. Another Member considered that although Oi Hip was not a subvented social welfare organisation, it was a social entity serving the community and their service recipients should be taken care of. For the remaining NGOs which were outside the purview of SWD, the Member concurred that URA should be encouraged to communicate better with them and provide assistance.

82. A Member pointed out that public engagement was very important throughout the urban renewal process, and public consultation was part of the current plan-making process. As URA was undertaking a project feasibility study to assess further urban renewal opportunities in the Lung Tong district, which should cover various aspects including cultural preservation, the Chairperson suggested and the meeting agreed that URA should also be advised to consult the Board in an earlier stage when formulating the proposals.

83. A Member was rather disappointed with the notional scheme for the DSP as no vision was reflected in the current proposal. The subject redevelopment should be a flagship project in the Kowloon City area, however, the proposed connection with the KTDA by a sunken plaza to be connected to the subway and the subway itself would create a bottleneck rather than a seamless integration. In view of the presence of a number of heritage points and cultural activities in both Kowloon City as well the KTDA, a more iconic project should be pursued. Another Member concurred and added that some cultural characters and attractions should be identified and incorporated into the redevelopment. The Member also suggested that more street level shops should be provided to enhance vibrancy of the area. The same view was shared by two other Members. In addition to vibrancy, another Member said that some street level small-scale shops and more public space could also enhance preservation of the social networks. Besides, the open-air sunken plaza could be enlarged by a special podium design. A Member said that the open-air sunken plaza was supported, however, as walkability was equally important, the space at street level should be increased as

far as practicable. Another Member was of the view that a shopping mall might only serve a small group of people but the public space could be enjoyed by the general public.

84. A Member said that the heritage and cultural activities should be preserved. As some of those activities should take place in close proximity to the relevant groups of people and the premises they occupied, relocating those NGOs outside the district might cause hardship and affect the continuity of the events. URA should also consider creating an environment for the Thai activities. Another Member supported the provision of 300 public parking spaces at the Site and preservation of the culture of Kowloon City.

85. The Chairperson concluded that while Members were in general in support of the DSP, they had some observations with regard to the improvement of the redevelopment scheme, including the design of the sunken plaza, provision of more GIC facilities and street level shops, relaxation of the BH restrictions to facilitate better design, and incorporation of cultural elements. Members also agreed that URA should be requested to consider provision of more social welfare facilities and further consult the relevant stakeholders and community groups on the possible ways to retain the local character, social networks of residents as well as assisting business operators and social groups to re-establish their networks in the locality.

86. Members noted that the amendments incorporated into the OZP were technical in nature and had no objection to such amendments.

87. Members generally considered that other grounds and proposals of the representations and comments on the DSP and OZP had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses given at the meeting.

88. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of Representations No. R1 (part) to R20 of DSP. The Board decided not to uphold other Representations R1 (part), R21 to R90 of DSP; R1 of OZP and considered that the DSP and OZP should not be amended to meet the representations and the reasons were:

- “(a) the development scheme plan (DSP) will facilitate the redevelopment of the DSP area to provide more housing to meet the acute housing demand, a

better living environment with commercial and community facilities, a sunken plaza to connect to Kai Tak Development Area and underground public vehicle park to address local demand (**R1 (part) and R21 to R90 of DSP**);

- (b) the boundary of the DSP is generally in line with the recommendations of the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City recommended under the District Urban Renewal Forum study (**R1 (part) of DSP**);
- (c) the sunken plaza and subway entrance area will not be subject to adverse air quality impacts (**R90 of DSP**);
- (d) the provision of community facilities and open space in Ma Tau Kok/Kowloon City district is generally in line with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (**R1 (part) and R90 of DSP; and R1 of OZP**);
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the DSP and Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) have been duly followed. The exhibition of the DSP and 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 (**R74 to R85 of DSP**); and
- (f) implementation issues such as acquisitions, rehousing and compensation are outside the purview of the Board (**R21 to R89 of DSP**).”

89. The Board agreed that the draft DSP, together with its respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval.

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

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting during the deliberation.]

91. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 7:40 p.m.