

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 9.1.2025.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning 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

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

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

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[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.]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations in respect of the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/1 (the DSP).

Presentation and Question Sessions

4. 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 M.C. Ma | - Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (TP/TWK) |

Representers and Representers' Representatives

R47 – Hui Ka Fai

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 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]

R62 – The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

Mr Chan Chak Bun] Representer's Representatives
Mr Leung Yee Wah Edward]

R498 – 梁海鈴

Ms Leung Hoi Ling - Representer

R499 – Ho Yuen Ting

Ms Ho Yuen Ting - Representer

R500 – 奚俊

Mr Hai Chun - Representer

R504 – 伍穎茵

Ms Ng Wing Yan - Representer

R506 – 黃曉桐

Ms Wong Hiu Tung - Representer

R510 – 林柔均

Ms Lam Yau Kwan - Representer

R511 – 馮恆業

Mr Feng Hengye - Representer

R512 – Lai Tai Yuen Adrian

Mr Lai Tai Yuen Adrian - Representer

R725 – 太宏有限公司

Mr Leung Kin Long - Representer's Representative

R726 – 穩澤花藝有限公司

Ms Fung Miu Na - Representer's Representative

R729 – 一號園藝

Ms Chan Muk Kei - Representer's Representative

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that the presentation made by the government representatives in the morning session of 8.1.2025 had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board)'s website for public viewing. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers 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. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers 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 Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and would inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

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

R47 – Hui Ka Fai

7. Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence (also URA's representative) said that Mr Hui Ka Fai was one of the current business operators in URA's previous Prince Edward Road West/Yuen Ngai Street revitalisation project (MK/02) (the PERW/YNS project). Mr Hui supported the subject DSP project. As Mr Hui was out of town on the day, he had authorised URA's representatives to attend the meeting on his behalf.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence said that Mr Hui supported the DSP project with the following main points/reasons:

- (a) Mr Hui used to work in the Flower Market. Owing to the rise of online shopping, the local flower business had become increasingly competitive. Considering that the Flower Market lacked potential for expansion, he had once moved out for a few years, but returned recently;
- (b) he was delighted to witness the new opportunities brought by URA's projects to the Flower Market. The new planning and development could strengthen the character and ambience of the Flower Market, making it an attractive destination for both locals and tourists. Therefore, he supported the PERW/YNS project, and appreciated that URA, in consultation with the local stakeholders including the Yau Tsim Mong District Council, had implemented such project successfully;
- (c) he supported URA's place-making approach for the DSP project. The Flower Market Christmas Festive Event (the Christmas Event) organised by URA in 2024 was a good start. Other good place-making examples included the "city walk" programme linking up URA's urban renewal projects with iconic buildings, streets and shops in the Central and Sheung Wan areas, the provision of co-living spaces with common rooms in URA's Staunton Street/Shing Wong Street preservation and revitalisation project and the moving-back arrangement for affected shops with distinctive local character in URA's redevelopment projects in Kowloon City;
- (d) from planning and design perspectives, URA's work facilitated the sustainable development of local shops with unique character. In particular, a holistic approach to the development of the area had been adopted, taking into account the following visions: (i) re-planning and consolidating land uses to solve local problems; (ii) injecting diversified developments and new vitality into the Flower Market, and improving existing facilities and environment to create conducive conditions for sustainable development; (iii) assisting flower

business operators during the transitional period to maintain the business environment of the Flower Market; and (iv) adopting an integrated approach, including redevelopment, rehabilitation, heritage preservation and revitalisation, to promote the local image and enhance economic vibrancy;

- (e) he supported URA's approach of optimising land resources and strengthening the local character by (i) consolidating government land for the provision of Waterway Park as a "flower appreciation hotspot"; (ii) adopting the "Single Site, Multiple Use" (SSMU) approach for the development of a multi-purpose complex with the provision of a public vehicle park (PVP) to resolve traffic problems; (iii) strategically including Site A1 in the DSP project; (iv) rejuvenating the back lanes abutting Sites A2 to A5 and the PERW/YNS project as the "Third Street" of the Flower Market to increase shop floor space; and (v) prioritising suitable premises for affected shop operators' relocation;
- (f) URA's holistic plan could link up the spaces in the community, realising planning gains and adding vitality to the area. The proposed Waterway Park could consolidate segregated government land and connect with the Flower Market to enhance overall walkability and connectivity of the area; and
- (g) he supported the submission of the DSP to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan left this session of the meeting temporarily during the presentation of R47's representative.]

R62 – The Hong Kong Institute of Architects

9. Mr Chan Chak Bun made the following main points:

- (a) he was the former president of the Hong Kong Institute of Architects (HKIA);
- (b) HKIA supported the DSP project and URA's planning vision to shape the Mong Kok East area into an "Exuberant Commercial District";

- (c) a comprehensive approach should be adopted in the DSP project, taking into account liveability, sustainability and cultural heritage. A balance between economic development and protecting the unique character of the Flower Market should be struck;
- (d) consideration should be given to engaging creative architects and designers to participate in the DSP project;
- (e) the DSP project should ensure the compatibility of new development with the existing urban environment and improve the quality of public open space (POS); and
- (f) provision of quality green and open spaces should be prioritised in the DSP project.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Yee Wah Edward made the following main points:

- (a) Mong Kok was originally known as Mongkok Village (芒角村) in the Qing Dynasty. According to Mr Lo Kam, an expert in Hong Kong anecdotes, the area was characterised by paddy fields where watercress and water spinach were cultivated through crop rotation. The agricultural produce was sold to non-Chinese residents on Hong Kong Island. In the 1960s, farmers started to plant flowers in the area. This history illustrated that flowers, waterway and vegetables had shaped the cultural landscape of Mong Kok;
- (b) the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok areas lacked popular and comfortable POS, with only a few small pocket parks scattered along narrow streets. Although there were ample open spaces at the periphery of the old district, those areas were inaccessible as they were separated by roads. To address the problems, new pedestrian connections should be provided to link historic streets with the open spaces in the peripheral areas. In 2018, noting URA's plan for redevelopment of the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok areas, HKIA had proactively

suggested developing Tin Hau Temple historic street and the historic waterways underneath the steep Nullah Road, which ran through the centre of Mong Kok to Cheung Wong Road in Tai Kok Tsui. Since there was no existing building along the waterway, it provided a good opportunity to develop and revive the space along the waterway;

- (c) some examples such as Cheonggyecheon in Seoul (首爾清溪川), Yongqing Fang in Guangzhou (廣州永慶坊) and Kai Tak River in Hong Kong demonstrated the feasibility of waterway revitalisation. URA's notional scheme did not re-open and revitalise the decked-over waterway, but only involved the provision of water features. While acknowledging that waterway revitalisation required co-ordination among government departments to resolve technical problems, URA should continue to liaise with relevant government departments and overcome such issues so as to provide a natural waterway for public enjoyment in the future. The proposed Waterway Park could ensure a building-free zone along the waterway and the provision of open space. This would facilitate long-term waterway revitalisation efforts, aiming to achieve outcomes comparable to those aforementioned cases in Seoul and Guangzhou;
- (d) the concept of 'transfer development ratio' was raised by HKIA 30 years ago and was eventually incorporated in some statutory plans. This approach had been widely adopted overseas to protect historical developments. To prevent a historic building/space from redevelopment, surplus plot ratio (PR) could be transferred to other vacant space/land with development potential. Nevertheless, it was crucial to control the massing of new buildings at the receiving site to avoid excessive bulk and height. The transfer of PR was demonstrated in URA's notional scheme by transferring the development potential of four small sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) to a larger site (i.e. Site A1);
- (e) HKIA had advocated the improvement of back lanes in Hong Kong. References could be made to some projects at Liwan in Guangzhou (廣州荔灣區) and Fan Tan Alley in Vancouver's Chinatown (加拿大域多利市華埠

番攤里), and some similar works in Hong Kong. In addition to cleaning up the back lanes, shop owners should also be encouraged to design their shops to attract pedestrians' usage. URA could take initiatives on this matter;

- (f) traffic was a major issue in the area, with frequent congestion and vehicles queuing up for parking. URA should consolidate parking spaces to alleviate congestion at key junctions;
- (g) at-grade activities should be encouraged. URA's notional scheme would turn Boundary Street Recreation Ground into a multi-purpose complex with imposing walls at pedestrian level, which would hinder pedestrian accessibility. As shown on the photomontage provided by URA, the proposed multi-purpose complex appeared to be a massive structure. URA should review the building massing of the notional scheme project and promote at-grade social and commercial activities. Reference could be made to the layout of the Cantonese Opera Art Museum in Guangzhou, which provided an at-grade pedestrian route through its main building block; and
- (h) HKIA hoped that a blue and green precinct could be built with the incorporation of greening and water elements to promote an environmentally-friendly concept and reflect the local history of vegetable and floral retailing. It was also essential to engage with the locals to build the community and share stories of Mongkok Village. Furthermore, instead of hiring a world-famous architect to design a conventional landmark building, the local community, particularly the younger generation, should be engaged in the design process. Organising workshops would be an effective way to facilitate this collaboration.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung joined this session of the meeting during the presentation of R62's representatives.]

R726 – 穩澤花藝有限公司

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fung Miu Na made the following main points:

- (a) she had been working in the floral business for 4 to 5 years and owned three shops in the Flower Market. She expressed concern that the DSP project would pose adverse impacts on her business;
- (b) the Flower Market was a vibrant and popular destination, especially during Chinese New Year. However, construction works associated with the redevelopment would cause dust and disruption, adversely affecting the operation of flower shops and significantly reducing the number of customers. Currently, locals and overseas visitors accounted for 70% and 30% of the clientele respectively; and
- (c) restricting outdoor displays would seriously affect the operation of flower shops. It would be challenging to regain the popularity of the Flower Market after redevelopment.

