

**Minutes of 1323<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 26.7.2024**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Engineer (Traffic Survey and Support)

Transport Department

Mr W.H. Poon

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Deputy Director of Lands/General

Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Winnie B.Y. Lau

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor B.S. Tang

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Kenny C.H. Lau

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1322<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 12.7.2024

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1322<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 12.7.2024 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

Matter Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 16.7.2024, the Chief Executive in Council approved the draft Yau Ma Tei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/K2/26), the draft Kwun Tong (South) OZP (renumbered as S/K14S/26) and the draft Tuen Mun OZP (renumbered as S/TM/39). The approval of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 26.7.2024.

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting at this point.]

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representation in respect of the Draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K3/37

(TPB Paper No. 10977)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that amendment items on the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) mainly involved rezoning of two sites in the Mong Kong area. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ben S.S. Lui - his former employer conducted a study related to urban renewal in Mong Kok; and

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - currently working on an urban renewal project in Mong Kok.

4. As the interest of Mr Ben S.S. Lui was indirect, and Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho had no involvement in the amendment items and his interest was also indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

5. The following government representatives and the representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

***Government Representatives***

Planning Department (PlanD)

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Mr Derek P.K. Tse | - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Mr Clement Miu    | - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon                 |
| Mr Chris K.C. Ma  | - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)               |

***Representer***

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

- |                   |               |
|-------------------|---------------|
| Ms Mary Mulvihill | - Representer |
|-------------------|---------------|

6. The Chairperson extended a welcome. Ms Mary Mulvihill expressed that the meeting should not be started until members of the public attending the meeting were ready, in particular to allow sufficient time for those who needed to put on the simultaneous interpretation devices. The Chairperson explained that the hearing would start only when all attendees had settled. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representation. The representer would then be invited to make oral submission. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer had completed her oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representer. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representer would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning (the Board) would then deliberate on the representation in their absence and inform the representer of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representation. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chris K.C. Ma, TP/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the representation, including background of the amendments to the OZP, grounds/views of the representer, government responses and PlanD's views on the representation as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10977 (the Paper). The amendment items were:

- (a) Amendment Item A (Item A) – rezoning of a site at 56 Fuk Tsun Street (Item A Site) from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and relaxation of the building height restriction (BHR) from 80 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to 115mPD to allow more land use and design flexibilities to facilitate future development/redevelopment;
- (b) Amendment Item B1 (Item B1) – rezoning of a site at Mong Kok Road Playground (MKRP) (Item B1 Site) from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) to “Open Space” (“O”) to reflect the existing condition;
- (c) Amendment Item B2 (Item B2) – rezoning of a strip of land (Item B2 Site) to the immediate north of MKRP from “G/IC” to “R(A)” with stipulation of a BHR of 115mPD and 20mPD to rationalise the zoning boundaries; and
- (d) Amendment Item B3 (Item B3) – removal of BHRs for two “G/IC” zones (Item B3 Sites) respectively occupied by the refuse collection point (RCP) cum public toilet fronting Mong Kok Road and the electricity sub-station (ESS) fronting Canton Road to allow optimisation of site potential and design flexibility for future development/redevelopment for Government, institution and community (GIC) uses.

[Mr Ryan M.K. Ip joined the meeting during PlanD’s presentation.]

8. The Chairperson then invited the representer to elaborate on her representation.

R1 – Mary Mulvihill

9. With the aid of a visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Item A

- (a) the item was considered unnecessary and should only be taken forward when

there were concrete plans in place. The current amendment exercise would give an impression that there were underlying issues which had not been revealed;

- (b) strong objection to the amendment. The existing building with traditional curved front junction design was very unique to Hong Kong and should be preserved to facilitate visual relief, pedestrian circulation and air ventilation;
- (c) there was a strong need for additional community facilities in the district to assist the underprivileged, in particular the youth. The subject building was recently revitalised and used to address such shortfall. If the Home and Youth Affairs Bureau (HYAB) currently had no plan to redevelop the building, it was not necessary to amend the zoning of Item A Site;
- (d) there were significant deficits in provision of various community services in the district, such as child care centre (40%), community care services facilities (62%), residential care homes for the elderly (60%), pre-school rehabilitation services (40%), day rehabilitation services (100%), etc.;
- (e) community uses would be in harmony with the presence of the temple and the mature tree at Item A Site. Item A Site might be zoned to “G/IC” with stipulation of maximum building height (BH) and plot ratio (PR), instead of “R(A)”;

Items B1 to B3

- (f) Item B1 would be supported without Items B2 and B3;
- (g) there was no public benefit brought by Item B2 and the Government should clarify whether Item B2 Site was intended for land sale;
- (h) with the removal of BHRs for Item B3 Sites, the scale and form of the future redevelopment thereat would become uncertain, which should be considered by the Board through section 16 application instead. There was also a further



reduction of open space provision;

General

- (i) Members should reject the amendments as they were not in the public interest. In terms of good town planning, it had always been a principle that high-density urban districts should have some lower buildings to provide spatial relief and to break the monotony. Developing every single lot into a uniform curtain wall block would contradict the administration's own guidelines; and
- (j) noting no representation was submitted by the members of Yau Tsim Mong District Council, it was considered that the district council no longer functioned as representatives of the community.

10. Ms Mary Mulvihill also expressed other views not related to the draft OZP. She alleged that at a recent hearing for considering representations in respect of the draft San Tin Technopole, draft Mai Po and Fairview Park and draft Ngau Tam Mei OZPs, the representers who attended the meeting were not treated fairly nor respectfully. For instance, only 10 minutes were allotted for each representer to make oral submission, most of the seating area was occupied by government officials, the representers did not have sufficient seating area and space for making presentation, and the lighting in the meeting room was not good. She also suggested that the government officials could be seated in a separate room with audio connections and the meeting room should be renovated.

11. Ms Mulvihill further expressed her views on the University of Hong Kong's Pokfield Road Campus project and a recent news report on some sites with planning approvals for animal boarding establishments being used for brownfield operations. As the 10-minute presentation time had already ended for a while, the Chairperson reminded Ms Mulvihill that the issues she was presenting were not related to the draft OZP and requested her to finish the oral submission at that juncture. The Chairperson also remarked that the Secretariat of the Board would in due course reply to the earlier email submitted by Ms Mulvihill to the Board regarding the meeting arrangements for another hearing.

[Mr Simon Y.S. Wong joined the meeting during R1's presentation.]

12. As the presentations of PlanD's representative and the representer had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer and/or the government representatives. 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.

*Item A*

13. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting R1's comment that there was currently no redevelopment plan, whether there was any reason to rezone Item A Site to "R(A)";
- (b) noting from the Paper that the temple and the mature tree at Item A Site would be preserved, the reason for including the concerned area in the "R(A)" zone;
- (c) how the "R(A)" zoning would allow more land use and design flexibility, given that such zoning would restrict Item A Site mainly to residential development and whether the existing affordable housing there could continue to operate;
- (d) in view of the requirement to preserve the existing temple and mature tree, what the rationales were for relaxing the BHR from 80mPD to 115mPD, which might result in a development up to 30 storeys or more;
- (e) whether the future residential development at Item A Site would be responsible for the long-term maintenance of the temple, and
- (f) whether there was any assessment on the design and historical merits of the six-storey tenement building.

14. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17A (TPB PG-No. 17A), there was a need for close monitoring of the progress of “CDA” development. The first review of each “CDA” site would be conducted at the end of the third year after its designation and subsequent reviews would be made on a biennial basis to determine whether the zoning should be retained. In considering the latest “CDA” Review in 2023, having noted that Item A Site was under the ownership of the Secretary for Home Affairs Incorporated (SHAI), the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board agreed that PlanD should liaise with HYAB about their plans for the site to decide whether the “CDA(1)” zoning should be retained. As Item A Site was owned by the Government and any redevelopment proposal, if agreed by HYAB, would be subject to scrutiny by relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) from traffic, environmental, heritage and tree preservation perspectives prior to its implementation, it was considered not necessary to retain its zoning as “CDA(1)”. In view that HYAB had no redevelopment plan for Item A Site at this juncture and given the surrounding area was mainly zoned for residential use, it was considered more appropriate to rezone the Item A Site to “R(A)” for residential development with commercial uses on the lower floors to allow more land use and design flexibilities to facilitate future development/redevelopment;
- (b) the whole of Item A Site covering a residential development and the Grade 3 Hung Shing Temple compound was under the ownership of SHAI. The existing temple, the mature tree and the open-air forecourt should be preserved and opened to the public as specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP;
- (c) under the previous “CDA(1)” zoning, any development at Item A Site required the submission of a Master Layout Plan (MLP) for the Board’s consideration and approval. Taking into account that the planning intention of the previous “CDA(1)” zone was for residential development and that the

existing tenement building was also used by Tung Wah Group of Hospitals (TWGHs) for affordable housing to the underprivileged and/or youth, “R(A)” zoning was considered appropriate for Item A Site. Other compatible uses, such as social welfare facilities, and shop and services on the lowest three floors, etc. as specified under Column 1 of the “R(A)” zone would be always permitted at Item A Site. It was also understood that TWGHs would continue to provide the current services and the rezoning of Item A Site would not adversely affect the provision of such services;

- (d) the BHR of 115mPD was in line with the BHRs for the surrounding “R(A)” and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) zones. Assessment had also been undertaken to confirm that the permitted PR would be achievable under a BHR of 115mPD;
- (e) the tenement building and the Hung Shing Temple compound within Item A Site were currently managed by TWGHs. HYAB confirmed that there was no redevelopment plan for Item A Site at the present stage and the current management arrangement would continue; and
- (f) regarding the historic value of the tenement building, the Antiquities and Monuments Office of the Development Bureau advised that no grading was accorded to the building.

*Items B1 to B3*

15. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that Item B1 Site was government land occupied by MKRP, whether it was necessary to rezone it from “G/IC” into “O” as it appeared that such rezoning would not have any implication on the existing development;
- (b) noting from the Paper that Item B2 Site was a narrow strip of land currently used as a scavenging lane, what the reason was for rezoning it to “R(A)” and whether it would be taken up for development together with the adjacent

residential building; and

- (c) noting that there was no plan to redevelop the RCP cum public toilet building, what the reason was for removing the BHR for that portion of Item B3 Site and whether there was any plan to build additional floors on the building.

16. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) it was an established practice to designate a suitable zoning on OZP to reflect the as-built or existing condition of a completed development. Item B1 Site was rezoned from “G/IC” to “O” to reflect the completed MKRP. The Column 1 uses under the Notes of “O” and “G/IC” zones were quite different, with the former mainly dedicated to open space and related uses. Moreover, MKRP formed part of the green corridor along Nullah Road under the Yau Mong District Study. The zoning of “O” for Item B1 Site complemented the overall planning of the green corridor;
- (b) Item B2 Site was previously zoned “G/IC” for a pumping station. After decommissioning of the pumping station, most part of the site was developed as an extension of MKRP (i.e. Item B1 Site). Item B2 Site, a strip of land to the immediate north of Item B1 Site, was a public scavenging lane owned by the Government, which also served the adjoining residential building. As the scavenging lane did not form part of MKRP and its scale was too small to be designated as ‘Road’, it was rezoned to “R(A)”, i.e. the same zoning of the adjoining residential building, to rationalise the associated zoning boundaries. The adjoining residential building, which was governed by its own land lease, did not have any bearing on the status of the scavenging lane, and the scavenging lane should not be included in the redevelopment of the adjoining building in the future; and
- (c) the two portions of Item B3 Sites were occupied by the RCP cum public toilet and the ESS respectively, and there were no plans for redevelopment or intensification of those existing facilities at present. Removal of the BHRs

was to allow optimisation of site potential and more design flexibility for future development/redevelopment of Item B3 Sites for GIC uses.

17. In response to two Members' further questions on why Item B2 Site was rezoned to "R(A)" with the BHR correspondingly amended, instead of being designated as 'Road' for better management by the Government, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that OZP was a plan showing broad land use zonings instead of every single land use in detail, especially for such kind of scavenging lane. There was also no direct relationship between the management of the land and its land use zoning. As Item B2 Site was outside MKRP and currently used as a scavenging lane which also served the adjoining residential building, "R(A)" zoning was considered appropriate. Regarding a Member's enquiry on the management responsibility of the concerned scavenging lane, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD indicated that the scavenging lane should be managed by the Government and there was no information at hand on the specific department responsible for its management.

18. In response to a Member's question on the status of the triangular site of Item B3, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the site was occupied by an ESS operated by CLP Power Hong Kong Limited. The original BHR of the ESS site was two storeys and the removal of BHR would facilitate the optimisation of site potential and allow more design flexibility for future GIC uses at the site. The land lease restricted its use to ESS only, and pursuing other uses or developments would require lease modification. If the proposed uses were not always permitted under the "G/IC" zone, planning approval would also be required. Any development proposal for the ESS site would be scrutinised by relevant B/Ds under the said mechanisms, preventing excessive BH and/or incompatible land uses at the site.

#### *Provision of GIC Facilities and Open Space*

19. Noting R1's comment about shortage of social service facilities in the district, which was quite alarming, a Member enquired if there were any further responses or information from PlanD. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that as shown in the GIC table attached in the Paper, there were shortfalls in certain types of community facilities and open space in Mong Kok area. Given that the area was old and already well developed, there were indeed limitations in providing more open spaces. Therefore, during the planning of some new areas, land would be reserved

for provision of open space in meeting the need for a wider district. If assessing on the basis of the wider Yau Tsim Mong District, there would be surpluses of about 40 ha and 2 ha of district open space and local open space respectively. For hospital beds, its provision was considered on regional basis under several clusters. As for the social welfare facilities, such as child care centres, residential care homes for the elderly and day rehabilitation services, it was understood that the Social Welfare Department would meet the demand gradually through long-term planning under different development opportunities. For example, child care centre, home care services for frail elderly persons and neighbourhood elderly centre were planned under the commercial development at the junction of Sai Yee Street and Argyle Street. Various social welfare facilities would also be provided in the Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme to be discussed in the next agenda item.

20. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representation in closed meeting and inform the representer of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

### Deliberation Session

#### *Item A*

21. A Member expressed that if the Government had no clear intention to redevelop Item A Site, which was recently revitalised with the provision of youth co-living space, there was no urgency to amend the zoning. The design flexibility and a relaxed BHR allowed under the "R(A)" zoning might in turn provide incentive to demolish the existing tenement building and the public might perceive that the rezoning would encourage redevelopment of the site. Another Member also expressed concern on the preservation of the mature tree at Item A Site.

22. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, remarked that Item A Site was previously zoned "CDA(1)" to facilitate redevelopment of the existing tenement building while preserving the adjoining Hung Shing Temple together with the mature tree and its forecourt in a comprehensive manner. In considering the latest "CDA" Review in 2023, MPC agreed that PlanD should liaise with HYAB about their plans for the Item A Site to decide whether the

“CDA” zoning should be retained. After consulting HYAB and taking into account the development context, Item A Site was rezoned to “R(A)” for the purpose of streamlining the development process, and the designated BHR was to align with those for the adjacent “R(A)” and “R(E)” zones. The requirement to preserve the existing temple, the mature tree and the open-air forecourt was specified in the ES of the OZP and the future project proponent was required to submit various technical assessment to concerned departments to demonstrate the acceptability of the proposed development from environmental and traffic perspectives, and to identify necessary mitigation measures.

23. A Member expressed concerns about the potential visual impact of the future development with a BH of 115mPD (or some 30 storeys) on the adjacent temple and mature tree, as well as the surrounding environment, and considered that a stepped BH should be adopted for this corner site from urban design point of view. The same Member asked if the Board could amend the BHR of Item A Site even if such concern was not raised in the representation. The Chairperson explained that the amendments on the OZP had already been agreed by MPC before gazettal, and the current meeting was to consider the representation and decide whether the OZP should be amended to meet in full or partially the representation only. Members noted that the representer (R1) did not raise any concerns or proposal in relation to the BHR of Item A. On the BHR of Item A Site, with the aid of the visualiser, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, said that Plan H-1 of the Paper showed the BHRs which were imposed on the OZP after a BH review some years ago. The BHR of 115mPD for Item A Site was in line with the BHRs of the surrounding area. Unless there were specific reasons, e.g. preservation or provision of wind corridor and view corridor, lowering the BH for a particular “R(A)” site (i.e. Item A Site) without concrete ground/planning consideration, which would be considered as a kind of spot zoning, should be avoided.

24. Noting the special site context, i.e. in-situ preservation of a temple and a mature tree which were surrounded by high-rise developments, a Member wondered if there was merit in maintaining the “CDA” zoning for Item A Site. This would allow the Board to consider and the public to comment on the submission of a MLP, which “R(A)” zoning would not permit. In that regard, the Chairperson remarked that the six-storey tenement building had been renovated in 2017 and TWGHs had no redevelopment plan for Item A Site at this juncture. When there was redevelopment proposal in the future, the “R(A)” zoning could help streamline the development process and yet, the Government could still maintain proper control over the



future redevelopment as the site was owned by the Government and the future project proponent, which would be assigned by HYAB, would still require to submit various technical assessments for relevant B/Ds' consideration. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Secretary supplemented the planning history of Item A Site with reference to paragraph 2.1 of the Paper. Item A Site was once zoned "R(E)" and with the approval of a rezoning application submitted by TWGHs for comprehensive residential development with in-situ preservation of the temple and the mature tree in 2003, it was subsequently rezoned to "CDA(1)" and a MLP submitted by TWGHs was approved under a section 16 (s.16) application. The approved MLP, however, was not implemented and the s.16 application lapsed in 2009. The current zoning of "R(A)" could allow greater land use and design flexibility for redevelopment of Item A Site in future, despite HYAB having no redevelopment plan at this juncture. The requirements for preserving the temple and the mature tree and conducting technical assessments had been specified in the ES of the OZP.

25. A Member was of the view that given the need to preserve the temple and the mature tree in-situ, a higher BHR for Item A Site might be a merit as it could allow flexibility in the building design without compromising the development potential of the site in the future redevelopment. Another Member supported the arrangement of having a non-governmental organisation running a government property for provision of social/community services and managing a historic building at the same time and hence, Item A Site should not be sub-divided, and it should be developed and managed as a whole.

26. After discussion, while noting that HYAB had no redevelopment plan for Item A Site at this juncture, Members generally supported the rezoning of Item A Site to "R(A)" for it could allow more land use and design flexibility to facilitate future development/redevelopment.

### *Items B1 to B3*

27. Noting some Members' concerns about whether the scavenging lane abutting an existing residential development under Item B2 should be zoned "R(A)" and a Member's enquiry on whether Item B2 Site could be zoned "O" with management by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, with the aid of the visualiser, explained that amending the zoning of a site to reflect the existing condition was a common practice. According to paragraph 3.3 of the ES of the OZP, "since the Plan is to

show **broad land use zonings**, there would be cases that **small strips of land not intended for building development purposes** and carry no development right under the lease, such as the areas restricted for garden, slope maintenance and access road purposes, **are included in the residential zones**. The general principle is that such areas should not be taken into account in plot ratio and site coverage calculations.” (**highlight** added). As such, the scavenging lane under Item B2 was rezoned to “R(A)” and yet, this did not mean to assign this strip of land to the adjacent private development.

28. A Member concurred that the scavenging lane was actually serving as the means of escape for the adjacent residential building, not the open space, and hence it was appropriate to rezone it to “R(A)”. Even if the scavenging lane was taken up for redevelopment of the adjacent residential building in the future, there should still be a separation between the future development and the open space in accordance with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines.

29. Members generally agreed that Items B1 and B2 were technical amendments for reflecting the existing conditions and rationalising the zoning boundaries, whereas Item B3 could allow optimisation of site potential as well as greater design flexibility for future development/redevelopment of the sites for GIC uses.

#### *General Issues*

30. Regarding the GIC table for the OZP area as attached in the Paper, a Member opined that it would be helpful if the information based on a wider area could be provided for Members’ reference in the future. The Chairperson said that the Member’s view would be followed up by PlanD.

31. Concerning the presentation made by R1, Members generally appreciated and respected the representer’s attendance at the subject hearing, but some Members also expressed that part of the representer’s presentation was irrelevant to the agenda item with ungrounded accusation to the Board, and the overall presentation time exceeded 10 minutes as allotted which was indeed unfair to other representers. The Chairperson also expressed appreciation for R1’s attendance of the hearing and remarked that flexibility for representers in making oral submission would only be allowed case by case. The Secretariat of the Board would suitably

take into account R1's views on meeting arrangements as expressed in her recent email and offer a substantive reply to R1 in due course.

