

**Minutes of 1329<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 8.1.2025, 9.1.2025 and 17.1.2025 p.m.**

**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

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon  
Transport Department  
Mr Vico P. Cheung

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands  
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Katy C.W. Fung (8.1.2025 a.m. and 9.1.2025 p.m.)

Mr K.K. Lee (8.1.2025 p.m.)

Mr Jeff K.C. Ho (9.1.2025 a.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Edward H.C. Leung (8.1.2025 a.m.)

Ms M.L. Leung (8.1.2025 p.m.)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (9.1.2025 a.m.)

Mr Kenny C.H. Lau (9.1.2025 p.m. and 17.1.2025 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 8.1.2025:

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

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon  
Transport Department  
Mr Vico P. Cheung

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands  
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

**Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K3/URA5/1  
(TPB Paper No. 10991)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

2. The Secretary reported that the draft Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/1 (the DSP) was submitted by Urban Renewal Authority (URA). Representations were submitted by the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA) (R62), URA (R69) and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R730). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                           |   |   |
|---------------------------|---|---|
| Mr Ivan M.K. Chung        | ] |   |
| (as Director of Planning) | ] | being a non-executive director of the URA Board   |
| Mr Maurice K.W. Loo       | ] | and a member of its Committee;  |
| (as Director of Lands)    | ] |   |
| Mr Timothy K.W. Ma        | - | being a member of the Land, Rehousing & Compensation Committee and 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           | - | being a council member of HKIA and having current business dealings with URA;   |

- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - being a consultant of URA for a project within the DSP;
- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a former director of the Board of URF;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former executive director of URA; and
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL.

3. Member noted that Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma, Vincent K.Y. Ho, Ryan M.K. Ip and Ben S.S. Lui, Professor B.S. Tang, Dr Tony C.M. Ip and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong would not attend/had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung and Maurice K.W. Loo were direct, Members agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting. As Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu had no involvement in the DSP and/or submission of the relevant representation, Members also agreed that he could join the meeting.

4. The Secretary also said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

5. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers 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, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

6. The following government representatives, representers and/or their representatives 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 Kervis W.C. Chan | - | Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)       |
| Mr Chris K.C. Ma    | - | Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK)               |

## **Representers and Representers' Representatives**

### R15 – Au Tin Che Daniel

- |                      |   |             |
|----------------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Au Tin Che Daniel | - | Representer |
|----------------------|---|-------------|

### R21 – 播道會天福堂

- |                        |   |                              |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| Mr Law Ming Nok Joseph | - | Representer's Representative |
|------------------------|---|------------------------------|

### R41 – 黃建新

- |                 |   |             |
|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Wong Kin San | - | Representer |
|-----------------|---|-------------|

### R69 – Urban Renewal Authority

- |                           |   |                               |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence | ] |                               |
| Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike      | ] |                               |
| Ms Kwan Mei Po Mable      | ] | Representer's Representatives |
| Mr Choy Tsz Hin Frankie   | ] |                               |
| Ms Lin Nga Kei Kelly      | ] |                               |

### R95 – Tse Shing Fung Peter

- |                         |   |             |
|-------------------------|---|-------------|
| Mr Tse Shing Fung Peter | - | Representer |
|-------------------------|---|-------------|



R488 – 夏穎嫻

R724 – 利得國際有限公司

Ms Ha Wing Han - Representor and Representor's Representative

R490 – 陳善凝

Ms Chan Cinlea Sin Ying - Representor

R494 – Tai Hang Ling

Ms Tai Hang Ling - Representor

R495 – 夏錫偉

Mr Ha Sik Wai - Representor

R496 – Chan Yun Lam

Mr Chan Yun Lam - Representor

R497 – Chu Ching Yee

Ms Chu Ching Yee - Representor

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the hearing would be conducted in two days on 8 and 9.1.2025. The representatives of PlanD would be invited to brief Members on the representations at this session of the meeting. After the presentation of PlanD, the representors and/or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representor would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representors and/or their representatives 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 for each morning and afternoon session after the attending representors and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representors and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representors and/or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After the hearing of all the

oral submissions from the representers and/or their representatives, the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Secretary supplemented that the video recording of PlanD's presentation at this session of the meeting would be uploaded to TPB's website for viewing by the other representers.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan and Mr Gary C.W. Tam joined this session of the meeting at this point.]

9. The Chairperson then invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kervis W.C. Chan, STP/TWK, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the DSP, the major grounds/views/proposals of the representers, government responses and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10991 (the Paper). The DSP was located in the northeastern part of Mong Kok and was commonly known as the Flower Market precinct. It comprised Sites A and B. Site A, which was further divided into five linked sites, i.e. Sites A1 to A5, was mainly designated as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use (1)" ("OU(MU)1") with stipulation of sub-areas, subject to a maximum domestic gross floor area (GFA) of 28,798m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum total GFA of 30,492m<sup>2</sup>. Sub-area (1) (i.e. Site A1) was subject to a maximum building height (BH) of 150mPD for residential development with retail and provision of public open space (POS). Sub-areas (2) to (5) (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) were subject to a maximum BH of 1 storey for single-storey retail facilities and POS. At-grade POS of not less than 800m<sup>2</sup> in total should be provided within the "OU(MU)1" zone. Site B was mainly designated as "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Mixed Use (2)" ("OU(MU)2") with stipulation of sub-areas. Sub-area (1) of "OU(MU)2" zone was subject to a maximum domestic GFA of 46,605m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum total GFA of 64,530m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 150mPD for residential and commercial development with retail and government, institution and community (GIC) uses. Sub-area (2) of "OU(MU)2" zone was subject to a maximum total GFA of 8,955m<sup>2</sup> and a maximum BH of 30mPD for a low-rise GIC complex with retail use. POS of not less than 16,200m<sup>2</sup> in total should be provided within the "OU(MU)2" zone, of which not less than 8,800m<sup>2</sup> should be provided at-grade. A public vehicle park (PVP)

should also be provided.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung joined this session of the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

11. The Chairperson then invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R15 – Au Tin Che Daniel

12. Mr Au Tin Che Daniel made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in Tai Hang Tung area and made frequent visits to the Flower Market and Boundary Street Recreation Ground for sports activities in the past 30 to 40 years;
- (b) he supported the DSP to meet the ever-changing social needs and public aspirations through restructuring and re-planning of land uses. The incompatibility of the existing refuse collection point at Flower Market Road with the surrounding uses was one of the examples to illustrate that the land use planning in the district lagged behind the changes in society;
- (c) while the utilisation rate of Boundary Street Sports Centres was high, the facilities therein were in poor condition. The provision of a GIC complex at Site B was supported as it would better utilise land resources and provide various sports, recreation and community facilities to cater for the needs of different age groups;
- (d) the proposed building setback along Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road would provide more walking space to minimise vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. The proposed underground PVP with loading/unloading (L/UL) spaces at the GIC complex would help address the shortfall of parking spaces in the district, particularly during events held at Mong Kok Stadium. It would also help alleviate the problem of traffic congestion as more L/UL facilities would be available for flower shop operators in the Flower Market; and

- (e) the benefits of the proposed redevelopment outweighed the drawbacks as some of the inherent problems in the district, including traffic problem, congested walking environment and aged facilities, could be resolved.

R21 – 播道會天福堂

13. Mr Law Ming Nok Joseph made the following main points:

- (a) Tin Fook Church (天福堂) was a subsidiary of Tin Chuen Church (天泉堂), which was established in 1993. Tin Chuen Church was part of the Evangelical Free Church of China (EFCC) (中國基督教播道會) and established in 1937, and the place of worship had been founded in the Flower Market area since 1952;
- (b) Tin Chuen Church had not been consulted on the proposed redevelopment. It had been providing long-term social services to the local community but the Social Impact Assessment (SoIA) conducted by URA had underestimated its contribution to the community; and
- (c) a large amount of money was spent in the renovation of the existing church premises during the pandemic period. URA should provide premises gratis and without costs to Tin Chuen Church, along with financial assistance for temporary and permanent relocation. The area of the premises for permanent relocation should be about 670m<sup>2</sup> (similar to the area of the current premises) and should be within the DSP area upon completion of the proposed redevelopment so as to continue its services in the Flower Market area.

R41 – 黃建新

14. Mr Wong Kin San made the following main points:

- (a) as a Yau Tsim Mong District Council (YTMDC) member, he rendered in-principle support to the DSP in terms of restructuring/reprovisioning

enhanced sports and recreation facilities, the planning concept of “Urban Waterway” and the provision of an underground PVP under the “Single Site, Multiple Use” (SSMU) principle;

- (b) since the commencement of the development scheme (DS) on 15.3.2024, supportive and opposing views and comments from flower shop and other business operators, concerned property owners and local residents had been received. Their views had been included in the written submission to the Board. Some of the major issues were highlighted below;

*Rationale of DSP boundary*

- (c) owners and residents of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were of the view that their buildings (over 70 years) should be included in the DSP due to poor building conditions, management and maintenance, but their views were not duly addressed by URA yet. On the contrary, Prince Edward Building at Site A1, which was only over 60 years and under good maintenance and management, was incorporated in the DSP area for redevelopment. There was no clear site selection criteria for the DSP. URA was suggested to liaise with the Owner’s Corporation/residents of Prince Edward Building to retain the building with redecoration works so as to complement the theme of the DSP instead of demolishing the building. This approach would minimise impacts on residents and flower shop operators;

*Reprovisioning of Existing Sports and Recreation Facilities*

- (d) currently, there were six sports centres in Yau Tsim Mong district, which were located at Kowloon Park, Kwun Chung, Fa Yuen Street, Tai Kok Tsui and Boundary Street (i.e. Sports Centre No. 1 and No. 2). According to a recent report submitted by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) to YTMDC, the utilisation rate of the above sports centres was approaching 100%. The proposed redevelopment would lead to a suspension of highly utilised sports and recreation facilities for at least 6 years,

which would compromise the well-being of local residents. URA should consider using the available land adjoining Mong Kok Stadium or adopting a phased approach by redeveloping the area to the north of the proposed Waterway Park first, leaving the space to the south at Site B for temporary reprovisioning of sports/recreation facilities such as table tennis tables and outdoor badminton and basketball courts for the local residents; and