R498 – 梁海鈴

12. Ms Leung Hoi Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she had been working in the Flower Market for over 10 years and felt nostalgic for it. She worried that upon redevelopment, it would be difficult for her to find a new job due to age concern, which in turn would affect her livelihood; and
- (b) the Flower Market held significant importance for many Hong Kong people, especially during festive seasons.

R499 – Ho Yuen Ting

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ho Yuen Ting made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed the DSP project;
- (b) 90% of land within the DSP project was government land, indicating a lack of urgency for redevelopment. The government land was crucial to the densely-populated Mong Kok area. Constructing massive buildings would be undesirable for the area and would adversely affect the Flower Market, which was rich in character and human touch;
- (c) she considered that the DSP project was in conflict with the following objectives (marked in italics) laid down in the Urban Renewal Strategy (URS):
 - (i) *restructuring and replanning of concerned urban areas* – there was no justification for the boundary of the DSP. Instead of pursuing comprehensive development for the entire area, only segregated sites were selected for redevelopment, lacking a community-oriented approach;
 - (ii) *designing more effective and environmentally-friendly local transport and road networks within the concerned urban areas* – the existing traffic condition in Flower Market was already smooth and in order;
 - (iii) *rationalising land uses within the concerned urban areas* – the Flower Market was the last vestige of Hong Kong’s vibrant urban culture, where streets, buildings and the community formed a unique bazaar-style culture;
 - (iv) *redeveloping dilapidated buildings into new buildings of modern standard and environmentally-friendly design* – buildings within the boundary of the DSP project were well-maintained and not dilapidated;

- (v) *promoting sustainable development in the urban areas* – the Flower Market had evolved into a symbolic landmark but the redevelopment would severely damage it;
 - (vi) *preserving buildings, sites, structures of historical, cultural or architectural value* – the cultural value of the Flower Market was well-established, serving as a collective memory for Hong Kong people. The DSP project would diminish the cultural value of the area; and
 - (vii) *preserving as far as practicable local characteristics* – the Flower Market was a unique local character and redevelopment would destroy the lively and vibrant community;
- (d) while URA claimed to adopt a “people first, district-based, public participatory” approach for urban renewal, there was no consultation with the flower business operators, residents, customers and tourists. Stakeholders had no opportunity to express their views and the proposal/documents submitted by URA indicated that the approach was not effectively implemented. Although URA’s vision was to create a quality and vibrant urban living environment in Hong Kong, the redevelopment would destroy the unique character and ambience of the Flower Market. Furthermore, with regard to URA’s mission to act with ingenuity and sensitivity to realise its vision, there was a lack of discussion with the flower business operators. The DSP project would take up government land and undermine the culture of the Flower Market. It was questionable whether URA understood the genuine needs of the Flower Market as URA seemed to overlook its unique character and the importance of preserving its culture but focus on profit making;
- (e) despite URA committing to take another year to discuss relocation options and preserve the character of the Flower Market with the stakeholders, the affected residents and flower business operators had not been consulted so far. It was hoped that the Board would extend the consultation period and allow sufficient time for business operators to prepare a counter proposal for the Board’s

consideration;

- (f) she queried why Prince Edward Building in Site A1 needed to be demolished. According to URA, the aim was to transform dilapidated buildings into the ones with better design. Nevertheless, Prince Edward Building was not old, had undergone renovation and remained in good condition. The need for redeveloping Prince Edward Building was unclear; and
- (g) while not opposing the provision of new shops at Site B for flower vendors, she requested URA not to include Site A1 in the DSP project.

R500 – 奚俊

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Hai Chun made the following main points:

- (a) he had worked at the flower shop at Prince Edward Building for over ten years and opposed redeveloping Prince Edward Building;
- (b) the flower shops at Prince Edward Building, both within the shop premises and the outdoor flower bazaar, were well-organised. Redevelopment of Prince Edward Building would destroy “the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market” (龍頭), which served as the gateway to the market. Redevelopment would not only affect the visual appeal of the Flower Market but also the current businesses of the flower shops;
- (c) URA’s redevelopment projects such as the “Sneaker Street”, “Bird Street” and Yue Man Square redevelopment projects had proved to be failures;
- (d) he proposed to build a museum at Site B to introduce the history of the Flower Market to tourists;
- (e) the popularity of the flower shops in Prince Edward Building was largely due

to consistent pedestrian flow. Amid the tide of business closures, the business environment of the flower shops in Prince Edward Building remained robust;

- (f) “shop-for-shop” (以鋪換鋪) compensation was preferred so that the current shop owners could rent the shops directly to the flower shop operators upon redevelopment. Leasing process with URA required proficiency in English and involved lengthy and complicated administrative procedures while leasing process with individual shop owners would be simpler for the flower shop operators; and
- (g) he queried whether there was transitional arrangement for flower shop operators during the construction period.

R504 – 伍穎茵

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ng Wing Yan made the following main points:

- (a) she worked as a sales associate in flower shops and had experience working in flower shops located in shopping malls and the Flower Market;
- (b) she observed that flower shops in shopping malls attracted fewer customers as mall shoppers usually visited with specific purposes in mind and flowers were often not their priority. Some customers would only visit flower shops incidentally as they passed by. During the COVID-19 pandemic, many flower shops, even those in prime locations like Times Square and The One, struggled to sustain their businesses. In contrast, the Flower Market offered a wide variety of flowers and plants that consistently attracted customers. Amid the tide of business closures, the business environment of the Flower Market remained robust, especially in the lead-up to the Chinese New Year;
- (c) the history of the Flower Market dated back to the colonial period, making it the first place people thought of when they wanted to buy flowers. What

distinguished flower shops in the Flower Market from those in shopping malls was the community-oriented atmosphere filled with human interaction and warmth. The DSP project would disrupt the culture and community of the Flower Market, cutting off its lifeblood;

- (d) the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building at Site A1 served as a gateway to the Flower Market. With colourful blossoms and plants displayed organically, it created a visually appealing environment that attracted visitors. Prince Edward Building should not be demolished and the outdoor flower bazaar should be preserved;
- (e) regarding the proposed waterway parks mentioned by R62, she shared her experience visiting a similar park in Guangzhou during the summer. She found it uninviting due to mosquitoes and unpleasant odours. With the hot weather during the summer in Hong Kong, the attractiveness of the proposed Waterway Park was doubtful;
- (f) with the redevelopment expected to take around 10 years, she was concerned about the adverse impacts brought to the flower shops in the Flower Market and that the next generation would lose the opportunity to experience the original Flower Market;
- (g) the DSP project would transform the existing Flower Market with unique character into an unrecognisable commercial street. The unique character of the Flower Street, which embodied human touch and authenticity, should be preserved;
- (h) she did not comprehend the design concept of URA's light projection onto the base of the Prince Edward Road West Flyover during the Christmas Event held last December; and
- (i) the Flower Market attracted many tourists, and the Flower Market in Mong Kok/Hong Kong had been a hot search on social media in the Mainland. For any redevelopment, stakeholders of the Flower Market should be consulted and

the proposals should be formulated collaboratively.

R506 – 黃曉桐

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Hiu Tung made the following main points:

- (a) she had been a florist for more than 10 years;
- (b) the Flower Market was the cornerstone of the flower business, serving as a horticultural wholesale and retail hub for florists/flower shops to source flowers and related products. The outdoor bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building at Site A1, located at the entrance of the Flower Market, was a landmark. With abundant sunlight, the colourful display of flowers and large plants created a visually appealing and dynamic environment that attracted a lot of visitors. This area played a vital role in showcasing blossoms, plants and gardening accessories;
- (c) the Flower Market had its unique character. It was a place filled with human touch and lively spirit where gardening enthusiasts shared knowledge and experiences, flower-themed workshops were often organised and vendors energetically hawked their products. Replacing the area with shopping malls and high-rise residential buildings would strip the area of its vibrancy and individuality;
- (d) noting that the DSP project would take about 10 years to complete, she was worried about the significant disruption to the flower shops. Many flower shops would close down and their employees would lose jobs. It would be difficult for them to find another job, which in turn would affect their livelihood; and
- (e) it was not reasonable to include Site A1 in the DSP project solely for its strategic location. Should a strategic location be the prime consideration for

redevelopment, she commented that whether some prime sites for government buildings/uses could be released for such purpose.

R510 – 林柔均

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lam Yau Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) she shared similar views as presented by some other representers earlier in the meeting;
- (b) while she did not completely oppose the DSP project, she considered that some areas of the redevelopment plan should be revised;
- (c) she had engaged professionals to conduct a pedestrian flow survey at five locations in the Prince Edward area from 12 noon to 6 p.m. on 21 December 2024 (i.e. Winter Solstice). The results showed that there were 17,016 pedestrians at the area in front of Prince Edward Building (i.e. Site A1), 7,025 at 220 Prince Edward Road West (near the footbridge connecting to MOKO), 13,799 at 157 Prince Edward Road West (near MTR Prince Edward Station), 12,388 at 106 Prince Edward Road West (near MTR Prince Edward Station) and 6,684 at 190 Prince Edward Road West (near the eastern end of the Flower Market);
- (d) being located in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, Site A1, which had the most pedestrian flow among others, was the landmark of the Flower Market. It also played a pivotal role in the local economy of the Flower Market. Noting that some other old and dilapidated buildings in the vicinity were not included in the DSP project, she queried whether there was a genuine need to demolish Prince Edward Building which was in good condition and well-maintained. It seemed that Site A1 was included in the DSP project by URA simply because it was located at a prime location with high commercial value. URA had not provided any response on the site selection criteria so far. While supporting the provision of new shops at Site B for the

affected flower vendors, she requested URA not to include Site A1 in the DSP project. “Replacing the bazaar by bazaar” (以墟換墟) and co-existence of new flower shops at Site B and old/existing flower shops at Site A1 should be pursued; and

- (e) URA had mentioned that they needed to take 1 year to discuss with the affected business operators on issues relating to relocation, preservation, community-making, etc. It showed that URA had not considered the above issues beforehand and the DSP was submitted in a rush to the Board for consideration. She requested the Board not to make a decision at this juncture. The Board should give the affected business operators 2 to 3 months to conduct a detailed analysis on the characteristics of the Flower Market and to put forward a counter-proposal for the Board’s consideration.