### *Conclusion*

32. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported all the amendments to the OZP, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representation and that all grounds of the representation had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

33. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the view provided by **R1 (part)** on Item B1 and decided not to uphold R1 (part) on other items and agreed that the draft Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

#### “Item A

- (a) taking into account the surrounding area being mainly zoned for residential use, as well as to allow more land use and design flexibility, it is considered appropriate to rezone Item A Site from “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) with maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) and total PR of 8.5 and 9 respectively and a maximum building height of 115mPD, which align with the current development restrictions of the “R(A)” zone on the Mong Kok OZP. The site is owned by the Government and any redevelopment proposal will be subject to scrutiny by relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) from traffic, environmental, heritage and tree preservation perspectives prior to its implementation. The current “R(A)” zone of the site is considered appropriate and is in line with the decision of the Board under the “Comprehensive Development Area” Review conducted in 2023;
- (b) the existing and planned provision of major government, institution and community (GIC) facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the

planned population in the Mong Kok Planning Area in accordance with Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the concerned B/Ds' assessments, except some social welfare facilities. The Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach with long, medium and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services;

Item B2

- (c) Item B2 is a technical amendment for rationalising the “R(A)” zoning boundary of the adjoining existing residential development as the concerned strip of land is currently the scavenging lane for that residential building; and

Item B3

- (d) for Item B3, the building height restrictions on the remaining “Government, Institution or Community” zones which are currently occupied by the existing refuse collection point cum public toilet and electricity sub-station have been deleted to allow optimisation of site potential and more design flexibility for future GIC development/redevelopment. It is considered appropriate from land use and site utilisation point of view.”

34. The Board also agreed that the draft Mong Kok OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting during the break.]

**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Submission of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K3/URA5/A prepared under Section 25 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance

(TPB Paper No. 10978)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

35. The Secretary reported that the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/A (the draft DSP) involved several sites in Mong Kok (the Sites) and was submitted by URA. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board  
(*as Director of Planning*) and a member of its Committee;

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Land, Rehousing and  
Compensation Committee and the Development  
Project Objection Consideration Committee of  
URA; and being a director of the Board of the  
Urban Renewal Fund (URF);

Professor B.S. Tang - being a non-executive director of the URA Board;

Dr Tony C.M. Ip ] having current business dealings with URA;

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip ]

Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former executive director of URA;

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a former director of the Board of URF; and

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - being a consultant of URA for a project within the DSP.

36. Members noted that Professor B.S. Tang had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Timothy K.W. Ma, Ryan M.K. Ip and Vincent Y.K. Ho and Dr Tony C.M. Ip were direct, Members agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members also agreed that as Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Ben S.S. Lui had no involvement in the DSP, they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Timothy K.W. Ma, Ryan M.K. Ip and Vincent Y.K. Ho and Dr Tony C.M. Ip left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

37. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and URA were invited to the meeting at this point:

##### ***PlanD's Representatives***

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK)  
Mr Clement Miu - Senior Town Planner/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)  
Mr Chris K.C. Ma - Town Planner/ Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon

##### ***URA's Representatives***

Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak - Director  
Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan - General Manager  
Ms Mable M.P. Kwan - Senior Manager  
Mr Frankie Choy - Manager

38. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the meeting. She then invited the representatives of PlanD and URA to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 10978 (the Paper).

*The Draft DSP*

39. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD remarked that the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS) commissioned by URA was completed in 2021. In the past two years, the Government had taken forward some of the recommendations of YMDS, such as formulating the mechanism for transfer of plot ratio (PR), permitting interchangeability of domestic and non-domestic PR of selected areas in Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok districts (Yau Mong districts), and removing the PR restriction of the commercial zone along Nathan Road. In response to the 2023 Policy Address, the draft DSP was prepared to facilitate the implementation of the first redevelopment project by URA as recommended in YMDS, i.e. the Nullah Road Urban Waterway Development Node (DN). Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, then briefed Members on the draft DSP as detailed in the Paper, including the background, the current status and surrounding context of the Sites, and the proposed zonings and development parameters of the draft DSP.

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) on 15.3.2024, URA commenced the Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme (the DS) in accordance with section 25 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance (URAO). It was aimed to achieve the target, as stated in the Policy Address, that URA would commence the redevelopment project of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway in Mong Kok East;
- (b) covering a total site area of about 29,315m<sup>2</sup>, the draft DSP comprised Site A and Site B. Site A was composed of five sub-sites (i.e. a larger one (Site A1) and four smaller sites (Sites A2-A5)), involving 23 buildings aged from 64 to 76 years. The four smaller sites were scattered around the Flower Market in the vicinity of URA's Prince Edward Road West/Yuen Ngai Street preservation and revitalisation project (the PERW/YNS Project). Site B was composed of two sub-areas (i.e. Sub-areas (1) and (2)), covering an area currently occupied by several existing government facilities and segregated

leisure spaces, such as Boundary Street Sports Centre No. 1 and No. 2, Boundary Street Recreation Ground, Sai Yee Street Children's Playground and Boundary Street Nursery;

- (c) YMDS devised a district-based Master Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) for the Yau Mong district. The draft DSP was part of one of the five DNs proposed in the MRCP. URA wished to restructure and regenerate the old districts and steer economic growth through a holistic planning and development approach to urban renewal;
- (d) to materialise the concept of "Urban Waterway" between Boundary Street and Nathan Road as recommended in the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN, a Waterway Park would be built as a "blue-green feature" to provide leisure and recreational space for the public. The "Single Site, Multiple Use" (SSMU) model would be adopted for a diversified and mixed development with a multi-purpose complex building accommodating government, institution or community (GIC) facilities (the GIC complex), as well as residential, hotel, office and retail uses. Mixed residential and commercial towers were proposed at Sites A1 and B. The development proposal would boost street vibrancy and extend the distinctive ambience and characteristics of the Flower Market. In addition, more public open spaces, underground parking spaces and community facilities would be provided;
- (e) currently, the open space along Flower Market Path was enclosed by fences and flower beds and was only taken as a pedestrian walkway between Flower Market Road and Boundary Street. The remaining open space pockets were interspersed among the existing GIC facilities, and some were adjacent to the refuse collection point and public toilet. Various recreational and sports facilities, such as Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground and Boundary Street Recreation Ground, were either segregated by Boundary Street or fenced off without convenient pedestrian connections between them. Boundary Street Nursery situated between Flower Market Road and Flower Market Path also separated the said sports facilities from the Flower Market and Mong Kok Stadium, thus hampering the connectivity, accessibility and synergy of the



facilities; and

- (f) there was a need to improve the traffic condition and pedestrian environment in the Flower Market area. The problems of inadequate parking spaces and loading/unloading (L/UL) bays gave rise to the situations of severe illegal and double parking and on-street L/UL activities, in particular during festive seasons, causing serious traffic congestion and blocking the pedestrian walkways. The existing condition of the back lanes in the area was in disarray with stuff piling up. Such a development context would be inadequate to meet the present and future development needs of the Flower Market area, and indeed would stifle the development potential and vibrancy.