*Promoting the Sustainable Development of the Flower Market*

- (e) the Flower Market was a tourist spot in Hong Kong. At the same time, it supported the living of many families. While the proposed redevelopment was supported, given the declining wholesale and retail business in the Flower Market, URA should propose measures to promote the sustainable development and preserve the characters of the Flower Market, and the experience of URA's unsuccessful projects of "Sneaker Street" (Fa Yuen Street) and "Wedding Card Street" (Lee Tung Street) should not be repeated in the Flower Market.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan joined this session of the meeting during R41's presentation]

R69 – Urban Renewal Authority

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Kwan Mei Po Mable made the following main points:

- (a) the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS) commissioned by URA was completed in 2021. A Master Urban Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) was formulated under YMDS to provide a blueprint for restructuring the old district and steering growth towards the development nodes (DNs) including the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN in Mong Kok East. In response to the 2023 Policy Address, the proposed redevelopment, covering the northeastern part of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN, was the first project to be implemented by URA to carry out replanning and restructuring

of land uses to realise the recommendations of the DN under the MRCP;

- (b) through replanning and restructuring of land uses in a comprehensive manner and based on the “Urban Waterway” concept, the proposed redevelopment would not only address urban issues such as aged recreation facilities and segregated amenity and resting areas and traffic problems in the Flower Market area, but also inject diverse development and new vitality into the Flower Market in connection with Mong Kok East, shaping Mong Kok East into an “Exuberant Commercial District” in a wider context;
- (c) the DSP comprised Sites A1 to A5 and Site B. A “linked-site” approach was adopted for Sites A1 to A5 which were strategically selected to minimise the impact on the flower shops in the Flower Market area while providing more open spaces and retail frontages and revitalising back lanes to improve the overall environment. For Site B, a SSMU model was adopted to achieve multiple objectives, including provision of a Waterway Park as a flower appreciation hotspot, provision of shop frontages with spaces for floral displays to reinforce the distinctive characteristics of the Flower Market, improvements to pedestrian and traffic environment and connectivity, and better utilisation of land resources by consolidating segregated spaces and sports facilities into a GIC complex with an underground PVP;
- (d) apart from the hardware design, URA would adopt an integrated approach of place-making, community making and public engagement, and organise events and activities to promote the business environment and vibrancy as well as reinforce the characteristics of the Flower Market. Similar approach had been adopted in other URA’s projects in Graham Street Market, Staunton Street/Shing Wong Street and Kowloon City to strengthen their unique characters. As for Mong Kok, URA commenced the Prince Edward Road West/Yuen Ngai Street revitalisation project (MK/02) (the PERW/YNS project) in close proximity to the DSP area in 2008. After the completion of the rehabilitation works for the graded historic buildings, the affected flower shop operators had returned to continue their business. In connection with the above, URA organised the Flower Market Christmas Festive Event (the

Christmas Event) during Christmas time in 2024, which showcased the area's unique charm and attractiveness, enhanced the festive atmosphere and boosted its business environment; and

- (e) the DSP area, upon redevelopment, would serve as a hub connecting the Flower Market with its adjacent areas including the Mong Kok Stadium and nearby parks. URA would continue to engage business operators and relevant stakeholders during the implementation of the DSP project.

R95 – Tse Shing Fung Peter

16. Mr Tse Shing Fung Peter made the following main points:

- (a) majority of representations (i.e. 89% of 767 representations received) provided opposing/adverse views on the DSP, which were substantially different from the results of the consultation conducted by URA earlier. Against the majority rule, the DSP should be suspended, taking into account the impacts on the operation of flower shops, the lack of measures to foster a more favourable business environment for the Flower Market upon redevelopment, and public aspirations for social stability. As the future ambience and vibrancy of the Flower Market were not guaranteed in light of URA's unsuccessful projects of "Bird Street" (Hong Lok Street), "Cloth Alley" (Wing On Street) and "Jade Street" (Canton Road), it was suggested to allow flower shop operators to expand their business area beyond the designated yellow line in the open area, which was considered as an effective measure to boost patronage based on past experiences;
- (b) to resolve the problems of the vehicle-pedestrian conflicts and illegal parking and to avoid traffic accidents, it would be more effective and pragmatic to implement a pedestrianisation scheme in the Flower Market area rather than pedestrian pavement widening;



- (c) whether the proposed revitalisation of back lanes as the “Third Street” of the Flower Market could enhance the walkability and address the vehicle-pedestrian conflicts was in doubt. A number of unauthorised structures including supporting frames for air-conditioners could be found in the back lanes of the Flower Market, which imposed an imminent safety threat to pedestrians if those back lanes were revitalised for pedestrian circulation;
- (d) the church and old buildings with historical and cultural values within the DSP boundary should be preserved in consultation with the Antiquities and Monuments Office and promoted as tourist attractions and landmarks of the Flower Market with a view to enhancing the business environment of the Flower Market and creating synergy effect;
- (e) some buildings in the DSP area (e.g. Prince Edward Building) would be demolished even though large-scale renovation works had been undertaken and the safety standards of the Buildings Department had been complied with. Demolishing well-maintained buildings went against the principle of environmental protection; and
- (f) the proposed design of the Waterway Park in URA’s notional scheme deviated from the original proposal under YMDS, and implementation of which might exacerbate public grievances. Alternative site for a “genuine” Waterway Park should be explored.

R488 – 夏穎嫻

R724 – 利得國際有限公司

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ha Wing Han made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed the proposed redevelopment in the capacity as the representative of two flower shops in Prince Edward Building;

- (b) the two flower shops had operated in Prince Edward Building at Site A1 for about 2 years. There had been young shop operators/tenants/flower-related practitioners starting business/working in the Flower Market. The business there was thriving due to the prominent location of the shops at the main entrance of the Flower Market (i.e. 龍頭) which was easily accessible by public transport, offering an open area for displaying flowers and providing a wide array of floral varieties. It was considered as a landmark of the Flower Market. Except for a paragraph on page 16 of the Paper, no response had been provided regarding the impact of the proposed redevelopment on the uniqueness of Site A1;
- (c) while the age of Prince Edward Building was over 60 years, it was well-maintained and in good condition. Building repair works were undertaken a few years ago. To her understanding, the fire service installations of the building had also been upgraded recently. It was not justified for URA to demolish the building simply because the stairway leading to the lift lobby posed difficulties for the physically disabled and the elderly;
- (d) unlike a shopping mall, the Flower Market was characterised by its open setting and flexible space, allowing high patronage, large business volume, and display of various kinds of seasonal flowers and plants of different sizes in outdoor area such as the open area in front of her shops, which was more appealing to customers. It was doubtful whether the current characteristics and ambience of “bazaar” (墟/市集) of the Flower Market could be preserved in a shopping mall setting as illustrated in the artist’s impression of URA for Site B;
- (e) her flower shops intended to launch fund raising campaigns in collaboration with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) to contribute to society. However, such campaigns might not be possible if her flower shops were affected by the proposed redevelopment; and

- (f) reprovisioning the affected flower shops in a shopping mall-like environment, which was not in the form of “replacing the bazaar by bazaar” (以墟換墟), would be fatal to their business because of high rent. The project proponent was not familiar with the operation of the Flower Market. URA did not provide any details on the relocation arrangement for the affected flower shops.

R490 – 陳善凝

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Cinlea Sin Ying made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed the proposed redevelopment;
- (b) a large piece of government land occupying about 85% of the DSP area would be acquired for the redevelopment project. Such proportion of government land was substantially high compared with other URA’s projects such as Kwun Tong Town Centre redevelopment project (K7) (38%), Queen’s Road West/Kwai Heung Street development project (C&W-007) (16%) and Hung Fook Street/Ngan Hon Street development project (KC-010) (10%). The DSP covering high percentage of government land deviated from URA’s objective of redeveloping old buildings. The DSP area was relatively large but the number of affected households and business operators was relatively small. There was a mismatch of land resources in selecting Sites A1 to A5 and Site B for redevelopment purpose. It was a waste of land resources to create a shopping mall similar to V Walk in West Kowloon and others in Tsim Sha Tsui as illustrated in the artist’s impression of URA, which were not frequented by local people;
- (c) URA did not discharge its duties properly on urban renewal as the open space site at Site B was planned for property development, depriving local residents of their right to use the open space. The DSP was considered a profit-making property redevelopment rather than a “people first” redevelopment

project;

- (d) there was no urgency for the redevelopment of the Flower Market. The proposed redevelopment would undermine the distinctive local character of the Flower Market and affect the livelihood of business operators and local residents. The front part at the entrance (i.e. Prince Edward Building) of the Flower Market (龍頭) would also be destroyed, which would in turn affect the vitality, local culture and bazaar ambience of the Flower Market;
- (e) referring to the blog of the Managing Director of URA dated 15.12.2024, it mentioned about the outdated local road design and shortage of L/UL facilities in the Flower Market, and the severe competition faced by flower shop operators in the Flower Market. URA's visionary planning of the Flower Market area would foster a more favourable business environment for the sustainable development of the Flower Market. In that regard, she held the views that as the L/UL activities/logistics arrangement were usually conducted during non-peak hours in the early morning, such activities did not generate significant traffic impact on the Flower Market area. There were no conflicts among the flower shops as they had their own characteristics in terms of their locations and sizes and types of flowers and plants available for the customers. As there was a lack of communication and consultation with the flower shop operators regarding the operation of Flower Market, she doubted whether URA could truly promote the sustainable development of the Flower Market. Besides, the festive activity conducted by URA during Christmas time was considered ineffective in promoting the Flower Market; and
- (f) the Board should ensure that URA would balance the gain and loss of the society and closely monitor the implementation programme if the proposed redevelopment was further pursued. URA should consult the stakeholders again and devise measures to preserve the distinctive characteristics of the Flower Market before and after completion of the proposed redevelopment.