R511 – 馮恆業

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Feng Hengye made the following main points:

- (a) his flower shop was located at 152 Prince Edward Road West and he opposed the DSP project. He shared similar views as presented by some other representers earlier in the meeting;
- (b) the DSP project would completely destroy the Flower Market. During the prolonged construction period, the construction works would cause dust and noise nuisance, and no one would visit the Flower Market. Many shops would close down and many people who had worked in the Flower Market for a long time would become unemployed;
- (c) URA had not consulted the affected business operators, and no information was provided to them on the relocation arrangement;

- (d) Prince Edward Building in Site A1 was in good condition and should not be demolished. The outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building was the most popular spot in the Flower Market. A wide variety of blossoms and plants were displayed outdoors to attract visitors. Site A1, which was located in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, was a landmark of the Flower Market and should not be acquired and redeveloped. It was queried why some other old and dilapidated buildings in the vicinity were not included in the DSP project;
- (e) some people had expressed the view that the PERW/YNS project had already diminished the attractiveness of the Flower Market. The DSP project would further harm its appeal; and
- (f) URA should engage with the affected business operators and listen to the views of the general public.

R512 – Lai Tai Yuen Adrian

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lai Tai Yuen Adrian made the following main points:

- (a) he was the representative of the business operators of the Flower Market and a member of the Hong Kong Flower and Potted Plant Wholesalers Association;
- (b) the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building in Site A1 was an extraordinary place. It was large in size with abundant sunlight, rendering it suitable for displaying large plants of 8m to 9m high. It was different from other indoor flower shops in the Flower Market with different customer groups. Besides, the outdoor flower bazaar had a dynamic frontage that allowed visitors to move freely, bringing vibrancy to the area. Furthermore, with its spacious open area, the outdoor flower bazaar could be sub-divided into different zones to cater for various flower and gardening businesses, performing as a horticultural wholesale and retail hub and providing a one-stop service comprising a wide range of products and services, from flowers and plants to

gardening accessories and tools. It was also a place of inspiration for farmers, designers, florists, etc.;

- (c) the outdoor flower bazaar, which was located in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, was the landmark of the Flower Market. It was also an important cultural heritage and a famous tourist attraction. The Social Impact Assessment (SoIA) conducted by URA only touched on the history of the Flower Market, the types of business operators and the problems faced by the business operators. It did not assess the structure, cultural heritage and business environment of the Flower Market. Despite the challenging economic situation, the business environment of the Flower Market remained robust. The success of the Flower Market rode on its special shopping experience in the form of an open market given to the customers and its well-established reputation over decades. The DSP project would adversely affect the integrity of the Flower Market by cutting off “the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market” (龍頭) and leaving “the rear part of the Flower Market” (龍尾). The DSP project would turn the Flower Market into an ordinary flower street, stripping away its original character. The DSP project would destroy the vibrant atmosphere and thriving business environment that make the Flower Market so special;
- (d) URA had no guarantee that the affected flower shops would be relocated within the same area with affordable rent. Furthermore, it was unreasonable for URA to use the gross floor area (GFA) to calculate the size of the affected flower shops, without considering the open area in front of the shops;
- (e) while URA was established to tackle the problem of urban decay and to facilitate urban renewal, it was exempted from paying land premium and received financial support from the Government. It was sceptical whether there was a genuine need to redevelop Prince Edward Building, or it was simply a financial consideration overriding the need for redevelopment. Renovated a few years ago, Prince Edward Building was in good condition with up-to-date fire service installations and two lifts, and being well-managed by its

Incorporated Owners (IO). According to the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS), Prince Edward Building was assessed as a building in good condition. It was queried why URA chose to redevelop Prince Edward Building when some other aged and dilapidated buildings in the nearby areas which were prone to fire risk, such as New Lucky House (華豐大廈) in Jordan, were not selected for redevelopment. URA's response that Prince Edward Building was included in the DSP project because the stairway leading to the lift lobby had posed difficulties for the physically disabled and the elderly was not justifiable. The chairman of the IO of Prince Edward Building and the business operator of the ground-floor shop had been liaising to installing a lift between the ground floor and the lift lobby to rebut URA's claim;

- (f) the public had lost faith in URA's redevelopment projects, which were seen as "fake preservation". If the subject redevelopment proceeded, the Flower Market would completely lose its unique character like a replica of the "Wedding Card Street", "Sneaker Street", "Bird Street" and Yue Man Square redevelopment projects;
- (g) there was a lack of proper consultation. While URA held two meetings with the affected residents and business operators in March and April 2024, about 90% of the time of the meetings was spent on URA's briefing, leaving limited time for questions and answers. Besides, it appeared that URA's representatives at the meetings deliberately selected the elderly to ask questions but other attendees like the representer were not selected for asking questions. While some attendees had questioned how to revitalise the back lanes as the "Third Street" of the Flower Market since the back lanes were narrow and occupied by piling stuff and supporting frames for air conditioners and similar items on the external walls of the buildings, URA had not followed up on the matter. URA's representatives had also failed to keep their promise to provide their contacts to two stakeholders who were his colleagues for further communication on the first day of the hearing. These actions indicated that URA lacked sincerity in its consultations with stakeholders;

- (h) while the provision of new shops at Site B was not opposed, he requested URA not to include Site A1 in the DSP project and to preserve the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building at Site A1. He questioned whether there was only one development option and why new flower shops at Site B and old/existing flower shops at Site A1 could not co-exist. He strongly requested “replacing the bazaar by bazaar”, not shopping malls; and
- (i) as URA had not taken into account all the above-mentioned issues before submitting the DSP to the Board for consideration, he requested to extend the consultation period and the Board should give the affected business operators 2 to 3 months to conduct a detailed analysis on the characteristics of the Flower Market and to put forward a counter proposal for the Board’s consideration.

R725 – 太宏有限公司

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Kin Long made the following main points:

- (a) while URA claimed that promoting integrated character street and heritage preservation were important elements in the DSP project, he queried how URA could promote them without conducting a genuine public consultation. As mentioned by R512 earlier, most of the time of the two meetings with the affected stakeholders held in March and April 2024 was spent on URA’s briefing, with not enough time for questions and answers, and URA had not responded/followed up the questions/concerns raised by the stakeholders. He also questioned why the Flower Market with its unique character had to be demolished instead of preservation;
- (b) noting that about 90% of land within the DSP project was government land, he queried why URA could utilise such a large area of government land for redevelopment. It was resource misallocation and not a genuine urban renewal project. The development of Sites A and B should be considered separately. Site B, which was government land and proposed for the development of open spaces and government, institution and community (GIC)

facilities, should be developed by relevant government departments such as the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) and the Architectural Services Department, not URA. URA should focus on its core business of redeveloping the old and dilapidated buildings;

- (c) URA had responded that Prince Edward Building needed to be redeveloped because it was an old building aged 64 years. However, it was noted that Prince Edward Building was in good condition and had been renovated a few years ago without structural safety problem. He questioned why Prince Edward Building needed to be demolished while some other buildings with poor facilities and management and structural safety problems in the nearby areas were not prioritised for redevelopment. Besides, as mentioned by R512 earlier, a lift would be constructed between the ground floor and the lift lobby of Prince Edward Building to address URA's concern. Being located in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building had long been the landmark of the Flower Market. It was also a popular spot with great vibrancy. Demolishing Prince Edward Building and replacing high-rise buildings at Site A1 would turn the area devoid of character and adversely affect the vibrancy and attractiveness of the Flower Market;
- (d) while URA had conducted various assessments on environmental, traffic and other technical aspects, no assessments on the cultural and urban design aspects of the Flower Market were conducted. The cultural character of the Flower Market such as full of human touch and collective memory had not been taken into account by URA. URA should submit an urban design and preservation proposal for the Board's consideration. The DSP for the Board's consideration lacked detailed information and in-depth analysis. It was hoped that the Board could perform its goalkeeper role;
- (e) URA proposed to transfer the development potential of four small and isolated sub-sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) to Site A1. Such proposal would definitely lead to a very high PR at Site A1, which would then be developed with high-rise buildings. The proposed high-rise buildings in Site A1 would not be

compatible with other buildings in the area. Besides, the proposed high-rise buildings in Site A1 would leave little/no open area for the operation of an outdoor flower bazaar. The current vibrant ambience of the Flower Market, which was characterised by order within chaos and organic development over the years, would be completely destroyed;

- (f) the drawings/plans prepared by URA before and after the meetings with the stakeholders remained unchanged without any revision. It implied that URA had not taken into account the stakeholders' views expressed at the meetings;
- (g) the current Flower Market was already very vibrant. He questioned how the proposed redevelopment could add vitality to the area and maintain the unique character of the Flower Market;
- (h) there was no direct relationship between the environmental hygiene of the Waterway Park and the flower shops;
- (i) while URA proposed that ground floor retail shop frontage would be established at Sites A1 and B to create additional spaces for retail activities, such proposal would only keep the layout of the Flower Market and could not preserve the unique character and ambience of the Flower Market;
- (j) while URA claimed that they would assist in identifying suitable premises for the affected flower shop operators to relocate and continue operation in the same area, there was no guarantee that the affected shops could be relocated in the same area with affordable rent;
- (k) he requested URA not to include Site A1 in the DSP project and the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building in Site A1 should be preserved. He requested "replacing the bazaar by bazaar"; and
- (l) he requested that the consultation period should be extended to enable different stakeholders to engage in the DSP project and the Board should give the affected business operators 2 to 3 months to conduct a detailed analysis on the

characteristics of the Flower Market and to put forward a counter proposal for the Board's consideration.