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) URA aimed to leverage the DS to address the aforementioned local issues, including aged recreational facilities with segregated functionality and spaces, lack of cohesive leisure and resting spaces, as well as traffic congestion and chaotic pedestrian environment in the Flower Market area. Adopting an integrated approach in urban renewal by ways of redevelopment, preservation, revitalisation and rehabilitation, the DS aimed to enhance the environment of the Flower Market area while facilitating its future development;
- (b) the Waterway Park of not less than 8,800m<sup>2</sup>, with the "Urban Waterway" as the axis, would serve as a connector to link up the nearby recreational facilities. Flowering trees and colourful shrubs would be planted in the Waterway Park to create a flower appreciation hotspot for public enjoyment. A pedestrian footbridge connecting to Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground across Boundary Street was proposed to link up the segregated recreational facilities in the Flower Market area. Through integrating landscape design, outdoor space layout and pedestrian connections, the Flower Market, Mong Kok Stadium, Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground and the proposed GIC complex would be connected to draw the pedestrian flow, large-scale sports events, and recreational activities together so as to energise the community

and create an attractive leisure and recreational hub;

- (c) in the notional scheme, high-rise residential and commercial development was concentrated at the northern part of Site B with a BHR of 150 metres above Principal Datum (mPD). Under the SSMU principle, a GIC complex was proposed to form an integral part of the podia/basement of the proposed development for reprovisioning and upgrading of existing GIC/recreation/sports facilities and provision of new facilities to meet the community needs. Reprovisioning of the existing 11-a-side football field on a raised level of about 15m would serve as a public open space at Site B. Ground floor retail shop frontage would be created at the podia along Sai Yee Street and at the area facing the Waterway Park to enable extension of retail and flower market activities and vibrancy;
- (d) the “linked-site” approach would be applied to transfer the development potential from small, scattered sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5, each of less than 250m<sup>2</sup>) that were difficult and inefficient for individual redevelopment to Site A1 to enable a larger scale mixed development to optimise urban renewal opportunities and amplify planning benefits. Under the current notional design, Site A1 comprised residential towers atop a commercial/retail podium with a BHR of 150mPD. An at-grade public open space would be provided at the southern part of Site A1 which also served as a part of the “Urban Waterway”;
- (e) Sites A2 to A5 would be redeveloped into public open space with low-rise retail facilities of one storey serving as gathering spots and for commercial activities. The back lanes would also be revitalised as the “Third Street” of the Flower Market, providing opportunities to open up the back facades of the existing buildings along the lanes to increase retail display frontages. Together with URA’s PERW/YNS Project, such integrated approach for urban renewal would create social attractions, boost street vitality, and reinforce the historical and local characteristics of the Flower Market;

- (f) under the draft DS, the total gross floor area (GFA) was about 103,900m<sup>2</sup> and the number of flats was about 1,350. In addition to the 8,800m<sup>2</sup> of the Waterway Park, the rest of the public open space would not be less than 8,200m<sup>2</sup>. Around 20,000m<sup>2</sup> non-domestic GFA for new/upgraded GIC/recreational/sports facilities would be provided. Underground carparks with about 500 ancillary parking spaces and 220 public parking spaces were planned to alleviate the shortage of metered parking spaces in the Flower Market area and the situation of illegal parking, as well as pedestrian-vehicular conflicts in the Flower Market precinct. About 10 additional loading/unloading bays would also be provided to facilitate the operation of some flower shops;
- (g) in terms of urban design, the high-rise buildings at Site B would maintain a minimum distance of 60m and 40m from the existing residential buildings along Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road respectively. To respect a cascading downward profile from Mong Kok East towards Kowloon Tong to its east, a staggered building height (BH) profile would be adopted. The Waterway Park would be of about 20m in width along the decked nullah at Site B to serve as a major air ventilation and visual corridor of the area. The design measures set out in the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines such as building setbacks and building separations would also be adopted as appropriate;
- (h) the entrance and exit of the underground carpark at Site B would be located on Boundary Street, relieving the bottleneck caused by the converging trips through Sai Yee Street. In the future, visitors could easily reach the Flower Market and nearby destinations from the underground carpark at Site B via the proposed underground pedestrian connection. This would improve the connectivity and accessibility while promoting the concept of “Park n’ Walk” as proposed in YMDS; and
- (i) apart from redevelopment through the necessary replanning and restructuring, URA would further promote building rehabilitation and preventive maintenance of the surrounding buildings in the neighbourhood for the

purpose of blending the old and the new. According to the current planning, the proposed retail units should have a florist or horticultural theme. URA would consider giving priority to the florist operators affected by the redevelopment to move back to those retail units after completion of the DS. Riding on the characteristics of the Flower Market, the area would be turned into an “Exuberant Commercial District” of Mong Kok East enriched with social, leisure and recreational and shopping attractions.

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Clement Miu, STP/TWK, PlanD continued to brief Members on the planning assessments of the draft DSP, as detailed in paragraph 12 of the Paper, that PlanD had no objection to the draft DSP.

43. As the presentations of the representatives of PlanD and URA had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer session. The Chairperson reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29C, the Board’s decision on the DSP would be kept confidential for three to four weeks after the meeting at which the DSP was considered under the provisions of the URAO and would be released when the DSP was published under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members were reminded to exercise due care when asking questions in the open session of the meeting so as to avoid inadvertent divulgence of their views on the DSP’s boundaries to the public. She then invited questions from Members.

*The “Urban Waterway” Design Concept and the Waterway Park*

44. The Vice-chairperson appreciated the concept of the Waterway Park to replicate the existence of an open nullah in the past, but considered that the current design as shown in URA’s illustrations looked like a shallow pool with a thin water body instead of a sunken channel. He enquired about the rationale behind the proposal and its impact on the existing nullah. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the design of the Waterway Park followed the axis of the “Urban Waterway”, which was in line with the alignment of the decked nullah. It would be developed as the initial anchor of the “Urban Waterway”, which would further

run through the heart of Mong Kok East under the MRCP framework recommended in YMDS;

- (b) taking the Cheonggyecheon (清溪川) in Seoul as an example, the public could reach the water level of the river for leisure and recreation purposes and the water flow in the waterway would be controlled to ensure safety;
- (c) the nullah was open for irrigation of agricultural fields in Mong Kok a century ago. It was subsequently polluted by incoming sewage as the city developed, especially owing to misconnection of sewers to the nullah upstream. As the water quality deteriorated, the nullah had to be covered for environmental and safety concerns;
- (d) in the course of conducting the assessments under YMDS in consultation with the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and the Drainage Services Department (DSD), it was found that the nullah water was full of germs and chemicals and the nullah could not be uncovered for the sake of environmental hygiene and public safety at this stage;
- (e) without uncovering the nullah, the waterway in the Waterway Park currently proposed was in the form of river-like thin water body over the decked nullah. It was an eclectic way to effectively reconnect the segregated spaces, promote water-friendly culture and provide a safe park with ample space for public enjoyment. The Waterway Park would be handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for management upon completion; and
- (f) the current design of the Waterway Park and the proposed underground pedestrian connections would not impact on the foundation and structure of the decked nullah. If the water quality of the decked nullah was improved in the future, works could be carried out to uncover the nullah within the Waterway Park.