R494 – Tai Hang Ling

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tai Hang Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she was a florist. According to her knowledge, the Flower Market was a renowned procurement and supply hub for flowers and floral materials from different countries and the Mainland, serving many floral studios/workshops in the territory, including those in Tsuen Wan, Lai Chi Kok, Kwun Tong and Diamond Hill;
- (b) the Flower Market was divided into three parts, i.e. the front part (at the entrance) (龍頭), the middle part (龍身) and the rear part (龍尾). Each of the flower shops therein had its own characteristics, selling flowers on retail or wholesale basis, with diverse types and species. Flowers were consumable items and were usually kept in relatively small quantity in the flower shops in other districts. Florists or buyers might come and purchase flowers in the Flower Market if they received urgent orders from their customers for delivery on the same day;
- (c) as the flower shops in the Flower Market were highly concentrated, buyers could stroll from Site A1 to Site A5 to compare prices, quality and freshness of flowers. They could also seek advice from flower shop operators before selecting freshly cut flowers or other floral products such as flower baskets for grand openings or bridal bouquets within short time. As flower shops would be scattered in different locations upon redevelopment, more time would be required when purchasing flowers and other floral materials. It was anticipated that the flower prices would increase if flower shops were relocated to a shopping mall, making them less affordable for the general public. There were concerns about the sustainability of the small flower shops upon completion of the redevelopment project;
- (d) providing supporting facilities such as underground PVP and L/UL facilities for flower shops would be ineffective if the business environment in the

Flower Market deteriorated and many flower shops closed down; and

- (e) given that the existing Flower Market was well-developed and had cultivated good relationships among flower shops, floral studios/workshops and customers, the Board was urged to consider maintaining the operation, ambience and distinctive characteristics of the Flower Market upon redevelopment.

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu joined this session of the meeting at this point.]

R495 – 夏錫偉

20. Mr Ha Sik Wai said that he opposed the proposed redevelopment on the similar grounds raised by other representers.

R496 – Chan Yun Lam

21. Mr Chan Yun Lam made the following main points:

- (a) he opposed the proposed redevelopment and found it unacceptable that the DSP encroached on a large portion of government land (i.e. about 85% of the DSP area), with only about 15% of private land involved in pursuit of the proposal;
- (b) the design lifespan of buildings constructed with reinforced concrete was about 50 years, with a safety factor of 1.2 or more imposed by architects/engineers. The structural safety of buildings depended on a host of factors including building design and conditions of steel bars and reinforced concrete. The building repair works of Prince Edward Building aged over 60 years at Site A1 had been completed. Its lifespan was expected to be extended by 20 years or more. Thus, it was not justified for URA to demolish the building solely because the stairway leading to the lift lobby posed difficulties for the physically disabled and the elderly. He questioned whether Prince Edward Building could be retained if the accessibility issue

was resolved; and

- (c) it was doubtful if the festive lighting decorations set up for the Christmas Event organised by URA could boost patronage and business of the Flower Market. An on-site survey on pedestrian flow at different times of the day before and after the event should be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the Christmas Event.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon left this session of the meeting during R496's presentation.]

R497 – Ms Chu Ching Yee

22. Ms Chu Ching Yee made the following main points:

- (a) apart from local people, visitors from the Mainland and other countries were also attracted to the Flower Market with promotion on the internet;
- (b) Site A1 was located at the prominent location, i.e. the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, and was easily accessible by public transport and frequently visited. The flower shops there were operated in the form of a bazaar, which provided an one-stop location for customers to purchase trees, flowers, indoor and outdoor plant decorations and gardening supplies. It also served as a gathering place for horticultural enthusiasts and florists to share experiences. As such, it was considered a landmark of the Flower Market. The inclusion of Site A1 in the redevelopment was unreasonable and the necessity of its redevelopment was in doubt;
- (c) some people alleged that the traffic congestion in the Flower Market area was brought by the L/UL activities of flower shops. As the flower shop operators would arrange quick transport to deliver large goods during non-peak hours in the early morning, such allegation was unfounded. In a shopping mall setting, such activities would only be conducted when parking spaces were available, which was considered inefficient from operational perspective;

- (d) flower shop operations involved a number of work procedures related to the handling of solid waste and dirty water, which might not be welcomed by the property management of shopping mall. Relocating flower shops to a shopping mall would also result in a loss of the Flower Market's distinctive bazaar ambience; and
- (e) the stakeholders were neither properly consulted nor informed about the details of the reprovisioning or relocation arrangements for the affected flower shops.

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

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

#### *DSP Boundary and Rationale*

24. Noting that 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) had not been incorporated in the DSP boundary, a Member asked if URA (R69) could explain the reasons and advise whether the ownership pattern (i.e. single vs multiple ownership) was one of the considerations in determining the DSP boundary. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the site area of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) was about 600m<sup>2</sup>. There was potential for separate redevelopment of the site under private initiative. URA was only one of the parties undertaking urban renewal projects. The current DSP project would serve as a catalyst for urban regeneration in the district by the private sector; and



- (b) the site concerned comprised six private lots. It was estimated that there were at least six flower shops. If the buildings within the site were included in the DSP boundary, the number of flower shops affected by the proposed redevelopment would increase further, thereby causing greater disturbance to the Flower Market. URA had no intention to adversely affect the integrity and operation of the Flower Market.

25. Noting that some representers were concerned that a large proportion of the DSP consisted of government land, which was significantly higher compared with other URA projects, a Member enquired if URA (R69) could explain the rationale. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that each URA project was planned and designed based on the characteristics, constraints and conditions of the respective site. The "Urban Waterway" was the core design concept of the DSP, which was situated on government land, and a large portion of it fell within Site B. To optimise land utilisation of Site B, the SSMU model had been adopted for a mixed development with a multi-purpose GIC complex building. While Site B was government land, a site area of about 17,700m<sup>2</sup> (more than half of the DSP area) was mainly for the provision of POS and GIC uses including the reprovisioning and upgrading of existing GIC/recreation/sports facilities and provision of new facilities, as well as ground-floor retail units for extension of retail and flower market activities without compromising the existing operation of the Flower Market. As such, it was considered not appropriate to directly compare the subject DSP project with other URA projects. It should be noted that the proposed reprovisioning and upgrading of GIC/sports/recreation facilities and provision of new facilities including the Waterway Park would be carried out at URA's own cost.

26. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, supplemented that under URA's notional scheme, the SSMU principle had been adopted at Site B for a comprehensive mixed-use development with the reprovisioning of existing sports/recreation facilities and open space provided at multi-levels at the site. The above facilities, together with the Waterway Park and new social welfare and health facilities would be handed over to the Government and open to the public upon completion. As such, the statement of "using 10% of private land in exchange for 90% of government land" (以一換九) in the DSP area was not accurate as despite Site B occupying about 85% of the DSP area in

total, only part of it was exclusively used for residential and commercial developments.

*“Linked-site” Approach and Transfer of Plot Ratio (PR)*

27. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the merits of the “linked-site” approach adopted for Sites A1 to A5 from the public interest perspective; and
- (b) a brief account of the calculation involved in the transfer of PR among Sites A1 to A5 to demonstrate that the resultant development intensity would be within the statutory limit.

28. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide and a visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the mechanism of transfer of PR, which involved planning application under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, was set out in the TPB Guidelines for Application for Transfer of PR under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 43) promulgated in 2023. In gist, the transfer of PR aimed to transfer the development potential from site(s) of low redevelopment potential (“Sending Site”) which might be too small for sensible redevelopment of the old building(s) therein on its own or occupied by building of historic value to a more sizeable site (“Receiving Site”) at more accessible and/or strategic location near/at a DN of the MRCP. This would encourage redevelopment of the old building(s) at the concerned sites and would possibly release the Sending Sites for open space and GIC uses as planning gains to the community without increasing the development intensity as a whole. The “linked-site” approach currently adopted by URA was similar to the concept of transfer of PR in that the development potential of the small Sites A2 to A5 was transferred to the sizeable Site A1 while the former sites would be converted into open space and single-storey retail use to enhance and complement the Flower Market environment; and

- (b) under URA's notional scheme, the maximum total PR of the linked sites comprising Sites A1 to A5, based on the total area of these sites, was kept at 9, i.e. the maximum permissible total PR of their original "R(A)" and "OU(MU)" zones. The resultant PR for Site A1 itself would be 11.47. The additional GFA to be absorbed by Site A1 transferred from Sites A2 to A5 did not exceed the maximum limit of 30% as set out in TPB PG-No. 43.

29. Noting that building repair works of Prince Edward Building at Site A1 had been completed recently and the building was in relatively good condition, the same Member enquired whether the development potential of Sites A2 to A5 could be transferred to Site B instead of Site A1 if Prince Edward Building was excluded from the DSP boundary. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the net site areas of Sites A2, A3, A4 and A5 were about 239m<sup>2</sup>, 109m<sup>2</sup>, 202m<sup>2</sup> and 198m<sup>2</sup> respectively. Given their small sizes, these sites were difficult to be redeveloped in an effective manner under the Buildings Ordinance. As such, the "linked-site" approach was adopted for Sites A1 to A5 with the development potential of Sites A2 to A5 transferred to Site A1;
- (b) taking into consideration that only Sub-area (1) of Site B was for high-rise development, leaving the larger portion, i.e. Sub-area (2), for low-rise GIC complex and POS, it was considered more appropriate to transfer the development potential of Sites A2 to A5 to Site A1 as its development intensity could be higher due to the strategic location near MTR Prince Edward Station;
- (c) the inclusion of Prince Edward Building in the DSP had taken into account a basket of factors including its strategic location in the DSP and the building conditions, though it was not the oldest building in the DSP. Site A1 comprised Prince Edward Building with the building age of 64 years and other aged buildings. The stairway leading to the lift lobby of Prince Edward Building posed difficulties for the physically disabled and the elderly. Since such issue could not be resolved by way of building repair works alone, redevelopment of it was considered necessary;

- (d) Prince Edward Building was located in a corner site of Prince Edward Road West and was situated in a strategic location of Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN as formulated under YMDS. The building accounted for one-third of the area of Site A1 with some low-rise and aged buildings in the remaining portion of Site A1. Site A1 would be redeveloped with the southeastern part for POS, forming part of the Waterway Park. The proposed Waterway Park connected Boundary Street to the northeast with Prince Edward Road West to the southwest through Site B and Site A1. It would further connect to the possible remaining part of the DN across Princess Edward Road West to Nathan Road in the future. The DSP was the first phase of the DN, with a view to providing public space for the general public. Existing segregated spaces would be reconnected at Site B to facilitate the Waterway Park development. Excluding Prince Edward Building from the DSP boundary would hinder the realisation of the “Urban Waterway” concept and the provision of air ventilation and visual corridor; and
  
- (e) according to the SoIA (Stage 2) report, 38 residents (about 27%) in Prince Edward Building were elderly (aged 65 or above), with an average age of 77. 11 residents were aged 60-64 (about 8%). There were 14 elderly singleton or doubleton households (about 10%). Of the surveyed households, 44% supported, 15% opposed and 24% had no comment on the proposed redevelopment.