[Professor Roger C.K. Chan rejoined this session of the meeting during R725's presentation.]

R729 – 一號園藝

21. Ms Chan Muk Kei made the following main points:

- (a) while supporting URA's proposal of providing new shops at Site B for the affected flower shop operators, she requested URA not to include Site A1 in the DSP project. The outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building in Site A1 was currently a bustling spot and should be preserved. She queried whether there was only one development option and why new flower shops at Site B and old/existing flower shops at Site A1 could not co-exist;
- (b) URA had previously responded that they would take one year to discuss with the affected business operators on issues relating to relocation, preservation, community-making, the possibility of re-creating the street market, etc. It showed that URA had not taken into account the above issues before submitting the DSP for the Board's consideration. The affected business operators were not fully consulted on the DSP project. She requested the Board not to make a decision at this juncture. The consultation period should be extended and the Board should give the affected business operators two to three months to conduct a detailed analysis on the characteristics of the Flower Market and to submit a counter proposal covering the urban design and preservation issues;
- (c) the DSP project would bring irreversible impacts on the Flower Market. Being located in the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market, the open area in front of Prince Edward Building in Site A1 had been developed into an outdoor flower bazaar, signifying the landmark of the Flower Market. With abundant sunlight, the outdoor flower bazaar was suitable for displaying

colourful blossoms and large plants. Characterised by a flexible layout and order within chaos, the outdoor flower bazaar was a place where the gardening enthusiasts exchanged their gardening knowledge and experiences, and it was a place filled with human touch. In the lead-up to festivals, people flocked to the Flower Market to pick out blossoms and plants. The local character and cultural heritage of the Flower Market would be severely destroyed by the DSP project. The DSP project would only keep the layout of the Flower Market but take away the unique character of the Flower Market. It would only be a replica of the “Wedding Card Street”, “Sneaker Street” and Yue Man Square redevelopment projects;

- (d) amid the tide of business closures in recent years, the business environment of the Flower Market remained vibrant. To further boost the local economy, the intrinsic character of the Flower Market should be further enhanced, not destroying it. With the prolonged construction time of the DSP project (i.e. about 10 years), the business environment of the Flower Market would be critically affected. The Night Vibes Hong Kong campaign promulgated by the Government had little effect on boosting the local economy;
- (e) while URA was committed to undertake urban renewal under a “people first, district-based, public participatory” approach, many of the affected business operators had not been consulted. She queried how URA could know the aspirations and needs of the affected business operators without consulting them. The drawings/plans prepared by URA before and after the meetings with the stakeholders remained unchanged without any revision. It implied that URA lacked sincerity to consider stakeholders’ views. URA should submit an urban design and preservation proposal but they did not do so;
- (f) it was procedurally unfair that URA had neglected all the above-mentioned issues at the project planning stage;
- (g) while URA was established to tackle the problem of urban decay and to facilitate urban renewal, she queried why Prince Edward Building, which had been renovated a few years ago and was in good condition with up-to-date fire

service installations and two lifts, needed to be demolished. URA's claim that Prince Edward Building was included in the DSP project because no lift was provided between the ground floor and the lift lobby was not justifiable. As mentioned by some other representers, the chairman of the IO of Prince Edward Building and the business operator of the ground-floor shop had been liaising to install a lift between the ground floor and the lift lobby. Some other buildings in the nearby areas, which were "three-nil" buildings without building management body and were dilapidated with the problems of falling concrete and pipe leakage, had not been included in the DSP project. There were no clear site selection criteria under the DSP; and

- (h) noting that 90% of land within the DSP project was government land, she queried why URA could use such a large area of government land for redevelopment. Redevelopment was just a pretext and URA was encroaching onto public resources. It was not a genuine urban renewal project but simply a development project on government land. He queried why URA had such a privilege to use government land while gaining profit from the DSP project.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi left this session of the meeting temporarily during R729's presentation.]

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

22. 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.

The DSP

23. Noting that some representers asked for not including Site A1 in the DSP project mainly on the grounds that Prince Edward Building should not be demolished because of its good condition and the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building was the

landmark of and gateway to the Flower Market, some Members enquired about the overall planning concept of the draft DSP as well as the rationale for its boundary delineation and including Site A1 in the DSP.

24. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R47's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the entire Flower Market covered two major street blocks. One street block was bounded by Boundary Street to the north, Fa Yuen Street to the west, Prince Edward Road West to the south and Sai Yee Street to the west while another street block was bounded by Flower Market Road to the north, Yuen Po Street to the west, Prince Edward Road West to the south and Sai Yee Street to the east. The Flower Market showed an L-shaped configuration along Flower Market Road and Sai Yee Street. There were some 120 shops in the Flower Market, and 31 of them would be affected by the DSP project, accounting for 26% of the total number of shops in the Flower Market. Site A1 was part of the Flower Market;
- (b) as regards the overall planning concept and the rationale for delineating the DSP boundary, the DSP was the first project to be implemented by URA under the Master Urban Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) framework of YMDS and to commence redevelopment at the Nullah Road Urban Waterway Development Node (DN). The DSP project served as a catalyst for urban regeneration and was intended to achieve a holistic re-structuring and re-planning of land uses in the Flower Market Road/Sai Yee Street area. It would enhance the built environment and provide solution space for enhancing the long-established character of the Flower Market. The DSP comprised six sites namely Sites A1 to A5 and Site B. For Sites A1 to A5, a linked-site approach would be adopted in which the development potential of the four individual small and isolated sub-sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) would be realised at Site A1. The DSP project was the first project to realise the transfer of PR in Hong Kong. Site A1 was proposed for residential development with retail facilities. An at-grade POS of about 500m² was proposed at the junction of Prince Edward Road West and Sai Yee Street, covering the current open area/outdoor flower bazaar

in front of Prince Edward Building as mentioned by some representers. At-grade POS would be provided in Sites A2 and A3 while single-storey retail facilities were proposed in Sites A4 and A5, which would be integrated with the retail frontage of the Flower Market. For Site B, a multi-purpose complex with upgraded GIC facilities, residential and commercial uses and Waterway Park were proposed. An underground PVP was also proposed within Site B; and

- (c) as regards the rationale for including Site A1 in the DSP, same as other URA's projects in the past, URA had already conducted a comprehensive examination and analysis of a basket of factors including land use, building age and condition, development potential, technical feasibility, the planning gains brought about by the redevelopment, etc. before deciding to proceed with the DSP project. Having considered that the redevelopment potential of Sites A2 to A5 might be limited because of their small size, the adoption of the linked-site approach would allow the development potential of these small and isolated sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) to be transferred to the larger and more strategically-located site (i.e. Site A1). Such approach would help optimise the development potential of Site A1 and free up Sites A2 to A5 for the provision of at-grade POS and low-rise retail facilities to enhance the ambience and vitality of the Flower Market area. The inclusion of Site A1 in the DSP was considered appropriate.

25. To supplement, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) the MRCP framework of YMDS set out the overall development strategy with various proposals, including DNs, open space network, green corridors, pedestrian connections, etc., to guide the rejuvenation of the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok areas;
- (b) as mentioned by URA, the DSP was the first project to realise the recommendations under the MRCP, i.e. to commence redevelopment at the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN. Among others, the proposed Waterway

Park in Site B would serve as a major green hub and would connect with other individual existing and planned open spaces as well as the proposed green corridor to form an integrated open space network in the area and to extend towards the West Kowloon area in the southwest. The proposed POS at the open area in front of Prince Edward Building in Site A1, which was strategically located to the immediate southwest of the proposed Waterway Park and at the axis of “Urban Waterway” following the alignment of the existing decked nullah, played an important role in the integrated open space system; and

- (c) the Notes of the DSP specified that at-grade POS of not less than 800m² in total would be provided in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use (1)” (“OU(MU)1”) zone (i.e. Sites A1 to A5).

Local Character of the Flower Market

26. Noting some representers’ grave concern that the DSP project would deprive the Flower Market of its character, some Members asked whether there were any plans to ensure that local character and ambience of the Flower Market would be preserved and enhanced.

27. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) in view of the fact that the area around Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road had been developed for many years, the relevant planning support and facilities were no longer able to cope with the development needs of the area, including aged recreational facilities with segregated functionality and spaces, lack of leisure and resting spaces, as well as traffic congestion and conflict between pedestrian and vehicles for road space in the vicinity of the Flower Market. URA aimed to leverage the DSP project to help resolve the district problems and to improve hardware support and spatial planning of the area;
- (b) the DSP project would promote the further development of the Flower Market on various fronts, including the provision of on-street retail units facing the

proposed Waterway Park on the ground level of the proposed multi-purpose complex so as to expand the Flower Market as well as to improve the supporting facilities and environment of the Flower Market. More opportunities would then be created for the existing flower shops and related operators to expand their businesses and enhance the vibrant marketplace atmosphere of the Flower Market;

- (c) at the same time, URA would complement with the revitalisation project of the pre-war tenement clusters (i.e. the PERW/YNS project) which was completed years ago, and combine the four sites in the Prince Edward Road West under the DSP project (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) to enhance the back lanes along Yuen Ngai Street and Yuen Po Street through landscaping and revitalisation works as well as place-making, with the aim to transforming them into the “Third Street” of the Flower Market in addition to Flower Market Road and Prince Edward Road West. The DSP project would help enhance the overall environment of the Flower Market, boost street vibrancy and extend the distinctive ambience and characteristics of the Flower Market to the vicinity;
- (d) the Waterway Park with an area of not less than 8,800m² was proposed in Site B. By incorporating landscape design elements as well as encouraging place-making, the Waterway Park would capitalise on its unique geographical location adjacent to the Flower Market and create a “flower appreciation hotspot”. This would highlight the distinctive characteristics of the Flower Market and revitalise the image of the area;
- (e) an underground PVP was proposed in Site B to provide public parking spaces for private cars and loading/unloading (L/UL) spaces to cater for the needs of the members of the public who would drive to the Flower Market to purchase flowers and the cargo handling needs of flower shop operators. The DSP project would help alleviate the problems of illegal parking, road congestion and pedestrian-vehicle conflicts. By improving the overall traffic and pedestrian environment in the vicinity, it would enhance the business environment and improve shopping experience of customers in the Flower Market, which would in turn help attract more customers to the flower shops

and related businesses, and promote the area as a diversified shopping district for leisure and recreation; and

- (f) all the above-mentioned proposals would help preserve and enhance the local character and ambience of the Flower Market, hence promoting the long-term sustainable development of the Flower Market.