45. Some Members were aware of the current condition of the nullah and a media report alleging that the Waterway Park design currently proposed by URA was due to the high costs

involved in uncovering the nullah. Members also noted that in resolving water quality problems for revitalising Kai Tak River and Tsui Ping River, the Government had to investigate and inspect the illicit sewer connections upstream, and similar efforts had to be made in order to achieve the provision of a genuine “Urban Waterway” as a “blue-green feature” under YMDS. Hence, some Members invited URA to consider toning down the proposed Waterway Park and the water-friendly culture aspect when promulgating the current design if it was difficult to achieve the kind of “Urban Waterway” the public were expecting. In relation to the above concerns, some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether it was expensive to remove the deck of the nullah and how the current proposal could complement the design theme of “Urban Waterway”;
- (b) condition of the nullah and whether similar water quality problems were encountered in revitalising the nullahs in the New Territories; and
- (c) whether there was a timeline to uncover the nullah given that the upstream of the nullah was outside the DSP.

46. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the DN of Nullah Road Urban Waterway in Mong Kok East as proposed in YMDS was planned to be materialised by the construction of an “Urban Waterway” and a Waterway Park as a new “blue-green feature” to reconnect the segregated spaces and rejuvenate the character of Mong Kok. The original idea was to remove the concrete deck of the nullah to promote water-friendly culture. As the water quality problem of the nullah could not be resolved in the short run, URA had to pursue the current proposal mainly on the grounds of environmental hygiene and public safety rather than the costs involved. Although there was a constraint on the depth of water body that could be accommodated on the decked nullah, the key element of water was kept in the current proposal and the water body would resemble the nullah underneath. By incorporating landscape design elements such as water bodies, flowers, trees, and shrubs, as well as encouraging place-making, the

Waterway Park would capitalise on its unique geographical location of being in close proximity to the nullah and respect its alignment;

- (b) the nullah was actually an underground ditch flowing from the northeast to southwest with the exit at the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter. There were illegal connections of the sewers from Shek Kip Mei to the nullah upstream. According to the test conducted by URA on the nullah water samples, the results revealed that excessive *Escherichia coli* existed in the water as exemplified by the offensive smell. Since the water flowing through the nullahs in the New Territories was usually from the hillside nearby, it was not subject to much human pollution; and
- (c) the current design of the Waterway Park was proposed in the notional scheme under the draft DSP to demonstrate its technical feasibility. The principles embedded in the notional design included respecting the alignment of the nullah, reconnecting the spaces on the two sides of the waterway and keeping clear of the access openings for maintenance of the underlying nullah. Subject to the acceptance of LCSD, there was room for adjustment in the design of the waterway. Should the water quality be improved in the future, the nullah could be uncovered by removing the concrete deck to provide the kind of “Urban Waterway” as proposed in YMDS. During the previous discussion with the Government, URA learnt that the prospective public works to the north of the DSP were mainly related to the stormwater storage tanks and associated drainage works. As it was the responsibility of the Government to handle the problem of misconnection of sewers upstream, EPD’s and DSD’s commitments on the resource availability and the implementation timetable were required prior to fixing a timeline to remove the deck of the nullah.

47. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD supplemented that relevant government departments including EPD and DSD had no adverse comments on the draft DSP. The draft DSP would not impose any constraints on the design of the waterway. If proved feasible in the future, the opening up of the decked nullah could be taken forward under the framework of the DSP.

48. Mr Terence Tsang, AD(EA), EPD supplemented that there were incessant efforts to rectify the misconnection of sewers in the territory. It was challenging to trace the origin of the upstream misconnections among the complicated networks in the congested urban areas. With limited resources, priority was given to areas that were currently exposed with offensive odour, e.g. coastal areas along Tsuen Wan and To Kwa Wan. Thus, at this moment it would be difficult to draw up a timetable for uncovering the decked nullah which did not pose any immediate environmental concerns.

49. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the rainwater would be discharged to the underlying nullah within the future Waterway Park;
- (b) whether the flooding risk in the DSP area and its surrounding was assessed; and
- (c) noting from the artist's impression of the notional design that a large area of the Waterway Park was empty without greening or street furniture, whether such bare ground and concrete wall would generate heat island effect.

50. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) there might be other connections to the underlying nullah within the Waterway Park. Based on the preliminary plan, rainwater would be discharged to the existing storm drainage system in the district unless there would be other design requirements from DSD;
- (b) in recent years, URA had conducted resilience studies to deal with climate change issue in its redevelopment projects, in particular those near the coastal area. Measures on drainage, electrical and mechanical facilities as well as waterproof system at the basements of the proposed developments would be devised to meet the modern building standards; and



- (c) the drawings presented in the Paper were illustrations of a conceptual design of the Waterway Park connecting Mong Kok Stadium and the shops along the Flower Market Road. Those greening or hard-paved areas as shown in the drawings would be subject to detailed design. As greening was an important element, URA would strive to strike a balance with respect to the functions of the Waterway Park as a connecting and gathering space and the provision of greenery spaces. On treatment of the existing trees, a tree preservation and removal proposal was required to be submitted. Regarding the preservation of the Old and Valuable Trees, stone wall trees and mature trees, a detailed proposal to determine the locations of transplanted trees and compensatory trees would be conducted for approval at the development stage.

51. A Member asked why there was no water body in the public open space proposed at the southern part of Site A1 in light of the concept of the “Urban Waterway” presented in YMDS. In that regard, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representative, said that the proposed shop frontage on the ground floor, being an integral element in the area, might pose constraints on the design of the public open space at Site A1. In addition, underground space was reserved for linkage to the MTR Prince Edward Station. There was insufficient space at the southern part of Site A1 for a reasonable width of water body when comparing with the Waterway Park at Site B. Notwithstanding the absence of water body at Site A1, the concept of the “Urban Waterway” would extend beyond Site A1 as recommended in YMDS.

#### *Revitalisation of Back Lanes*

52. The Vice-chairperson considered revitalisation of the back lanes a good idea and enquired whether the back lanes were public or privately owned and whether the number of revitalisation sites could be increased as the current proposal with only two sites being transformed into open space seemed inadequate.

53. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) in the notional scheme, Sites A2 and A3 were proposed mainly for public open space, while Sites A4 and A5 would each have a small-scale kiosk together with open space for public passage and gathering. The provision of those public open spaces would help widen the access to the back lanes. URA's existing PERW/YNS Project with the pre-war tenement clusters preserved would complement the four sites in enhancing the back lanes along Yuen Ngai Street and Yuen Po Street through landscaping and revitalisation works as well as place-making;
- (b) some of the back lanes were private land and some were government land; and
- (c) the outcome of URA's efforts in transforming the back lanes into the "Third Street" of the Flower Market in addition to the Flower Market Road and the Prince Edward Road West would demonstrate the enhancement of the overall environment of the Flower Market and extension of the distinctive ambience and characteristics of the Flower Market to its vicinity. With previous experience gained in other projects, URA was confident to serve as a facilitator to work with the stakeholders to revitalise and beautify the back lanes.

54. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the building at Site A3 would be demolished to make room for the proposed enhancement; and
- (b) as it was common that some portions of the back lanes were used for back of house operation such as dishwashing, how URA would ensure that the shop operators would work together in the revitalisation plan to enhance the conditions of the back lanes.

55. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) Site A3 would be transformed into the entrance to the "Third Street" of the Flower Market. In addition to forming a small pocket of open space, the rest

of the space so created could allow the presence of a frontage of the existing shop facing Yuen Ngai Street if permitted under the relevant regulations. The backyards of the graded historical buildings of the PERW/YNS Project could also be restored to strengthen the ambience and street vitality, which would in turn further promote the development of the Flower Market; and

- (b) URA gained knowledge of the operation of the shops along Flower Market Road through the project engagement programme initiated after the commencement of the DS. Consensus from the shop operators and support from the neighbourhood would be obtained in revitalising the back lanes. Through an integrated approach in implementing the DSP by ways of redevelopment and revitalisation to boost street vitality, URA reckoned that incentives could be generated for the shop operators to follow suit. Should there be back lane operations in violation of any regulations, relevant authorities might be engaged to undertake enforcement actions.

#### *The Draft DSP and its Impact on the Flower Market*

56. Two Members said that Sites A2 to A5 were very small and surrounded by buildings, some of which might be heritage buildings, and enquired about the reason why some larger sites were not selected for inclusion in the DSP area for provision of more public open spaces. Envisaging that residents in the area might respond differently in respect of acquisition and resumption of properties by URA, the Members also enquired if there were any criteria in site selection for the DSP.

57. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, explained that the following considerations were taken into account in formulating the DSP area:

- (a) Sites A2 to A5, with buildings aged 76 years, were small in size ranging from about 110m<sup>2</sup> to 240m<sup>2</sup>. Potential for individual redevelopment of those sites was not high;

- (b) with reference to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Transfer of Plot Ratio under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 43), the additional GFA to be absorbed by Site A1 transferred from Sites A2 to A5 had already reached the maximum limit of 30%; and
- (c) bearing in mind the need to preserve the character of the Flower Market, the number of shops affected at Sites A2 to A5 accounted for only 12% of the shop cluster along Flower Market Road and potential impact on the shop cluster, and hence the character of the Flower Market, would be minimised.

58. As advised by the Chairperson to use Plan 6 of the Paper to explain the building age of the surrounding development, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak, URA's representative, supplemented the following main points:

- (a) Sites A2 to A5 were mainly surrounded by relatively newer buildings completed in 1970s and 1980s and the graded historical buildings currently maintained by URA under the PERW/YNS Project and hence, those sites were not considered to be included in the DSP area;
- (b) whilst 38-48 Flower Market Road located between Sites A3 and A4 shared the same building age category as Sites A2 to A5, they were not included in the DSP. One of the considerations was that compared with Sites A2 to A5 each with a site area of less than 250m<sup>2</sup>, sites at 38-48 Flower Market Road could form a larger site area of about 600m<sup>2</sup> which was considered viable for a single redevelopment of a reasonable scale;
- (c) if 38-48 Flower Market Road sites were included in the DSP, the overall impact on the shop cluster along Flower Market Road would increase from 12% to 20%; and
- (d) the tremendous tasks of urban renewal should not only rely on URA, but also the private sector and the Government. The revitalisation of the Flower Market and the preservation of the local character of the district were the objectives of the DS. URA intended not only to preserve the existing

characters of the Flower Market, but also to enhance its characters and ambience so as to inject diversified developments and vitality into it. This would provide space for more flower shops and create a better business environment and a more comfortable shopping environment for the people visiting the flower shops. In doing so, more private incentives in redeveloping and revitalising the area were envisaged.

59. Some Members followed up and raised the following questions:

- (a) what the impact on the flower shop cluster would be taking into account e.g. those lost at Site A1, and whether the extension of ground floor retail shop frontage along Sai Yee Street away from the market core could compensate such loss; and
- (b) considering if 38-48 Flower Market Road were to be redeveloped by private developers that the future shops there might not necessarily be flower shops due to commercial decisions, whether and how the character of the Flower Market could be preserved under the DSP.

60. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the Flower Market was not confined to the area around Flower Market Road. There were flower shops and related businesses along Sai Yee Street and Playing Field Road. There were a total of about 120 flower shops in the Flower Market and about 26% (i.e. 31 shops run by 28 operators) would be affected by the DSP. Ground floor retail units would be provided at Site A1. Together with those provided at Site B, the number of shop units to be provided upon redevelopment would be more than the loss. A balance between the need for redevelopment and minimising the impact on the Flower Market was struck in the DSP; and
- (b) not all shops in the Flower Market were flower shops; some were cafes or sports-related, thereby creating synergy effect. A relatively small portion of

the flower shops in the Flower Market would be affected by the DSP. The ground floor of the proposed GIC complex at Site B would provide on-street retail units. URA would consider giving priority to the florist operators affected by the redevelopment to move back to these retail units and arrangements to facilitate their transitional operation would also be explored. It was envisaged that the number of flower shops could be maintained in the Flower Market. To create synergy with the adjacent sports facilities and events held at Mong Kok Stadium, the themes of horticulture, floristry or gardening and sports would be recommended for the future on-street retail units at Site B. The frontage of the proposed GIC complex facing Sai Yee Street would also be set back to allow more space for shop displays and to enhance the pedestrian environment. As exemplified in the activities organised by URA in the Central Market, Peel Street/Graham Street Project in Central and Nga Tsin Wai Road/Carpenter Road Project in Kowloon City, a variety of indoor and outdoor florist-related and cultural-related activities would be organised with the neighbourhood to promote the character of the Flower Market. This would help the operators of nearby ground floor and upper floor shops outside the DS to sustain their operation, which would in turn facilitate the preservation of the local characters and vibes of the Flower Market. Urban renewal required the collaborative efforts of all sectors in the community and private initiative might inject new energy and vitality into the Flower Market.