*Planned/Committed Developments in Mong Kok*

30. A Member enquired whether there were any other major planned/committed development(s)/redevelopment(s) (either URA’s or private developer(s)’ projects) in the Mong Kok district as such development/redevelopment project(s), together with the subject DSP project, might have implications on the traffic flow and air quality of the area. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) there were currently two major planned/committed development/redevelopment projects in Mong Kok. One was a commercial development at Sai Yee Street near MTR Mong Kok East Station, which was currently under construction; and the other was URA's redevelopment project at Shantung Street/Thistle Street, for which the tender invitation would be issued soon. Both projects, which proceeded according to the permissible GFA/PR under the respective OZP and DSP, had been taken into account in URA's technical assessments for the subject DSP; and
  
- (b) YMDS commissioned by URA was completed in 2021. Subsequently, based on the recommendations of the study, the Mong Kok OZP and the Yau Ma Tei OZP had been amended to permit interchangeability of domestic and non-domestic PRs of appropriate zones; remove the PR restriction for "Commercial" ("C") zone along Nathan Road such that the development intensity of the areas concerned would be governed by the Building (Planning) Regulations (Cap. 123F); and rezone various sites along the character streets to "OU(MU)" to provide incentives for redevelopment by the private sector. The subject DSP project, as the first phase of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN for upgrading the environment of the area concerned, together with the OZP amendments mentioned above, could also serve as catalysts to encourage private participation in the urban renewal of Mong Kok.

#### *Impact on the Character of the Flower Market*

31. Noting some representers' remark that the Flower Market (in the form of a bazaar) had its own characteristics, including its dynamic in nature, uniqueness, vibrant ambience, large business volume, open setting and flexible layout tailored to operational needs, a Member asked if there were any specific measures to retain such characteristics upon completion of the proposed redevelopment. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that as requested by LCSD, a buffer distance between the Waterway Park and the retail frontage of the future development would be provided. In that connection, URA designed retail frontage on the ground floor in Site B in front of the Waterway Park and along Sai Yee Street, with podium setback to create wider pedestrian pavement as well as allow spaces for street-front displays to extend retail and flower market activities and

maintain vibrancy. The setback area for retail displays would be under private ownership and the operation would be similar to the open area fronting the existing flower shops at Prince Edward Building to reinforce the local character and vibe of the Flower Market. Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, supplemented that only about 30 shops (about 26% of total shops) but not all shops in the Flower Market precinct would be affected. URA had no intention to disturb the operation of the Flower Market. New space would be provided at Site B for the future expansion of the Flower Market and relocation of the flower shops affected by the DSP and private initiatives in the area.

32. Another Member opined that URA should formulate a holistic plan to maintain the ambience and character of the Flower Market with modernised elements for the purpose of blending the old and the new. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that one of the main objectives of the DSP was to create capacity and provide space for promoting the long-term development of the Flower Market with the participation of the current business operators and the new ones. Flower Market Road served as a transition from the existing flower shops in the Flower Market on one side to the new Waterway Park with small on-street retail shops to extend the ambience of the Flower Market on the other side. The provision of space within the DSP area would facilitate further evolution of the Flower Market.

33. Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, supplemented that URA had devoted efforts to implement a number of projects to achieve the sustainable development and promote unique local character as exemplified by the Staunton Street/Shing Wong Street (H19) revitalisation project by means of the 4C (i.e. converge, co-create, collaborate and convert) (聚、創、合、傳) community-making approach, which was appreciated by the community and professionals. Through the community-making approach, the stakeholders would be gathered together to review and develop ideas on how to preserve the character and ambience of an area so that a workable implementation plan would be formulated with the participation of stakeholders.

34. The same Member, while acknowledging URA's responses, held the view that while the hardware would be provided under the DSP, URA should consider measures to preserve the ambience, character and culture of the Flower Market under the DSP. It seemed that the said 4C community-making approach had not been adopted in this redevelopment

project as it was criticised by some representers for the lack of consultation and communication between URA and the stakeholders. While it was agreed that modernised elements should be incorporated in the DSP, the unique character of the Flower Market should be reflected in the DSP to appreciate the history of the Flower Market. The design of the Waterway Park could be incorporated with different themes related to the Flower Market. Also, the design of the DSP should cater for the operation needs of the flower shops. For instance, the ground level of Site B could be developed in the form of a bazaar with display space in the open area that allowed the display of tall plants, similar to the current Flower Market.

35. Another Member shared the view that the unique character of the Flower Market should be preserved. URA should be innovative and creative, and enhance the design to showcase the unique and local character of the Flower Market. URA was suggested to make reference to MixC World in Shenzhen with an outdoor installation of “Bubblecoat Elephant” at its entrance in designing the project with signature figures/installations made by seasonal flowers as the theme to attract more visitors. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69’s representative, said that the design of the project had incorporated some elements of the Flower Market such as the provision of outdoor space for display, retail shop frontage on ground floor and comfortable walking environment. The design could be further enhanced through the community-making engagement. Members’ suggestions would also be taken into account during the detailed design stage of the project.

#### *Impacts on the Operation of Flower Market and Flower Shops*

36. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether majority of the existing flower shops on Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road would not be affected by the proposed redevelopment;
- (b) whether URA had any measures to assist the affected flower shop operators in relocating to the retail facilities in the redevelopment project with priority and affordable rent; and
- (c) positioning of the retail facilities at Site B, noting that some representers requested maintaining the current bazaar-like ambience of the Flower Market

which would better support small-scale shop operators.

37. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) only those flower shops at Sites A1 to A5 would be affected. The Flower Market covered the areas around Flower Market Road, Sai Yee Street and Fa Yuen Street with about 120 flower shops in total. According to the findings of the freezing survey, 31 flower shops (i.e. about 26% of total flower shops) would be affected by the proposed redevelopment. The actual number of affected flower shops for retail/wholesale purpose should be less than that as some of the premises were used by flower shops for storage. The affected flower shops occupied a total GFA of about 1,700m<sup>2</sup>, i.e. about 19% of the total GFA (about 9,000m<sup>2</sup>) of all the flower shops in the Flower Market. As such, not the majority of the Flower Market would be affected;
- (b) priority to rent the retail facilities in the redevelopment project would be given to the affected business operators. Reference could be made to the PERW/YNS project that priority was accorded to the affected business for moving back to the PERW/YNS project area. URA would continue to engage the affected shop operators on the relocation arrangements; and
- (c) retail uses would be concentrated on the ground level as on-street retail units could make use of the building setback area along the retail frontage for display of flowers and floral products. This design would also be adopted in the retail block south of the Waterway Park. The concept drew inspiration from the existing Flower Market. The aim was to attract new tenants related to the flower/floral-related businesses. Together with the relocated flower shops upon redevelopment, the ambience of the Flower Market could be retained. The business model would be similar to that of Central Market where high-end or luxury brands were not the targeted tenants.

38. In response to a Member's enquiry on any specific requirements that should be incorporated in the redevelopment project to address the needs of flower shop operators, Ms



Ha Wing Han, R488 and R724's representative, with the aid of a visualiser, made the following main points:

- (a) the DSP should aim at re-establishing Flower Market as a bazaar to preserve its human touch, history and local character. URA should address the needs of the affected flower shop operators;
- (b) URA made no response to the requests for giving priority to the affected flower shop operators to continue their business in the new retail facilities at Site B with affordable rental arrangements. The operators could not sustain their businesses with high rental costs;
- (c) the flower business involved a number of work procedures such as unpacking, trimming and other tasks that made the shopping mall environment unsuitable. Strict property management regulations might pose additional challenges for operators;
- (d) there was a lack of communication and consultation. URA had no knowledge of the sense of human touch in the Flower Market and could not address the needs of the affected flower shops. Except during the period of conducting the freezing survey, there was no personnel from URA visiting the Flower Market. When she was interviewed in a questionnaire survey conducted in the early stage prior to the wide press coverage of the redevelopment project, an interviewer, who claimed to be a staff member of the Government, merely put in "ticks" in the questionnaire indicating her support for the Urban Waterway development from business operation viewpoint without asking her views specifically and sincerely. It was doubtful if other surveys such as those for the affected households in Prince Edward Building were conducted in the same manner; and
- (e) concerns were raised about the Christmas Event organised by URA, where a power generator emitted smoke. There was no substantial increase in pedestrian flow during the event period. It was doubtful if URA's future events would help promote the Flower Market.

39. A Member raised the following questions to Ms Tai Hang Ling (R494):

- (a) the current number of florists in Hong Kong and their mode of operation; and
- (b) apart from the Flower Market, whether there were other outlets for them to buy floral materials.

40. Since Ms Tai Hang Ling (R494) had left the meeting, Ms Ha Wing Han, R488 and R724's representative, who was a staff member of a flower shop, made the following main points:

- (a) she did not have the information at hand regarding the number of florists in Hong Kong. According to her knowledge, other than full-time practitioners, there were many part-time florists in Hong Kong; and
- (b) a variety of flower species from different countries/regions such as Columbia, Ecuador, Japan, Korea and the Mainland could be found in the Flower Market. Except for flowers from the Mainland, the minimum order quantity of flowers from other countries was 100 kilograms. Flower shops in the Flower Market could make the order of such large quantity as wholesale trade was also the dominant business of the shops there. Given the wide range of choices and the high concentration of shops, florists preferred purchasing floral materials in the Flower Market.

41. Ms Chan Cinlea Sin Ying (R490) also responded that people preferred making purchases in the Flower Market because of lower flower prices.

42. Noting from R488's representation that flower shops in the Flower Market were engaged in wholesale and/or retail business and operated under sole proprietorship or as a conglomerate, and the flower shops the representer worked in intended to organise activities in collaboration with NGOs and hence the flower shop performed a leading role in the Flower Market, the same Member asked about potential impacts of the proposed redevelopments on the flower shops in the Flower Market. In response, Ms Ha Wing Han, R488 and R724's representative, said that given the uncertainty on whether the redevelopment project would

maintain the ambience and character of the Flower Market and hence the patronage in future, flower shop operators might consider reducing the orders for valuable species and/or from some of the overseas suppliers.