Arrangements for the Affected Flower Shops

28. Noting that some affected flower shop operators had expressed grave concern that their businesses would be adversely affected by the DSP project and requested “replacing the bazaar by bazaar”, some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any relocation/moving-back arrangements for the affected flower shops;
- (b) whether the design and layout of the proposed retail shops in Sites A1 and B could cater for the operational needs of flower shops such as provision of sufficient headroom and outdoor area for displaying large and tall plants;
- (c) whether there were any measures to ensure that the proposed retail shops in Sites A1 and B would meet the design requirements set by URA; and
- (d) whether there were any transitional arrangements for the affected flower shops during the construction period.

29. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47’s representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) a multi-purpose complex with ground-floor retail shops abutting the proposed Waterway Park would be provided in Site B while a residential block with ground-floor retail shops abutting the proposed POS would be provided in Site A1. Besides, a single-storey retail block would be provided at the southwestern corner of Site B. All the above-mentioned retail shops were

considered suitable for the moving-back arrangement of the affected flower shops;

- (b) the floor-to-floor height of the retail shops would be further examined at the detailed design stage. Besides, the retail frontage would be set back from the proposed Waterway Park/POS, providing outdoor space for retail activities such as displaying large and tall plants. A balance would also be struck between the design of the retail frontage and the proposed Waterway Park/POS;
- (c) implementation details had yet to be finalised. The DSP project might be implemented, managed and/or operated by URA on its own or in collaboration with developers. Should developers be involved in the DSP project, development agreements which specified the terms and requirements (such as the design requirements for retail shops) would be signed between URA and the developers. A management committee would also be set up by URA and the developers, under which URA would closely scrutinise and monitor the performance of the developers to ensure that the terms and requirements as laid down in the development agreements were fully complied with. Drawing from the example of the Central Market revitalisation project, URA had partnered with a developer to jointly operate and manage the Central Market building in accordance with the terms and requirements laid down in the development agreement, in particular about the provision of affordable retail and cultural uses. It was proven to be a success as the commercial spaces in the Central Market building were currently taken up with operations ranging from street food stalls, local brands boutiques and lifestyle grocery stores, not the chain/high-end stores; and
- (d) the DSP project would be implemented in phases and interim decanting sites would be identified within the Flower Market area for the affected shops to facilitate their continued operation. The open area in front of Prince Edward Building, where there was a nullah underneath and no structure was allowed to be constructed atop, would be one of the interim decanting sites for the affected shops during the construction period and would be developed as a POS to be managed by URA under the DSP project.

30. The Chairperson asked whether it would be a better option for URA to implement, manage and operate the proposed ground-floor retail shops in Sites A1 and B so as to achieve the objective of preserving the bazaar-style character of the Flower Market. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representatives, said that from the past experience, URA preferred inviting developers to implement, manage and operate the retail facilities as they had much more experience than URA in facility management, leasing and marketing, event promotion, etc. Through the execution of development agreements and setting up of management committee as mentioned earlier, on-street retail shops with outdoor display area would be provided in Sites A1 and B to meet the operational needs of the flower shops and to preserve the bazaar-style character of the Flower Market.

31. Two Members asked R512 whether his concern had been addressed or he was satisfied with the DSP project after listening to URA's explanation on the moving-back and transitional arrangements for the affected flower shops to the on-street retail shops in Sites A1 and B, and if not, what his concern was. In response, Mr Lai Tai Yuen Adrian, R512, recapitulated his views as presented earlier and said that Site A1 should not be included in the DSP project, Prince Edward Building should not be demolished and the outdoor flower bazaar in front of Prince Edward Building should be preserved. While on-street retail shops would be provided in Sites A1 and B for the affected flower shops, he and other affected flower shop operators were concerned about high rental price and complicated leasing arrangement for those retail shops in Sites A1 and B. High rental price of the retail shops in Sites A1 and B might also lead to an upsurge of the rent of the shops along Flower Market Road, which in turn would affect the business of the flower shops along Flower Market Road. Besides, regarding the transitional arrangement for the affected flower shops during the construction period, URA had not provided much information and had not consulted the affected flower shop operators on the transitional arrangement such as the location of the interim decanting sites.

Pedestrian Accessibility and Connectivity

32. Noting that the presenter (R510) had conducted a survey indicating that pedestrian flow at the eastern end of the Flower Market (i.e. the area near the junction of Yuen Po Street and Prince Edward Road West or the rear part of the Flower Market as mentioned by some presenters) was relatively low and that the area was not easily accessible from MTR Mong

Kok East Station, the Vice-chairperson enquired whether there were any measures to enhance pedestrian accessibility and connectivity to the eastern end of the Flower Market.

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

- (a) both Prince Edward Station and Mong Kok East Station were located in the vicinity of the Flower Market. Some visitors might choose to exit from Prince Edward Station to reach the western end of the Flower Market (i.e. the area near the junction of Sai Yee Street and Prince Edward Road West) via Playing Field Road or Prince Edward Road West. Some might choose to exit from Mong Kok East Station to reach the eastern end of the Flower Market via Sai Yee Street or through the shopping mall namely MOKO and a footbridge across Prince Edward Road West. It was observed that the physical distance from Mong Kok East Station to the Flower Market was slightly longer than that from Prince Edward Station and there were more commercial activities near Prince Edward Station which might attract more pedestrian flow; and
- (b) to enhance the overall pedestrian accessibility and connectivity of the area, an underground pedestrian connection was proposed between the PVP and the southern part of the Waterway Park adjacent to Flower Market Road within Site B. The underground pedestrian connection aimed to enhance connectivity and walkability, encouraging visitors and nearby shop operators to park their vehicles at the PVP and walk to the Waterway Park, the Flower Market and its surrounding areas. URA would implement the proposed underground pedestrian connection as an integral part of the DSP project. Besides, with a view to enhancing walking experience and improving connectivity in the vicinity, three potential pedestrian connections, including a pedestrian subway between Sites A1 and B across Sai Yee Street, a pedestrian subway from Site A1 towards Nathan Road/Prince Edward Station to the southwest across Prince Edward Road West and a pedestrian footbridge connecting Site B with Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground to the north, would be further explored at the detailed design stage.

34. To supplement, Mr Vico P. Cheung, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department said that there were currently grade-separated and safe pedestrian connections to reach the eastern end of the Flower Market from Mong Kok East Station. Visitors who exited from Mong Kok East Station could walk through MOKO and use the escalators next to Royal Plaza Hotel and the footbridge across Prince Edward Road West to reach the eastern end of the Flower Market. It was reckoned that more and clear directional signage could guide the visitors to the Flower Market.

35. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R47's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) based on observation, more visitors chose to reach the Flower Market from Prince Edward Station. Some of them looped around the Flower Market by browsing through the shops along Flower Market Road from west to east up to Yuen Po Street. Some of them only walked along a section of Flower Market Road up to Yuen Ngai Street and left the Flower Market. Hence, the pedestrian flow at the eastern end of the Flower Market was seen comparatively lower; and
- (b) under the DSP project, Sites A4 and A5, which were located in the eastern end of the Flower Market, were proposed to accommodate single-storey retail facilities to integrate with the retail frontage of the Flower Market Road and to bring more visitors to the eastern end of the Flower Market and the Yuen Po Street Bird Garden. Besides, URA proposed to carry out revitalisation works at the back lanes abutting Sites A2 to A5 and beautification works such as creating artwork/murals at Yuen Po Street. In addition, URA would collaborate with LCSD to upgrade the existing open space at the junction of Yuen Po Street and Prince Edward Road West, such as creating distinctive landmarks. The above measures would help create a more distinctive and pleasant pedestrian environment in the Flower Market, attracting more visitors to the area.

Traffic

36. Noting that there were serious traffic congestion and pedestrian-vehicle conflict at Flower Market Road, particularly during the festive days, a Member asked whether there were any measures to solve the traffic problems. In response, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R47's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that under the DSP project, in addition to the ancillary parking provisions at both Sites A and B, an underground PVP with 220 private car parking spaces and 10 L/UL spaces was proposed at Site B. This would enhance the convenience of the visitors who drove to the Flower Market and provide an additional option for flower shop operators to carry out L/UL activities at the PVP. Besides, the flower shop operators currently carried out L/UL activities in front of their flower shops. With the improvement to the overall traffic environment as mentioned above, there would be scope for URA and/or relevant government departments to explore the possibility of allocating designated time for L/UL activities at Flower Market Road with a view to further improving the traffic environment.

37. Another Member asked R512 whether the L/UL activities of the flower shops would have any impact on the traffic condition of the area. Mr Lai Tai Yuen Adrian, R512, said that the L/UL activities of the flower shops were usually carried out in the early mornings and would not affect the traffic in the area. Based on his observation, about 45 goods vehicles carried out L/UL activities in the Flower Market on normal days. He queried whether the 10 L/UL spaces to be provided in the PVP, which was located not immediately next to the flower shops, could cater for the needs of the flower shops.