61. A Member enquired about the criteria for the transfer of PR in the relevant TPB guidelines, specifically regarding geographical location and development scale. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD explained that in accordance with TPB PG-No. 43, GFA could be transferred from the sending site (SS) to the receiving site (RS) on the same OZP by relaxing the maximum permissible PR/GFA of the RS as specified in the OZP by up to a maximum of 30% for accommodating the GFA transferred from the SS. RS should be strategically located and accessible, and/or adjacent to or complementary with major development nodes. Favourable consideration would be given to a RS with a site area of not less than 1,000m<sup>2</sup> to provide better room to accommodate the transferred GFA with better layout/building design and adequate amenities. SS included sites suitable for conversion into public open spaces and/or GIC uses with the support of the relevant government departments,

sites with buildings worthy of conservation and/or sites with excessive development intensity and hence low redevelopment potential. Favourable consideration would also be given to accepting an SS if redevelopment on its own would result in pencil-type development not conducive to an efficient layout or the existing building on the site was dilapidated and aged 50 years or more. TPB PG-No. 43 set out the relevant requirements and considerations for section 16 applications involving the transfer of PR from one site to another through minor relaxation of PR or GFA restriction. While making reference to the principles of the said TPB guidelines, the draft DSP in effect adopted the “linked-site” approach for the transfer of GFA from Sites A2 to A5 to Site A1.

*The Notional Scheme and Technical Aspects*

62. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed hotel use could be converted to residential use at Site B;
- (b) whether swapping the development of Sub-areas 1 and 2 of Site B for better connection and circulation of the open and recreation spaces had been considered;
- (c) regarding the air ventilation assessment (AVA), whether the permitted BH on the OZP or the existing BH was adopted as the baseline scheme; whether the terrain level had included the approved developments not yet completed or even without indicative design in the surrounding areas; and whether 500m level or ground level was measured in calculating the wind direction weighted average velocity ratio;
- (d) whether the proposed access to the public carpark at the one-way Boundary Street would overload the capacity of the already congested road; and
- (e) whether study on the pedestrian flow was conducted and if so, whether improvement measures were proposed to enhance pedestrian accessibility, e.g. linkage with the MTR stations.

63. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Lawrence C.K. Mak and Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) the land use mix proposed in the notional scheme was intended as an illustration to demonstrate the feasibility of the DS. Flexibility was provided in the proposed development parameters of the DSP. There was room for adjustment in the mix of residential and commercial GFAs and the future developer could also determine on his own the type of commercial uses to be provided at Site B;
- (b) in formulating the DSP, various combinations of building forms at different locations had been considered. The football pitch at Sub-area (2) of Site B could not be accommodated at Sub-area (1) of Site B mainly because of the constraints of the nullah structure and hence the shape and configuration of the development site. In the current design, high-rise buildings located at Sub-area (1) of Site B were farther away from the existing buildings along Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road and thus visual openness could be maintained. According to LCSD, the existing football pitch was always fully booked and the provision of 11-a-side football pitch was inadequate in the territory. Seamless reprovisioning of the football pitch was required to minimise disruption to the services and hence, interim reprovisioning site could only be identified outside the district;
- (c) similar to other AVAs conducted under the current practice and scrutinised by PlanD, OZP-compliant scheme with permitted BH on the OZP was largely adopted as the baseline scenario for the DSP area. The dimension of the terrain was 2,800m (length) x 2,800m (width) x 2,000m (height) and all the committed developments had been included and the details were kept up-to-date in the course of the assessment. In calculating the wind direction weighted average velocity ratio, the pedestrian level at 2m above ground was measured;



- (d) currently, vehicles entering the Flower Market might exit either through Sai Yee Street and Boundary Street or Flower Market Road and Prince Edward Road West. There would be no change to such arrangement in the future. The proposed ingress of the public carpark at Boundary Street could make use of the capacity of the west-bound lane of Boundary Street towards Tai Hang Tung Road in order to reduce the number of vehicles entering the Flower Market through the bottleneck at Sai Yee Street. The traffic impact assessment (TIA) undertaken had confirmed the technical feasibility and acceptability of the arrangement; and
- (e) the scope of the TIA included both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. Pedestrians would mainly come to the Flower Market from the direction of the MTR Prince Edward and MTR Mong Kok East Stations. In view of the existing traffic, widening of at-grade crossings at Sai Yee Street and Prince Edward Road West was proposed. Pavement widening at Playing Field Road was also identified. URA further suggested a possible footbridge connecting Site B with Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground and further to the Mission Hill, and a possible subway across Sai Yee Street subject to further study with reference to the underground facilities and pedestrians' preferences. In YMDS, the conceptual proposal of linkage with the MTR Prince Edward Station was highlighted but there was no concrete proposal for the area outside the DSP for the time being

#### *Social Impact Assessment (SIA)*

64. Two Members enquired about the major results of the two SIA conducted, in particular the views of the flower shop operators and the information on owner-occupiers and tenants. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mike Y.F. Kwan, URA's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) a total of 149 households (359 residents) and 56 business operators were recorded in the freezing survey. Most of the surveyed households supported the proposed redevelopment;

- (b) there were 71 owner-occupier households (about 48%) and 78 tenant households (about 52%). Subdivision of domestic units for domestic use was taken into account to analyse the degree of sharing. Out of the 21 subdivided units, 53 households were found and the degree of sharing was about 2.52. One of the domestic units was subdivided into 10 units;
- (c) about 4% of the 359 residents surveyed were ethnic minority, which was lower than the district-wide and territory-wide levels of about 17% and 8% respectively;
- (d) the percentage of elderly residents within the DS was about 23%, which was much higher than the district level of 18%. Elderly singleton households and elderly doubleton households accounted for about 9% and 5% respectively. Under the project engagement programme initiated by URA, a special team of staff made follow-up visits to the elderly households to explain the policies in detail and help them understand the compensation and rehousing arrangements and the timeline of the project;
- (e) there were currently some 120 ground floor flower shops in the Flower Market, more than 20 of them would be affected by the DS. The most concerned issues of the flower shop operators were insufficient shop space, parking space and loading/unloading bays while those of the customers were congestion, unpleasant pedestrian environment and lack of parking spaces; and
- (f) to address the concerns of the flower shop operators, on-street retail units facing the proposed Waterway Park on the ground level of the proposed GIC complex were proposed to provide more at-grade open area and improve the supporting facilities and environment of the Flower Market. More opportunities would then be provided for the flower shops and related operators to expand their businesses and enhance the vibrant marketplace atmosphere of the Flower Market. The proposed underground public carpark providing additional public car parking spaces and L/UL bays could facilitate the operation of the flower shops and enhance the convenience of the visitors who drove to Flower Market. Improving the overall traffic and pedestrian environment in the vicinity would

enhance the business environment and improve the shopping experience of visitors in the Flower Market, which would in turn promote the area as a diversified shopping district for leisure and recreation.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

65. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson thanked the representatives of PlanD and URA for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

66. The deliberation session was recorded under confidential cover.

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

### **Any Other Business**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

67. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 2:35 p.m.