43. Another Member noted from the DSP that only a small number of flower shops would be affected by the proposed redevelopment. Solution space would be provided at Site B and the back lanes abutting Sites A2 to A5 would be revitalised as proposed by URA. The capacity of the Flower Market would increase with new spaces, which would be beneficial to the flower business in Hong Kong. In response to the Member's question why the flower shop operators in the Flower Market had the perception that the whole Flower Market would be affected, Ms Ha Wing Han, R488 and R724's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the Flower Market's unique character was rooted in its traditional local culture, selling a variety of high-quality flowers at low prices. It was inevitable that the price of flowers of the same type selling in high-end shopping mall would be much higher than that in the Flower Market, taking into account the higher rental which would pose challenges to small-scale shop operators, and less variety of flowers available for the customers due to insufficient space for storage and retail display of tall plants. It was unlikely that the unique character of the Flower Market could be extended to Site B; and
- (b) the wholesale flower market in Hong Kong had already reached its saturation due to its limited population size. The shop premises in the area of Sites A2 to A5 were likely occupied by a few large flower shops for wholesale business.

44. Ms Chan Cinlea Sin Ying (R490) shared the same views of Ms Ha Wing Han (R488) that currently, tall plants/trees (say 2 m high) could be displayed in the open area fronting her shop in Prince Edward Building. It was unlikely that sufficient headroom would be available for the display of tall plants/trees in the new shop premises at Site B. This would limit the choices for the customers and affect her selling strategy.

45. The same Member asked whether the flower shops affected by the proposed redevelopment could rent the premises at Sites A4 and A5 in future. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the relatively

larger size and the elongated shape of Sites A4 and A5 made them suitable for one-storey retail shops with extended retail frontages for the Flower Market. This design would also accommodate small-scale flower shops, aiming to create a more vibrant ambience.

#### *Interim Arrangements for the Flower Shop Operators*

46. In response to a Member's question on the interim arrangements for the affected flower shops, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that since there was only a small number of affected flower shops, URA would explore possibilities to provide interim decanting locations within the DSP area through the phased development approach or identify appropriate shop premises in the vicinity of the DSP area to facilitate the affected flower shops to continue their business during the construction period. URA was also in the process of engaging a community-making organisation to further engage the stakeholders, providing assistance to the affected business operators. Those who supported or opposed the proposed redevelopment would also be invited to participate in the public engagement process, similar to that conducted under the Staunton Street/Shing Wong Street (H19) revitalisation project, with a view to facilitating the sustainable development of the Flower Market.

#### *The "Urban Waterway" Design Concept and the Waterway Park*

47. Mr Tse Shing Fung Peter (R95) expressed that there was a substantial increase in the number of objections to the proposed redevelopment as a "genuine" Waterway Park could not be materialised. While with near 90% of the representations opposing the DSP, URA still pursued the redevelopment proposal and showed no respect for the adverse public views. At the invitation of the Chairperson, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) a Waterway Park with an area of about 8,800m<sup>2</sup> would still be provided; and
- (b) the original idea was to open up the nullah to connect with the public space at the ground level to create a large Waterway Park. However, technical assessments under YMDS revealed that the water in the decked nullah contained large amount of pollutants, microbes and strong odour-causing chemicals owing

to the illicit sewer connections upstream. It was acknowledged that such problem was difficult to be resolved. As agreed by the relevant government departments, the decked nullah could not be uncovered for the sake of environmental hygiene and public safety at this stage. The current design, which was in the form of river-like waterway with thin water body and appropriate water features along the alignment of the decked nullah, was considered practical and could help reflect the character of the nullah, and the design had been agreed by LCSD. That said, the design of the proposed Waterway Park would not preclude the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah which was a long-term vision upon improvement of the water quality as specified in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP.

48. In response to a Member's question on the way to materialise the "Urban Waterway" concept in the area to the south across Prince Edward Road West, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of two PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the "Urban Waterway" design concept, as formulated under YMDS, aimed to provide public space with a visual and air ventilation corridor, serving as a breathing space for the residents in the densely populated area of Mong Kok;
- (b) the first phase of the DN covered the area from the Boundary Street to Prince Edward Road West in a north-east to south-west direction, i.e. the DSP. Currently, the open spaces along Flower Market Path were fenced off and the path was the only pedestrian walkway between Flower Market Road and Boundary Street. The remaining pocket open spaces were interspersed among the existing GIC facilities. By consolidating those segregated open spaces, a sizable Waterway Park under the DSP could be formed for public enjoyment; and
- (c) regarding the remaining portion of the DN, i.e. to the south of Prince Edward Road West, segregated areas at Nullah Road would be consolidated as urban space for public enjoyment at the next stage of the DN.

*Revitalisation of Back Lanes abutting Sites A2 to A5*

49. While appreciating the proposal to revitalise the back lanes abutting Sites A2 to A5 as the “Third Street” of the Flower Market, a Member said that some of the representers mentioned that there were a number of physical constraints to materialise such concept, including the existence of illegal structures and narrow width. In response of the Member’s enquiry on the strategy to achieve the concept, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69’s representative, with the aid of two PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposal provided an opportunity to open up the back facades of aged buildings in the area surrounding Yuen Ngai Street to increase retail frontage and provide more walking space in the area, helping to divert pedestrians from Flower Market Road. The implementation would be similar to that under the PERW/YNS project; and
- (b) upon approval of the DSP, a place-making project would commence. URA would maintain continued dialogues with the stakeholders including flower shop operators and their views on the design would be taken into account to make better use of the back lanes as usable space for the flower shops.

*Sports and Recreation Facilities*

50. A Member noted some representers’ comment that the proposed redevelopment of Site B would lead to the suspension of highly-utilised sports facilities for about 6 years, causing inconvenience to the users. In response to the Member’s question on the transitional arrangements during the construction stage, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69’s representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) it would take about 6 years to complete if all the sports facilities were reprovisioned in one go, and about 10 years if the reprovisioning was carried out in phases. While one of the existing sports centres might remain available for the local residents if a phased development approach was adopted in the redevelopment process, it would be more desirable to reprovision all the sports

facilities as a whole package given the long lead time and the dusty and noisy environment as a result of the construction works within Site B;

- (b) the construction works at Site B were scheduled to commence in 2027. During that period, sports centres in Yau Tsim Mong and Sham Shui Po districts, including those at Fa Yuen Street, Tai Kok Tsui, Kwun Chung, Kowloon Park and Pei Ho Street, would still be available for public use. URA would explore the possibility of providing interim sports facilities within the DSP area and/or at entrance plaza of Mong Kok Stadium, which might not be in use or was at present underutilised, for public use during the construction period; and
- (c) as regards the temporary reprovisioning of the existing 11-a-side football field, the matter was being co-ordinated by the Development Bureau in collaboration with LCSD and the Civil Engineering and Development Department. Potential sites (e.g. in Kai Tak) had been identified for such purpose. Relevant district council would be consulted on the matter in due course.

51. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the future sports and recreation facilities at Site B would be designed for people of all ages as pointed out by Mr Au Tin Che Daniel (R15), Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that a Waterway Park of about 8,800m<sup>2</sup> would be provided as public space and a GIC complex designed based on the SSMU principle would serve to reprovision the existing sports facilities. URA would liaise with LCSD on the facilities to be provided at Site B with a view to striking a balance to suit future users of all age groups.

#### *Connectivity with Yuen Po Street Bird Garden*

52. In response to a Member's question on the connectivity between the proposed redevelopment and Yuen Po Street Bird Garden, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) Yuen Po Street Bird Garden was located to the east of the DSP area. With the revitalisation of the back lanes as the "Third Street" of the Flower Market and the enhancement of the walking environment through the place-making process,

visitors could walk to the Bird Garden via the back lanes with improved experience; and

- (b) the current pedestrian flow in the area around Site A5 was high as people were used to making the way to Prince Edward Road West via Yuen Po Street. URA was exploring the feasibility of undertaking enhancement works in Yuen Po Street in collaboration with relevant government departments to create a distinct entrance, leading the visitors from MOKO to the Flower Market.

#### *Impact on the “Dawn Market” (天光墟)*

53. Regarding a Member’s enquiry about the potential impacts of the proposed redevelopment on the “dawn market” located on the pedestrian pavement at Boundary Street and Flower Market Path, which was perceived by some as an intangible cultural heritage in Hong Kong, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69’s representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the SoIA had covered the “dawn market”, though majority of it was outside the DSP boundary. It was observed that the number of goldfish vendors and other hawkers in the “dawn market” and the patronage had been declining in recent years. Upon approval of the DSP, URA would liaise with relevant government departments to provide assistance to the vendors/hawkers as appropriate.

#### *Engagement with Stakeholders of the Flower Market*

54. Noting that some representers perceived a lack of communication and consultation regarding the proposed redevelopment, two Members enquired about the details of the public consultation conducted by URA and the future public engagement plan. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) URA engaged different stakeholders through various channels. Upon the commencement of the DSP, a public briefing was held in March 2024. A “Project Engagement” Programme (「夥伴同行」探訪計劃) had also been initiated and a special team of URA’s staff conducted follow-up visits with the



affected business operators and households. Hong Kong Wholesale Florist Association (香港鮮花盆栽批發商會) and representatives of flower shops were consulted in April 2024 and YTMDC was consulted in May 2024. The owner of the flower shops of R488 and R490 also participated in the consultation meeting in April 2024, and his views were similar to those of R488 and R490 given in the hearing session. He opposed the proposed redevelopment and considered that the room for survival of his shops, being located in Prince Edward Building in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, would be severely affected by the proposed redevelopment. His primary concern was related to the proposed demolition of Prince Edward Building, and he did not provide other views on issues related to the preservation of the local character of the Flower Market and its long-term development;

- (b) for the questionnaire survey conducted in January 2024, URA engaged service provider through outsourcing for the survey as substantial manpower was required. The aim of the survey was to understand the operators' needs rather than asking if they agreed with the proposed redevelopment since the project had not yet commenced at that juncture. The findings of the survey revealed that the respondents were concerned about insufficient shop space, loading/unloading and parking facilities and congested walking environment in the Flower Market, and requested the provision of more parking spaces, improving the accessibility of the Flower Market and establishing it as a flower appreciation hotspot. The findings of the survey were generally reasonable;
- (c) upon commencement of the DSP, URA's Corporate Communications Division was tasked to engage the relevant stakeholders. While the questionnaire survey was conducted in January 2024, the freezing survey was conducted on the commencement date of the DSP (i.e. 15.3.2024) in accordance with the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS); and
- (d) upon approval of the DSP, URA would invite owners, tenants and staff of shops and households including the representers of R488 and R490 to join the public engagement including the community-making activities in future, and would visit the affected parties to understand their needs and provide assistance.