Waterway Park

38. Noting that the design concept of the Waterway Park was to provide water features above and/or along the decked nullah rather than opening up the existing decked nullah to revive a natural waterway, a Member asked R62 (HKIA) about their views on the proposed Waterway Park. In response, Mr Leung Yee Wah Edward, R62's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) he was the heritage consultant of the revitalisation project for the En Ning Road area in the Liwan district, Guangzhou (廣州荔灣區恩寧路);

- (b) HKIA had suggested to URA back in 2018 that with a view to creating an integrated open space network and connecting the green spaces in the peripheral areas with the urban centre, there was great potential to revitalise the historic waterways in the Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok areas including the one underneath Nullah Road and to create urban waterway parks. They were glad that URA had accepted their suggestion as the proposed Waterway Park would enhance the overall accessibility and connectivity of the area; and

- (c) there was no doubt that a park with water features was not comparable to a park with natural waterways. That said, it was reckoned that it should be the first step to designate the decked nullah areas as “Open Space” (“O”) on the statutory plan and the long-term vision should be the re-opening of the decked nullah to revive the historic and natural waterways. Taking the examples of Cheonggyecheon in Seoul, Yongqing Fang in Guangzhou and Kai Tak River in Hong Kong, revitalising the waterways always took many years to tackle the technical problems. The design of the proposed Waterway Park would not preclude the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah, and re-opening of the decked nullah would be explored at the detailed design stage subject to technical feasibility, improvement of the water quality, re-arrangement of the underground public utilities, etc. It was envisaged that the decked nullah would be re-opened in the future.

39. As a related issue, another Member asked whether the open area in front of Prince Edward Building was proposed as part of the proposed Waterway Park. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD said that the open area in front of Prince Edward Building was currently private land and there was a nullah underneath. In accordance with the lease restriction, no structure was allowed to be constructed on that area. The open area in front of Prince Edward Building was proposed to be developed as a POS to be managed by URA, forming part of the integrated open space network and green corridor from the Waterway Park to the southwest towards the West Kowloon area.

Flower Appreciation Hotspot

40. Noting that one of the objectives of the DSP project was to promote the Flower Market area as a “flower appreciation hotspot”, a Member enquired about the details of the “flower appreciation hotspot” proposal. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47’s representatives, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, made the following main points:

- (a) to align with the Shining City Project announced in the Policy Address, the Waterway Park under LCSD’s management would be developed as a “flower appreciation hotspot”. Flowering trees, seasonal blooms and colourful shrubs would be planted in the Waterway Park to create a “flower appreciation hotspot” for public enjoyment. It would not only enhance urban beautification but also amplify the ambience of the Flower Market area; and
- (b) the concept of “flower appreciation” was not confined to viewing flowers at the Waterway Park or purchasing flowers from the flower shops. The DSP project would help promote a thriving flower appreciation culture and stimulate flower-related commercial and recreational activities such as flower-themed café in the Flower Market area.

Mitigation Measures during the Construction Period

41. Noting some representers’ grave concerns that the construction works of the DSP project would cause dust and noise nuisance to the Flower Market area and affect the business environment of the Flower Market, a Member enquired whether there were any mitigation measures during the construction period. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47’s representative, said that URA had extensive experience in handling construction projects. During the construction period, various noise mitigation and dust control measures would be adopted to minimise environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. A liaison group between URA and the affected stakeholders in the vicinity would be formed to maintain close communication regarding the redevelopment issues. Special arrangements, e.g. temporary suspension of construction works during school examination days,

could be made if necessary. All the construction works would comply with relevant legislations and statutory requirements.

Proposed Building Height (BH)

42. In response to a Member's question about the proposed BH for Sites A1 and B under the DSP and whether a higher BH restriction could be adopted, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that the BH restrictions for Site A1 and Sub-area (1) in Site B was 150mPD for high-rise developments while that for Sub-area (2) in Site B was 30mPD covering the proposed low-rise GIC complex and Waterway Park. According to URA's notional scheme, a staggered BH profile had been adopted with taller tower blocks of 150mPD at the southwest (i.e. the two towers at Site A and the two towers in the middle portion of Site B) stepping down to the lower tower block of 130mPD at the northeast (i.e. the tower in the northeastern corner of Site B). Taking into account the wider context of the Mong Kok area with a maximum BH of 160mPD in the "Commercial" zones along Nathan Road and respecting the general stepped height profile descending from the Mong Kok East area towards the Kowloon Tong area, the proposed maximum BH of 150mPD in Sites A1 and B was considered not incompatible with the surrounding areas and further increase in BH restriction would jeopardise such BH concept.

Economic Characteristics of the Flower Market

43. In response to a Member's questions about the number of business operators and employees in the Flower Market, the business revenue of the Flower Market and the operation mode of the flower shops, Mr Lai Tai Yuen Adrian, R512, made the following main points:

- (a) apart from two/three chain stores, most of the flower shops in the Flower Market were family-operated for several generations. Redevelopment of the Flower Market would adversely affect the livelihood of many families. While he had no information in hand on the number of business operators and employees in the Flower Market, flower shop operators would usually hire more labour in the lead-up to Chinese New Year; and

- (b) flower business involved many labour-intensive procedures, e.g. unpacking boxes of flowers and plants, removing thorns of flowers, cutting flowers, arranging flowers and plants in vases/pots, etc. Most of the above works were carried out in the back lanes. Turning the back lanes into the “Third Street” of the Flower Market would adversely affect the operation of flower shops and it was questioned how the narrow back lanes being used as the fire escape routes of the buildings and occupied by piling stuff and similar items could be turned into a pedestrian street.

Consultation

44. Two Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether URA had any information about affected stakeholders’ views towards the proposed redevelopment, particularly those in Prince Edward Building; and
- (b) URA’s views on some representers’ suggestion of extending the consultation period for another two/three months.

45. With regard to the affected stakeholders’ views towards the proposed redevelopment, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47’s representative, made the following main points:

- (a) when URA conducted freezing survey for the DSP project, affected stakeholders’ views towards the proposed redevelopment were collected;
- (b) for the whole redevelopment area, among the 149 surveyed households, 40% of them supported while 13% opposed the proposed redevelopment. Of the 56 surveyed business operators, 20% of them supported while 11% opposed the proposed redevelopment. Others did not return the questionnaire, did not respond/refused to respond or expressed no comment;
- (c) for Prince Edward Building, all the business operators of the ground-floor shops opposed the proposed redevelopment. Among the 54 surveyed households, 44% of them indicated support for the proposed redevelopment

while 15% opposed the proposed redevelopment. Others did not return the questionnaire, did not respond/refused to respond or expressed no comment; and

- (d) like other URA's redevelopment projects, there were always diverse views among affected residents and business operators towards redevelopment. Residents were inclined to support redevelopment while business operators tended to oppose redevelopment.

46. As regards representers' suggestion to extend the consultation period, Mr Mak Chung Kit Lawrence, R47's representative, said that URA would maintain communication with the stakeholders and engage them in the DSP project. As mentioned earlier, a liaison group between URA and the affected stakeholders would be formed to maintain close communication. Besides, URA would continue to collaborate with the stakeholders to showcase the uniqueness of the Flower Market through various community-making initiatives such as street beautification work.

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi rejoined and Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

47. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the 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.

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

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:45 p.m.]

49. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 9.1.2025.

50. 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 Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

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

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

Government Representatives

PlanD

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

Representers and their Representatives

R47 – Hui Ka Fai

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 Ki Kelly]	

R639 – Chan Yuk Heung Wendy

Ms Chan Yuk Heung Wendy	-	Representer
-------------------------	---	-------------

R676 – Mary Mulvihill

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

R731 – 郭靈欣

Mr Kwok Ling Yan	-	Representer
------------------	---	-------------

R732 – 陸少芬

Ms Luk Siu Fun	-	Representer
----------------	---	-------------

R751 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

Mr Wong Wan Ki Samuel] Representer’s Representative

R767 – Tin Chuen Church

Mr Tam Chi Ho Raymond]

Mr Tang Wai Cheong] Representer’s Representatives

Mr Fung Kam Hung]

Mr Wong Yan Wai]

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

R639 – Chan Yuk Heung Wendy

53. Ms Chan Yuk Heung Wendy made the following main points:

- (a) she spoke as an ordinary citizen of Hong Kong and a flower lover who frequently visited the Flower Market;
- (b) she expressed her concerns as she did not know whether the Flower Market would be relocated elsewhere, and hoped that the character of the Flower Market, including its pleasant atmosphere with ample open spaces and high accessibility, would be preserved without compromising its authenticity; and
- (c) noting that the DSP covered a large area, she considered that the area should be provided with open spaces and planned holistically, taking into account Yuen Po Street Bird Garden and Mong Kok Stadium. She would like to know when the redevelopment project would be completed.

R731 – 郭靈欣

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kwok Ling Yan made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in the neighbourhood of the Flower Market and had a strong connection with the community. His late father had served the church for a long time and he himself was also a member of Tin Chuen Church (天泉堂);
- (b) he neither supported nor opposed the DSP but would like to provide comments. If the DSP was to be implemented, he proposed relocating Tin Chuen Church to the portion reserved for GIC facilities within the DSP;
- (c) Tin Chuen Church had strong ties to the community. Despite the transient nature of shop tenants and residents, the church had remained, akin to an “Old and Valuable Tree” witnessing the development of the Flower Market. As Tin Chuen Church had been serving the Flower Market community for a long time, it was important to the community;
- (d) Tin Chuen Church was open not only to the church members but also to all members of the neighbourhood, including workers in the Flower Market (such as cleansing workers) and those in need. He recalled that a member who often returned and donated to Tin Chuen Church out of gratitude for the priest’s guidance during his childhood. Recently, Tin Chuen Church held a gospel lunch during Christmas for 180 people (which were more than expected), including grassroots families. Church members also sang carols for the community during Christmas; and
- (e) Tin Chuen Church provided the soil for the Flower Market to grow, without it, the Flower Market could not grow healthily. He used the metaphor of an old piano to describe the current status of the Flower Market. While the old piano might have low musical value, its historical value as one of the few pianos made in Hong Kong was immense, and he planned to collaborate with interested parties to display it to the public. Noting the heated discussion on the term of “bazaar” (墟) during the first day of the hearing, he believed that it was the people who made the Flower Market authentic and valuable.

[Mr Rocky L.K. Poon joined this session of the meeting during the presentation of R731.]

R732 – 陸少芬

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Luk Siu Fun made the following main points:

- (a) she was a preacher of Tin Chuen Church and would like to share the stories compiled in the pamphlet *Rainbows of the Flower Market: Touching Stories in the Flower Market* (《花墟的彩虹 感人的故事》);
- (b) Tin Chuen Church did not have rich resources, but it was a church filled with warmth and love, just like a family. The mission of the church was to love and care everyone in the Flower Market community, including the elderly, shop employees, cleansing workers and passers-by. She cited some examples, such as a cleansing worker who appreciated the church's provision of food to marginalised individuals and a female scavenger who overcame her embarrassment to join a stretching exercise class owing to the church's welcoming environment. She also shared a story of praying for a distressed woman who left with a smile, believing that God had healed her pains. Tin Chuen Church recently started supporting single mothers after hearing about a single mother who committed suicide due to familial difficulties. Through its love, respect and acceptance, the church had helped cleansing workers and scavengers to regain self-esteem, fostering solidarity and mutual support within the Flower Market community;
- (c) she shared the community's sadness about the relocation of Tin Chuen Church, noting that many people valued the free-of-charge community space for food and rest. Others lamented the relocation as the church had recently been renovated;
- (d) she requested that Tin Chuen Church remained in the Flower Market area to continue serving the Flower Market community; and

- (e) she urged Members to recognise the deep bonding between Tin Chuen Church and the Flower Market.

R751 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

56. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Samuel Wong made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed BH of up to 150mPD was incompatible with the surrounding environment. Although the BH restriction of the surrounding developments was 115mPD, most of the existing buildings to the west and south of Sites A and B did not exceed 50mPD, except for a few with a BH at about 100mPD. Commercial buildings to the south, such as Pioneer Centre and Grand Century Place, were about 90mPD. To the immediate north were recreational and open spaces including Police Sports and Recreation Club, Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground and Fa Hui Park that had no buildings. The proposed BH profile under URA's notional scheme that stepped down from 150mPD in the southwest to 130mPD in the northeast could not be considered a "stepped" height profile, when compared with the BH of the buildings in Yau Yat Tsuen in Kowloon Tong which was about 30mPD;
- (b) the DSP prioritised income generation over public interests. About 90% of the area covered by the DSP was government land, while the remaining about 10% was private land. 65% and 22% of Site B were zoned "O" and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") respectively. Both the "O" and "G/IC" zones were intended to serve the needs of local residents and the community. With reference to YMDS, the objectives of the Flower Market project were to optimise redevelopment potential and steer growth with private and commercial developments by taking up land that was originally for community uses, and this worsened the deficits of community facilities and open spaces in Yau Tsim Mong District;

- (c) he questioned the necessity of “urban renewal” to provide better open space. It was contradictory for URA to free up small and isolated sites for the provision of POS in Site A, and on the other hand, to demolish the existing, large and connected open space for residential/commercial development in Site B. According to URA, the proposed Waterway Park could serve as a major air ventilation and visual corridor in the area. Nevertheless, the existing open spaces were already serving the same purpose. URA also claimed that the proposed sizable at-grade POS at Site B would help consolidate the existing open and leisure spaces currently segregated by fencing. He considered that there were alternative solutions as it was a land administration issue which could be resolved by allocating the land occupied by the decked nullah along Flower Market Path, which segregated existing open spaces, to relevant government departments, such as LCSD or the Drainage Services Department for better overall design and integration;
- (d) previous urban renewal projects, such as Lee Tung Street in Wan Chai, “Sneaker Street” in Mong Kok, failed to strengthen the original characters of those streets and led to gentrification, resulting in loss of traditional businesses. The Flower Market developed organically over time because of market forces and changing local circumstances. The proposed DSP risked disrupting the operation and undermining the sustainability of the existing businesses/activities in the Flower Market. The plans to strengthen the character of the Flower Market were unclear, e.g. lacking details on the amount of retail spaces earmarked for flower shops, and no information on whether local businesses outside the DSP could use the L/UL facilities in Site B; and
- (e) there might also be conflicts among the proposed development, flower market activities and sports events. Future residents of the proposed residential developments might consider the noise from the flower shops as a nuisance. Taking Tseung Kwan O Promenade as an example, residents complained about noise and air pollution from alfresco dining restaurants. Similarly, residents near Hammer Hill Road Sports Ground complained about noise from football match audiences. Mong Kok Stadium, known for allowing

drums for chanting during matches, was a popular home ground for local football teams because of its optimal size and vibrant atmosphere. He suggested that managing the expectations of future residents was crucial to minimising such conflicts.

R767 – Tin Chuen Church

57. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tang Wai Cheong made the following main points:

- (a) at a meeting with Ir Wai Chi Sing, Managing Director of URA, on 23.5.2024 and as per URA's letter to Tin Chuen Church (天泉堂) dated 17.7.2024, URA advised Tin Chuen Church that it could submit a representation to express its concerns, if any, to the Board during the DSP hearing process;
- (b) Tin Chuen Church requested URA to (i) provide premises near the Flower Market community free-of-charge for temporary relocation, along with subsidies for relocation, renovation and other related expenses; and (ii) provide suitable premises with a minimum floor area of 670m² (equivalent to the current premises) within the DSP project for permanent relocation, also free-of-charge, along with subsidies for relocation, renovation and other related expenses;
- (c) Tin Chuen Church was established in 1952 at Sai Yee Street, and was the first church of Evangelical Free Church of China (EFCC) established in Hong Kong. Over the past 80 years, it had become an indispensable spiritual pillar of the Flower Market community. It was also a living heritage and a signature institution of the Flower Market. It had about 700 registered members who regularly participated in worship, fellowship and various activities;
- (d) Tin Chuen Church had been deeply integrated into the Flower Market area. From 2022 to 2024, the church organised over 2,400 social services/activities for the Flower Market community, serving over 78,000 individuals. The

services provided included fellowship, baptism, mental health support and counselling, uniformed programmes for youth, afterschool tutoring, caring and education programmes, provision of free food, daily necessities and shared space, regular visits to seniors, elderly care homes, etc. Those social services, which supplemented the insufficient subsidised social welfare services in the district, would be lost without re-provisioning of the church in the Flower Market area;

- (e) the church was an exemplar of “impact investment” which invested its donations to raise its social impact. During 2020 to 2021, Tin Chuen Church invested HK\$ 7 million for interior renovation with an aim to provide a larger, air-conditioned shared space for the community;
- (f) within walking distance of Prince Edward Station and Mong Kok East Station and being well-served by various public transport, the current location of Tin Chuen Church was highly accessible and convenient for the community members. Relocating Tin Chuen Church elsewhere would bring difficulty to the grassroots families and the underprivileged to seek assistance and receive services;
- (g) Tin Chuen Church’s role and contributions in social services were well-acknowledged by its members, EFCC, collaborating organisations including Chong Lap (H.K.) Co. Ltd., Yang Memorial Methodist Social Service, and community leaders such as Professor Ho Kin-chung, Mr Law Chun-ming, Yau Tsim Mong North Area Committee member, and Mr Kwok Bit-chun Benjamin, former District Council member. They all supported the relocation of Tin Chuen Church within the Flower Market area;
- (h) the scope of Tin Chuen Church’s social services was in line with government policies. As revealed in a research by Civic Exchange in 2017, there was a lack of open space. By sharing its hall and activity room with the community, Tin Chuen Church could help improve the situation concerning the shortfall in the provision of open space in Mong Kok district in meeting the standard of 2m² per person under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and

Guidelines. According to Samaritan Befriender Hong Kong 2023 Annual Report, the suicide rate was 14.55 per 100,000 people. Tin Cheung Church had provided mental health support, counselling services and a variety of social welfare services for grassroots. The 2024 Policy Address announced extending the Pilot Programme on Community Living Room which targeted to provide additional space with diversified facilities and services for grassroots families to improve their quality of life, and Tin Chuen Church had been providing such services to the Flower Market area;

- (i) the contributions of Tin Chuen Church were not accurately reflected in URA's SoIA. The emphasis of the SoIA was on flower shop operators, while Tin Chuen Church was described merely as a "church" with no further details. The SoIA did not put enough emphasis on Tin Chuen Church's importance in providing social services to the community;
- (j) he noted that URA reserved GIC spaces for social welfare services within the redevelopment. With well-established social network and services, Tin Chuen Church was a better option than new social welfare institutions in serving the Flower Market community; and
- (k) without special reprovisioning arrangements for Tin Chuen Church in the redevelopment plan, URA failed to meet the following objectives as stated in URS: (i) preserving buildings, sites and structures of historical, cultural or architectural value; and (ii) preserving as far as practicable the social networks of the local community.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan joined this session of the meeting during the presentation of R767.]