55. In response to a Member's question regarding the identity of the interviewer with regard to the survey incident mentioned by Ms Ha Wing Ha, R488 and R724's representative, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, said that URA was a statutory body and not a government department. He clarified that the survey was not conducted by the Government and interviewers were instructed to present their identity as URA's representatives when conducting the survey. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, also clarified that to his understanding, PlanD and other government departments did not conduct such questionnaire survey.

### *The Christmas Event*

56. A Member was of the view that the Christmas Event should not be considered as part of public engagement and raised a question to URA (R69) on the purpose of organising the Christmas Event, considering that District Council, the Tourism Board or even Radio Television Hong Kong could organise similar events. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the Christmas Event was launched during Christmas time by URA in collaboration with the Yau Tsim Mong District Office. The purpose was to demonstrate URA's commitment to the Flower Market by making it more vibrant, attracting more visitors, enhancing its business environment and promoting "Night Economy". With the festive lighting decorations and other outdoor installations set up in the Flower Market, it attracted more people, boosting the vibrancy of the Flower Market, especially during the night time. While business turnover data was not available, URA commissioned a traffic consultant to conduct an on-site survey concerning the peak 15-minute pedestrian flow in a weekend before and during the event. The results revealed that there was a substantial increase in the pedestrian flow in various surveyed spots within the Flower Market area, including, among others, the pedestrian pavement fronting the Prince Edward Building (695 (before) vs 864 (during)), the junction of Sai Yee Street and Prince Edward Road West (445 (before) vs 471 (during)), and Yuen Ngai Street (160 (before) vs 244 (during)).

57. As regards the follow-up question from the same Member on whether URA intended to perform a co-ordinating/leading role in the redevelopment process, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of two PowerPoint slides, said that the Christmas Event was the first step of URA in enhancing the business environment of the Flower

Market. In addition to organising events in future, URA would continue to engage with the business operators to address their needs and concerns on the overall planning and relocation arrangements for the affected businesses.

58. The Chairperson asked whether the representers working in the flower shops had any further comments to make. In response, Ms Ha Wing Han, R488 and R724's representative and Ms Chan Cinlea Sin Ying (R490), said that they had no further comments. [Professor Simon K.L. Wong left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

59. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the presentation and Q&A session for the morning session of the hearing on the day was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

60. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be adjourned for lunch break.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:25 p.m.]

61. The meeting was resumed at 2:20 p.m. on 8.1.2025.

62. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

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

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon  
Transport Department  
Mr Vico P. Cheung

Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

## Presentation and Question Sessions

63. The following government representatives, representers and/or their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

### **Government Representatives**

#### ***Planning Department (PlanD)***

Mr Derek P.K. Tse	- DPO/TWK
Mr Kervis W.C. Chan	- STP/TWK
Mr Chris K.C. Ma	- TP/TWK

### **Representers and Representers' Representatives**

#### R69 – Urban Renewal Authority

Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence	]
Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike	]
Ms Kwan Mei Po Mable	] Representer's Representatives
Mr Choy Tsz Hin Frankie	]
Ms Lin Nga Kei Kelly	]

#### R109 – 黃靜思

Ms Wong Ching Sze	- Representer
-------------------	---------------

#### R117 – 陸婉兒

Ms Lok Yuen Yee Yvonne	- Representer
------------------------	---------------

#### R243 – Loo Hing Ling

Mr Loo Hing Ling	- Representer
------------------	---------------

#### R294 – 易德新

Mr Yik Tak San	- Representer
----------------	---------------

R301 – 何磊  
Mr Ho Lui - Representer

R306 – 胡艷紅  
Ms Hu Yanhong - Representer

R312 – 胡巧兒  
Ms Wu Hau Yi - Representer

R318 – 何建鍾  
Mr Ho Kin Chung - Representer

R325 – 陸建文  
Mr Luk Kin Man Ricardo - Representer

R478 – Lee Yee Nan  
Ms Lee Yee Nan - Representer

R517 – 馮偉超  
Mr 馮偉超 - Representer

R746 – 李應新  
Mr Lee Ying Sun - Representer

64. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their representations:

R243 – Loo Hing Ling

65. Mr Loo Hing Ling made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member and a deacon of EFCC – Tin Chuen Church (天泉堂);
- (b) Tin Chuen Church was the only church affected by the proposed redevelopment;
- (c) according to URA's website, URS was to adopt a "people first, district-based, public participatory" approach to carry out urban renewal by way of

redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalisation and heritage preservation. Nevertheless, in previous discussions with URA, the church did not find that URA was adhering to the above principles. The church, like the affected shop operators, occupied ground-floor premises but was offered a smaller compensation package, which included only cash compensation without any replacement premises;

- (d) having operated in the current premises for more than 70 years, the church had deep roots in the Flower Market community. With URA's acquisition of the church's premises for the proposed redevelopment, the church faced difficulties in continuing its operation within the same district. Firstly, with a deadline of March 2025 for responding to URA's compensation offer, the church found insufficient time to consult its congregation and its mother church (i.e. EFCC) before making a well-informed decision on its way forward. Secondly, there was no detailed information about the amount of cash compensation offered. Thirdly, according to URA, the affected property owners would not be entitled to additional allowances in case of change of ownership after the freezing survey. Without knowing the compensation amount and timing, the church found it hard to look for a replacement premises. Under such circumstances, church members felt disheartened and worried about the possible eviction by URA;
- (e) according to the Paper, URA would proactively assist in identifying suitable premises in the nearby area for the church's relocation upon request. Nonetheless, it was believed that finding premises of comparable size at affordable rent in the same district would be challenging; and
- (f) URA was requested to provide suitable re-provisioning arrangement for the church in the same district. The Board was also invited to look into the hardships that the church was enduring.

R318 – 何建鍾

66. Mr Ho Kin Chung made the following main points:



- (a) he had been a resident of Prince Edward Building for about 60 years and was also the chairman of the Incorporated Owners of the building;
- (b) he and many elderly residents objected to URA's acquisition of Prince Edward Building;
- (c) Prince Edward Building was in good condition, with maintenance in compliance with all relevant government requirements. He queried the rationale for demolishing such a well-maintained building; and
- (d) the community he lived in was conveniently located and well supported by community facilities. It would be difficult to find a replacement flat in the same district, and it was not sure if URA could offer compensation options other than monetary compensation.

R117 – 陸婉兒

67. With the aid of a video clip, Ms Lok Yuen Yee Yvonne made the following main points:

- (a) in the video, a Mr Ho said that he and some of his relatives had lived in the Flower Market area for more than 20 years. He had witnessed the uniqueness and cultural richness of the area, as well as its problems, such as narrow streets. While appreciating URA's efforts in revitalising the area, he was disappointed by URA's focus on erecting new buildings, rather than resolving the residents' livelihood problems. He urged URA to re-consider the current redevelopment plan with a priority on improving livelihoods; and
- (b) the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were completed in 1948, which were older than Choi Hung Estate completed in 1962. However, the latter would be redeveloped soon whereas the former was still left dilapidated without any sign of redevelopment. The old buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were not served by lifts and hence were not suitable for elderly residents. 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.)

should be included in the proposed redevelopment scheme.

R325 – 陸建文

68. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Luk Kin Man Ricardo made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the Paper's recommendation of no amendment to the DSP to meet the representations;
- (b) although URA claimed to adopt a people-first approach in its urban renewal work, the current DSP project showed no sign of reflecting that principle since the substantial public resources deployed (i.e. majority of the DSP area being government land) had not addressed the pressing redevelopment needs of many other older buildings and the residents' aspirations for an improved living environment. Older buildings such as those at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) (outside the DSP boundary) had higher building age, poor facilities and management, as well as structural safety and potential fire hazard issues (e.g. lack of means of escape). Although URA claimed that the building cluster could constitute a separate single viable redevelopment project, the Board should note that before the announcement of the DSP project, the residents, together with private developers, had already explored the feasibility of redeveloping that building cluster, but to no avail. 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) warranted URA's intervention instead of being left to market forces, which had proven ineffective in this case;
- (c) the "linked-site" approach under the DSP only linked up a few small isolated sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5), leaving many older buildings in the leftover sites, further deteriorating. Since URA was empowered for land resumption, it could implement a larger redevelopment project for old district in more financially viable terms than private developers. URA should adopt a district-wide co-ordinated approach by expanding the DSP boundary to cover the entire street block bounded by Flower Market Road, Yuen Po Street,

Prince Edward Road and Yuen Ngai Street (“the Eastern Street Block”), thereby including more aged buildings such as 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.), etc.; and

- (d) the Board should consider including the Eastern Street Block in the DSP project for wholesale redevelopment.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon joined this session of the meeting during R325’s presentation.]

R478 – Lee Yee Nan

69. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Lee Yee Nan made the following main points:

- (a) the mission of PlanD included (i) planning to make Hong Kong a liveable, competitive and sustainable Asia’s World City; (ii) formulating sustainable and resilient spatial development strategies and plans; and (iii) facilitating suitable development and redevelopment;
- (b) as background information, a building plan dated 1948 from the Buildings Department (BD) indicated that the three sites of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.) and Site A3 formed part and parcel of the then single lot (i.e. KIL No. 2372 s.B), on which a group of interconnected buildings had been proposed. In 1972, 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.) was separately redeveloped as Ashfield House (Block 1), leaving the building on the adjacent narrow strip of land (i.e. Site A3) untouched due to land resumption difficulties. Currently, with URA’s notional scheme, development potential of Sites A3, A4 and A5 would be transferred out of the Eastern Street Block. The above series of piecemeal actions had made comprehensive redevelopment of the whole street block increasingly difficult;
- (c) compared with Site A1, the Eastern Street Block was more advantageously located, commanding views towards Mong Kok Stadium and Lion Rock beyond, amid a relatively quiet neighbourhood with good accessibility.

URA's proposal to transfer development potential from higher-value land (i.e. Sites A3 to A5 within the same street block) to lower-value land (i.e. Site A1) did not make market sense;

- (d) a building with lift facilities (viz. Prince Edward Building in Site A1) had been included in the DSP, whereas a building without lift facilities (viz. Ka Hing Court between Sites A4 and A5) had been excluded. She queried the rationale behind this decision. Since the development potential of Sites A4 and A5 would be tapped by the DSP project, the prospect of redeveloping Ka Hing Court through amalgamation with Sites A4 and A5 would vanish;
- (e) URA's notional scheme had reduced the overall GFA permissible for the Eastern Street Block, effectively undermining the prospect of wholesale redevelopment of the street block and limiting future layout/building design. The Board should retain the original development potential within the same street block and include (but not limited to) the following land parcels in the DSP to facilitate comprehensive redevelopment, i.e. 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.), 1-7 Yuen Po Street (even nos.) and 206-208 Prince Edward Road West (even nos.);
- (f) the Flower Market was a gem of Hong Kong culture, attracting international tourists. Mong Kok Stadium was a favourite venue for international football matches and could become a magnet for quality developments, similar to the case of Wembley Stadium in London. These tourism resources could be consolidated to complement with the recently released Development Blueprint for Hong Kong's Tourism Industry 2.0;
- (g) redevelopment and heritage preservation were not mutually exclusive. Projects such as Shanghai Xintiandi (上海新天地) and Foshan Lingnan Tiandi (佛山嶺南天地) were successful examples of integrating redevelopment with heritage preservation, offering valuable lessons for URA;

- (h) the URA Managing Director's Blogs stated that the buildings in the Flower Market area were obsolete and should better be redeveloped through URA's co-ordinated approach, rather than the private sector's piecemeal efforts, so that the character and ambience of the Flower Market could be preserved. To this end, URA was suggested to make reference to the district-wide co-ordinated approach of urban renewal adopted in the Mainland;
- (i) the DSP project was the first one among the five DNs identified under YMDS. URA's notional scheme, which involved a small redevelopment component (i.e. about 10% private land) at the cost of a large piece of government land (i.e. about 90%), could not be regarded as a genuine redevelopment project. Instead, it appeared to prioritise profit maximisation, contrary to URA's mission and disregarding the imminent redevelopment needs of the 80-year-old buildings. This approach should not be set as a model for the subsequent DN projects; and
- (j) she sincerely hoped that the future planning for the Flower Market area could capitalise on its unique cultural and comparative advantages, fostering a liveable, sustainable and marketable neighbourhood conducive to cultural, sports and tourism activities.

R301 – 何磊

70. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Ho Lui made the following main points:

- (a) to justify the extensive development in Site B, the redevelopment component of Site A should be expanded by including more derelict private land. In particular, 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) and 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.) could be merged with Site A3 to form a larger sub-site under Site A. This amalgamation would then transform the DSP project into a genuine redevelopment initiative; and
- (b) Site A3 was identified as having the least redevelopment potential among Sites A1 to A5 due to its isolated location and small size, which limited its

effectiveness in URA's notional scheme. As R478 explained earlier, Site A3, together with the adjacent 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) and 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.), was previously part and parcel of one single lot. With URA's involvement, opportunity should be taken to reunite these three sites for redevelopment under the DSP project to achieve economies of scale. If the development potential of Site A3 was transferred away by URA's notional scheme, it would not contribute to the redevelopment of the said street block.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan and Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan left this session of the meeting during R301's presentation.]

R312 – 胡巧兒

71. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Wu Hau Yi made the following main points:

- (a) she asserted that amalgamating 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.) and Site A3 for redevelopment would yield more benefits than the current scheme, which included:
  - (i) on development intensity, the amalgamated site could generate a larger development quantum and greater flexibility in layout/building design;
  - (ii) on site area, the amalgamated site with a total area of 1,300m<sup>2</sup> and a regular shape in good proportion was considered suitable for redevelopment. It was capable of accommodating a decent lift lobby for two to three lifts and some ground-floor shops;
  - (iii) on site orientation and visual amenity, the amalgamated site would provide scope for a redevelopment with a north-south orientation, overlooking Mong Kok Stadium, Fa Hui Park, the East Rail and Lion Rock to the north, and the well-preserved historic buildings on Prince Edward Road West, Royal Plaza Hotel and Grand Century Place to the

south. Moreover, the site was within a school net with many renowned schools;

(iv) on transportation, the amalgamated site enjoyed good accessibility where MTR Prince Edward Station and MTR Mong Kok East Station were in close proximity;

(v) on revitalisation of back lanes, the amalgamated site could provide building setback to accommodate wider and longer back lanes and possible retail frontages; and

(b) the Board should consider including 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) and 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.) in the DSP to create synergy with Site A3.

R294 – 易德新

72. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Yik Tak San made the following main points:

(a) he requested the inclusion of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in the DSP project;

(b) he had lived in the Flower Market area for about 20 years and started residing at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) a few years ago. He felt disappointed to learn that 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were not included in the DSP project;

(c) Site A1 comprised relatively young buildings, while Sites A2 to A5 were piecemeal. In comparison, 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were old but the site was large. However, Sites A1 to A5 were chosen for inclusion in the DSP over 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), giving the impression that URA had intentionally abandoned 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.). It was difficult to understand URA's site selection criteria;

- (d) URA claimed that 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were suitable for separate redevelopment by the private sector due to their relatively large site area (about 600m<sup>2</sup>). By the same token, the larger Site A1 (about 3,500m<sup>2</sup>) should also be suitable for separate redevelopment by the private sector and should not have been included in the DSP project;
- (e) compared with 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) (aged about 76 years) which had no lift facilities, Prince Edward Building (aged about 64 years) was in relatively good condition in terms of building age, building conditions, property management and lift availability. URA claimed that since Prince Edward Building was not served by lift on ground floor, there was a need to improve the situation and hence include the building in the DSP. In that regard, the Board should note that 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) had no lift at all but only stairs. The Board was requested to include 38-40 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in the DSP project for redevelopment;
- (f) pursuing a comprehensive redevelopment of the amalgamated site would not only bring about the benefits mentioned by R312 but also help materialise URA's concept of providing the "Third Street" to the Flower Market;
- (g) the DSP project was proposed to be implemented in three phases. Phase 1 should prioritise completing Site B to reprovision the affected shop operators and residents, followed by Phase 2 for Site A and Phase 3 for the amalgamated site; and
- (h) URA should make best use of Site B to improve the welfare and living environment of elderly residents.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left this session of the meeting during R294's presentation.]



R306 – 胡艷紅

73. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Hu Yanhong made the following main points:

- (a) she requested the Board to include 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in the DSP project for redevelopment;
- (b) the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were completed in 1948, which were about 80 years of age and approaching 90 years. Those buildings, similar to New Lucky House (華豐大廈) and Garley Building (嘉利大廈), posed a great fire hazard due to the lack of proper means of escape and fire service installations (FSIs). A fire accident did happen in 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) a few years ago. Given the sub-standard building design, the buildings could not be equipped with standard FSIs, despite repeated warnings from the Fire Services Department (FSD) and BD. Wholesale redevelopment of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) was the only viable solution to address the fire safety problem;
- (c) the living conditions in the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were far from satisfactory. There was no lift, no communal lighting, no gas supply, no seawater for flushing leading to a waste of freshwater, no caretaker leading to security problems, no owners' corporations due to lack of expertise and no property management company to take care of the daily operation of the buildings. The poorly designed stairways of the buildings had led to slipping incidents, making the elderly residents reluctant to go out;
- (d) the mission of URA was people-first and district-based. URA should be held responsible for redevelopment of buildings aged over 50 years and/or with potential fire hazard. As expressed in the URA Managing Director's Blog dated 24.3.2024, most buildings in the Flower Market area were so dilapidated that they warranted intervention by URA for co-ordinated redevelopment, instead of piecemeal redevelopments by individual private developers. Only through URA's concerted effort could the ambience of the

Flower Market be sustained and the relocation arrangements (both transitional and long-term) for the affected flower shop operators be made possible; and

- (e) knowing that URA had recently contacted the affected parties on acquisition matters, the residents in the derelict 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) particularly felt forsaken and unheard. She sincerely urged URA to include 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in the DSP project.

R517 – 馮偉超

74. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr 馮偉超 made the following main points:

- (a) the vision of PlanD was “to make Hong Kong a liveable, competitive and sustainable Asia’s World City”, and its mission was “to formulate sustainable and resilient spatial development strategies and plans, to guide the optimum use and balanced development of land, to facilitate suitable development and redevelopment, and to partner and engage with the community”;
- (b) URA was empowered by law to undertake urban renewal and was supported by various resources, such as ample funding, exemption from paying land premium and tax, financial guarantees and land resumption powers. That came with greater responsibility, and URA should adopt a more people-first, district-based and public participatory approach. In selecting redevelopment site, URA should prioritise buildings in dilapidated conditions, i.e. those lacking proper management and maintenance, in dire need of redevelopment, with potential fire hazard and unsatisfactory living conditions;
- (c) according to YMDS, there were about 4,000 aged buildings in Hong Kong (as of 2017) built before the introduction of the new building code in the 1960s, and many of them were not up to modern standards and lacking essential amenities. While YMDS had identified those issues, it did not

provide a clear redevelopment strategy or roadmap;

- (d) the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were completed in 1948, aged about 80 years and being the oldest in the Flower Market area. Buildings of similar age in the same district such as New Lucky House (華豐大廈) and Garley Building (嘉利大廈) were prone to fire hazards. A fire had previously broken out at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.). Without means of escape or provision of standard FSIs, the buildings posed a significant fire risk despite repeated warnings from FSD and BD. The sub-standard building design had constrained the provision of standard FSIs. The only solution was to redevelop the whole building cluster;
- (e) URA, which was empowered with land resumption powers, should act in the public interest to redevelop dilapidated buildings and unleash the development potential of sites in prime locations in Mong Kok. Private developers showed no interest in redeveloping 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) due to resistance from ground floor flower shop operators. Only with URA's authority could effective relocation arrangements (both transitional and long-term) be formulated to address the concerns of the affected shop operators;
- (f) if 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were excluded from the DSP project for the sake of profit maximisation, they would remain neglected indefinitely. The proposed redevelopment under the DSP project would then create a stark contrast between the luxurious Sites A1 and B and the derelict 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in close proximity; and
- (g) URA should clarify its site selection criteria for redevelopment and focus more on redeveloping dilapidated buildings rather than putting up luxurious properties.

R746 – 李應新

75. Mr Lee Ying Sun made the following main points:

- (a) he was a pastor of EFCC – Taikoo Shing Church and had collaborated with Tin Chuen Church on many projects;
- (b) Tin Chuen Church was the first church in Hong Kong established by EFCC after its relocation from Guangzhou. That piece of history held significant symbolic meaning for EFCC;
- (c) Tin Chuen Church had developed strong ties with the local community, bringing together people from all walks of life and making significant contributions to community development. The church was open to everyone, not just its members, and supported individuals not served by other institutions; and
- (d) he requested the reprovisioning of Tin Chuen Church in the same district for continuing its contributions to the community.

R109 – 黃靜思

76. Ms Wong Ching Sze made the following main points:

- (a) she had been a resident in the Flower Market area for 38 years;
- (b) the vehicle-pedestrian conflicts and blockage of pedestrian walkways had long been the issues in the Flower Market area. Shop operators tended to extend their shop fronts by placing goods on pedestrian walkways and public roads, forcing pedestrians to walk on carriageways. The situation became aggravated in festive times. Since URA's notional scheme proposed wider pedestrian walkways to accommodate increased pedestrian flow and L/UL activities, she supported the DSP project in this aspect; and

- (c) under URA's notional scheme, a considerable amount of existing mature trees would be felled to make way for the water features on the covered nullah, and the existing indoor sports centres would be demolished early in the implementation programme. These actions would bring negative impact on the public enjoyment of the natural environment and sports/recreational facilities. URA was requested to retain at least half of the existing trees and arrange for the immediate provision of replacement sports and recreational facilities.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 15-minute break.]

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

*DSP Boundary and Rationale*

78. The Vice-chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the rationale for the DSP boundary;
- (b) the possibility of excluding Prince Edward Building in Site A1 from the DSP project; and
- (c) the possibility of including more redevelopment sites (e.g. 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), the Eastern Street Block, etc.) into the DSP project.

79. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the planning concept of the DN of ‘Nullah Road Urban Waterway’ under YMDS was to preserve and enhance the character of the Flower Market precinct through the creation of solution space in Site B to accommodate development needs and new retail frontages for the expansion of the Flower Market. URA’s notional scheme adopted the “linked-site” approach to bring planning gains to the community by transferring the permissible PR of the small and isolated sites with low redevelopment potential (i.e. Sites A2 to A5 (each of about 100m<sup>2</sup> to 200m<sup>2</sup> in size)) to the larger and more strategically located site (i.e. Site A1) so as to optimise the development potential of Site A1 and free-up Sites A2 to A5 for provision of amenity and low-rise retail facilities to enhance the ambience and vitality of the Flower Market area. With the uses and scale of the selected redevelopment/development sites proposed under the notional scheme, a proper balance had been achieved, taking into account various factors, including the Flower Market operation and the possible impact on the existing residents in the area;
- (b) Site A1 (including Prince Edward Building) was sizeable and situated at a strategic location. It could serve as a receiving site under the “linked-site” approach, capable of accommodating a large-scale redevelopment with provision of public facilities. For example, the existing decked nullah portion within the lot boundary of Prince Edward Building could be converted into a POS (about 500m<sup>2</sup>) as a “Public Open Space in Private Developments” and framed with retail frontages. The suggestion of excluding Prince Edward Building from Site A1 would compromise the cost-effectiveness of the whole DSP project; and
- (c) the DSP project could serve as a catalyst for the regeneration of the wider area. With the implementation of the DSP project stimulating economic and commercial activities in the area, those private lots which currently seemed to possess little or no redevelopment potential might become attractive redevelopment projects over time. For 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), since they were of reasonable size (about 600m<sup>2</sup>) and capable of being redeveloped as a separate single development of reasonable scale, they were

not included in the DSP boundary. If 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were included in the DSP boundary, the number of affected flower shops would further increase, hence causing greater disturbance to the Flower Market's operation.

*Impact on the Leftover Sites*

80. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) what if the dilapidated buildings outside the DSP boundary were not taken forward for redevelopment by private developers, or what if they were redeveloped by private developers but were not compatible with the character of the Flower Market;
- (b) the impact on the prospect for comprehensive redevelopment of the Eastern Street Block if the PRs of Sites A3 to A5 were transferred out of the street block; and
- (c) whether the existing old buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) could be preserved, following URA's approach of heritage preservation and revitalisation adopted for the historic buildings under the PERW/YNS project.

81. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) URA had adopted a multi-pronged 4R approach (i.e. redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalisation and preservation) in urban renewal, coupled with place-making and community-making initiatives to inject vitality into the target areas. In parallel with the commencement of the DSP project in the Flower Market area, URA had proactively contacted residents living in buildings not covered by the DSP project to promote self-initiated building rehabilitation and maintenance, aiming to safeguard the long-term well-being of the buildings. URA had also implemented revitalisation initiatives to further enhance the ambience and street vitality of Flower Market. The Christmas Event launched by URA in 2024 was a case in point;

- (b) since the Eastern Street Block comprised buildings of varying ages from 30 to 70 years, some of which had been preserved under the PERW/YNS project, the prospect of comprehensive redevelopment of the entire street block was slim. The DSP project would improve the living environment in the neighbourhood, which in turn would incentivise individual redevelopment projects by private developers. Specifically, the proposal to free up Sites A3 to A5 for provision of POS and low-rise retail facilities would help improve the local environment and enrich the shopping experience. A viable private redevelopment project could involve an integrated redevelopment of the combined site of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) and 4-8 Yuen Ngai Street (even nos.), which was subject to a total PR of 9 as a Class B site under the Building (Planning) Regulations; and
  
- (c) the PERW/YNS project for the preservation and revitalisation of a row of Grade 2 historic buildings on Prince Edward Road West was supported by a prior study on pre-war buildings across the territory. For the old buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), whether they were worth preserving would be subject to study.

#### *Provision of Open Spaces and Sports and Recreational Facilities*

82. In response to a Member's question about the provision of replacement sports and recreational facilities following the demolition of the existing ones, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that although there was a variety of existing sports and recreational facilities in Site B (including open space, GIC/sports facilities and a plant nursery), they were physically segregated by fencing and/or walls. Access to/use of some of these facilities (except the open spaces) required applications or appointments. Under URA's notional scheme, the existing sports and recreational facilities in Site B would be demolished to make way for the proposed development. To minimise the disturbance to the availability of these facilities, the proposed redevelopment in Site B would be suitably phased, and opportunities would be explored to provide transitional sports and recreational facilities within Site B. The proposed Waterway Park in Site B was designed to consolidate the currently segregated leisure spaces and provide more quality open spaces for



public enjoyment. Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, added that to minimise inconvenience to the public, URA had been liaising with LCSD on the transitional arrangements for the affected sports facilities during the construction stage.

*Tin Chuen Church*

83. The Vice-chairperson and two Members raised the following questions:
- (a) what short-term and long-term measures URA would provide to Tin Chuen Church in identifying and re-provisioning the church premises; and
  - (b) whether the church could be re-provisioned in the proposed hotel/office tower in Site B.
84. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R69's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:
- (a) Tin Chuen Church was located at 225-227 Sai Yee Street, occupying the lowest three floors of a 4-storey tenement building at 225 Sai Yee Street and all floors of another 4-storey tenement building at 227 Sai Yee Street. At a meeting arranged by URA in May 2024, representatives of EFCC and Tin Chuen Church expressed their preference for "shop-for-shop" (以舖換舖) compensation;
  - (b) according to URS promulgated in 2001 and URA's acquisition policy approved by the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council in the same year, there was no provision for "shop-for-shop" compensation for non-domestic properties. Nonetheless, URA had a special compensation policy for church owning and using its own properties, which would be a reasonable cash compensation;
  - (c) under the planning regime, church was regarded as 'Religious Institution' use, which in general was always permitted in the "C" zone but required planning permission in the "Residential (Group A)" zone. Buildings near MTR

Prince Edward Station on both sides of Nathan Road were generally zoned “C”. To facilitate church use in the proposed redevelopment, the ‘Religious Institution’ use was incorporated under Column 1 of Schedule I of the “OU(MU)” zone under the subject DSP as an always permitted use in the non-residential portion of a building upon redevelopment. URA would also assist the church in renting premises in the non-residential portion of future properties of the DSP project, given that the non-residential portion would not be alienated for sale. The church had been advised to take note of the above when searching for replacement premises;

- (d) the DSP project might take more than 6 years to complete. If the church chose to re-provision its premises in the DSP project, it might need to identify temporary replacement premises in the interim. URA had been assisting in identifying suitable premises for the church’s relocation and had earlier identified two potential premises for their consideration, albeit eventually found unsuitable by the church. URA would continue to provide assistance to the church in the process; and
- (e) the church had suggested re-provisioning by utilising the 20,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA reserved for GIC facilities as stipulated in the DSP. It should be noted that according to the ES of the DSP, the said 20,000m<sup>2</sup> GFA was reserved for GIC facilities which would be handed over to relevant government bureaux/departments for ownership, management and maintenance upon completion. Tin Chuen Church did not fall under this category.

85. Regarding the proposal of accommodating the church in the proposed hotel/office tower in Site B, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69’s representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, explained that under the planning regime, the ‘Religious Institution’ use was always permitted in Site B under Schedule I of the “OU(MU)” zone on the DSP as mentioned above. With reference to URA’s notional scheme, the church could be accommodated in the proposed hotel/office tower and the non-residential portion underneath the residential towers, subject to its operational requirements.

86. Regarding the deadline for the church to respond to URA's compensation offer, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R69's representative, said that according to established practice, eligible affectees of URA projects were required to respond to URA's compensation offer within 2 months. Should the church find this timeframe insufficient to go through their internal procedures and reach a decision, URA would allow flexibility for the deadline.

87. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session for the afternoon session of the hearing on the day was completed. She thanked the representers, their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course. The representers, their representatives and the government representatives left the meeting at this point.

88. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.