R676 – Mary Mulvihill

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

- (a) she objected to the proposed redevelopment in the DSP;

Oversupply of Residential and Commercial Properties

- (b) as the demand for both residential and commercial properties had greatly diminished, Hong Kong was facing an oversupply of properties. For residential properties, the Chair of Jones Lang LaSalle stated that there were around 100,000 vacant private residential units, with more under development;
- (c) on the retail and commercial side, the outlook was even bleaker. Prices of prime office space in Hong Kong's Central Business Districts had plunged by 46% between 2018 and 2024. Rents for the city's premium office spaces were estimated to have fallen by 8.6%, and a further 10% decline was predicted in 2025. Rental values for prime shopping centres decreased by 2.3% while high street shops experienced a modest 1.3% increase in 2024. The commercial value of Grade A office declined by 9.8% and high street shops decreased by 1.6%. The pace of rate cuts was expected to be slower, potentially prolonging the property downturn. There were 529 foreclosures in 2024, compared to 266 in 2023, and more cases of banks taking action were anticipated;
- (d) the residential units proposed should be for subsidised housing as there was still a need for affordable housing. The location of the proposed commercial development was isolated. Many existing hotels were being converted to student hostels because of high vacancy rates. Instead of building more, the focus should be on how to utilise existing stock. Members should take these into account when evaluating how the land could be best used;

Mode of Operation of URA

- (e) URA's modus operandi was no longer viable. It was time for an in-depth review of its operations as they were no longer sustainable socially and financially. URA had already experienced setbacks in offloading its Kwun Tong and Kowloon City sites. Financial pressure was mounting. The Flower Market project was a grab of government land originally for POS and

recreational facilities to bolster its balance sheet;

Local Culture and Operation of Flower Market

- (f) regarding URA's recommended themes of horticulture, floristry or gardening for the proposed on-street retail shops in Site B, she remarked that wedding card shop had never been seen again at "Wedding Card Street" in Wan Chai, not to mention Yue Man Square, "Sneaker Street" and other projects that failed to re-create their original ambiances;
- (g) the Flower Market was one of the few retail nodes that had survived the crisis in the retail sector. The shops there were crowded at weekends. Any development/redevelopment that would adversely affect the commercial viability of the market and other activities in the district should be avoided;

Provision of Open Space and GIC Facilities

- (h) in view of the extensive community facilities proposed in Site B, there would be little interest from developers. It was possible that the project would face considerable delays, prolonging the period during which sports and recreational facilities would be suspended in the district. The existing sports facilities were very popular and fully booked. Depriving the community of those facilities for a decade was contrary to the pledges made during the Olympics that the Government would promote sports in the community. Renovation, if required, could be done in stages;
- (i) Mong Kok had a deficit of more than 50% in both local open space and district open space, amounting to 17 ha. The DSP would reduce them by a further 1.6 ha. The net increase in POS of about 1,185m² was intended to compensate for the planned takeover of Nullah Road Garden of 1,150m². The POS in front of Site A1 would be for displaying flowers/floral products and those in Sites A2 and A3 were small in area;

- (j) no private open space was provided for the 1,175 and 2,200 future residents in Sites A1 and B respectively. The residents would no doubt use the proposed POS on the podium in lieu and the amount of POS should be deducted to reflect such situation;

Urban Design and Landscape

- (k) the proposed maximum BH of 150mPD in Sites A1 and B would create wall effect and was in conflict with the character of the district. The current low-rise ambience would be lost;
- (l) the proposed Waterway Park was mostly unshaded concrete and the proposed water features were merely a series of pools as the nullah was too contaminated;
- (m) the tree survey, which recorded 212 existing trees, was flawed as many mature trees would be affected by the DSP. There was concern about the loss of over 100 trees in a district that had very little green coverage. The proposed new trees would be spread out, failing to support an ecosystem for flora and fauna, unlike the clustered patterns of the current open space;

Public Consultation

- (n) as the existing sports facilities served a wider community on a district basis, the consultation should be extensive. Nevertheless, only retailers and residents were consulted but not the general community regarding the impact on sports facilities. The SoIA also did not cover the effects of the deprivation of open space and recreational facilities on both the mental and physical health of local residents living in small, cramped units and many from other districts who enjoyed the existing facilities;
- (o) the papers/documents on URA's website could not be searched by keywords nor copied and pasted to extract relevant details, and this was unacceptable;

Insufficient Justifications for Redevelopment

- (p) Prince Edward Building at Site A1 was not a low-rise dilapidated building. Development just for the sake of development was not acceptable;
- (q) the “district problems” claimed by URA, such as segregated facilities by fencing, sports centres requiring upgrade and unwelcoming public toilets and refuse collection point, were minor in nature and could be easily addressed by other means;
- (r) the provision of additional parking spaces would attract more vehicles and was contrary to the government policy of promoting the use of public transport;
- (s) it was not reasonable to demolish existing buildings which were still in use for the purpose of providing two small POS in Sites A2 and A3. Transfer of PR of these pieces of land was merely for generating URA’s revenue; and
- (t) the DSP was not in line with URS as it diminished the quality of both open space and recreational facilities, and removed well-loved local establishments.

59. As the presentations of the representers and/or their representatives 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 questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Commercial Property Market

60. A Member noted that the vacancy rate of the Grade A office buildings in Central reached a high level and the rental yield fell significantly due to the recent downturn in the property market. With the change in working styles and the increasing prevalence of co-working space and home office in recent years, the trend of a declining office market remained

gloomy in the next 5 to 10 years. As commercial floor areas were proposed at Site B in the DSP, the Member enquired about URA's views on the falling value of commercial properties and the associated risks.

61. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) the SSMU model was adopted at Site B, which consisted of open space, GIC facilities, residential and commercial uses. The podium were mainly for reprovisioning of upgraded and sports/recreational facilities, social welfare facilities and a district health centre while the ground-floor shops were for reprovisioning of affected flower shops and expansion of the Flower Market. There were three towers at Sub-area (1) of Site B in URA's notional scheme, with two residential towers in the west and one commercial tower in the east. The commercial and retail uses could complement the Waterway Park; and
- (b) since the proposed redevelopment was likely to take more than 10 years to complete and it was not certain how the property market would change by that time, instead of the conventional residential and commercial zonings, the "OU(MU)" zone was proposed on the DSP to allow flexibility for the mix of uses to meet the changing market needs. In particular, the GFA restrictions of the "OU(MU)" zones on the DSP had allowed flexibility to adjust the mix of the residential and commercial uses in the composite development in response to the market fluctuation.

Sports Centres

62. Noting that two indoor sports centres would be affected by the DSP, a Member enquired if the functions of these sports centres would remain after the redevelopment as they were not shown in URA's notional scheme. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, said that URA had been liaising with LCSD on the reprovisioning of the indoor sports centres, including the design and the area requirements. Despite keeping a similar scale, the existing functions of the sports facilities would be upgraded with renovated ball courts and multi-

functional rooms. Some facilities e.g. squash courts, which were less frequently used, might be turned into other facilities for urban sports. The design of internal layout would allow flexibility for different sports activities. As depicted in a section plan of the proposed development at Site B, three storeys with high headroom labelled as GIC facilities under the soccer/hockey field were designated for the reprovisioning of the sports centres. The costs of reprovisioning would be borne by URA. LCSD would seek government funding for the provision of new facilities, if any.

38-48 Flower Market Road

63. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the demolition and construction works would affect the row of aged buildings including 38-48 Flower Market Road; and
- (b) whether the developers would be interested in redeveloping 38-48 Flower Market Road as Sites A2 to A5 were for low-rise development under the DSP.

64. In response, Messrs Mak Chung Kit Lawrence and Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representatives, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) Sites A2 and A3 were for the provision of at-grade open space and Sites A4 and A5 were for the development of small-scale single-storey retail blocks. Percussive piling or bored piling foundation would not be required for the low-rise structures. Adopting modular integrated construction with a pad footing of a depth of 3 feet at Sites A4 and A5 would minimise the construction impact on the aged buildings in the surroundings. In practice, URA was experienced in construction in old and congested urban areas, even for high-rise redevelopment with piling foundations; and
- (b) buildings on Sites A2 to A5, if any, would be low-rise subject to a BH restriction of one storey as specified on the DSP. Being located outside the DSP, redevelopment of 38-48 Flower Market Road with a site area of about 600m² would be governed by the existing planning restrictions of the Mong

Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The site was zoned “OU(MU)” with the inherent flexibility of mix of uses subject to a maximum PR of 9 and a maximum BH of 115mPD under the Mong Kok OZP. Upon implementation of the DSP to enhance the vibrancy and ambiance of the Flower Market, the buildings aged 76 years at 38-48 Flower Market Road as a whole would have potential to be redeveloped into a high-rise residential development on its own. It was understood that there were attempts by developers, though in vain, to acquire the properties of 38-48 Flower Market Road before the recent fall in the property market. The DSP was the first project to realise the recommendations of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN. URA aimed to leverage the DSP to facilitate the long-term sustainable development of the Flower Market and to encourage redevelopment of old areas nearby. As the “Urban Waterway” extended to Nathan Road, the DSP would not be the last project of URA for the DN. The tremendous tasks of urban renewal should not only rely on URA but also the market force. For instance, there were representations suggesting inclusion of 206-208 Prince Edward Road West in the DSP, which, as reported in the news, was just acquired by the private sector in December 2024.

Tin Chuen Church

65. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr Fung Kam Hung, R767’s representative, said that Tin Chuen Church was a registered non-governmental organisation (NGO) and charitable institution, which was exempted from tax under section 88 of the Inland Revenue Ordinance.

66. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the amount of floor area reserved for social welfare facilities in the DSP and how the reserved space would be distributed;
- (b) whether the acquisition policy of 7-year-old flat in the same locality would be applied to Tin Chuen Church; and

- (c) whether any space in the DSP could be allocated for Tin Chuen Church so that the church could sustain its services in the locality.

67. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representative, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) about 20,000m² GFA was reserved for GIC facilities at Site B. Those GIC facilities would be handed over to the relevant government bureaux/departments for ownership, management and maintenance upon completion. Relevant government departments such as the Social Welfare Department (SWD) and the Home Affairs Department would be responsible for allocating the reserved GIC space to various facilities/services. GIC facilities as required by the Government were proposed to be exempted from GFA calculation;
- (b) the affected premises of Tin Chuen Church belonged to the EFCC. They were private properties to be counted as non-domestic or commercial GFA and would not be considered as GIC facilities required by the Government. In accordance with the principles adopted in property acquisition other than industrial properties, URA would offer an owner of the property such as Tin Chuen Church the market value (assessed on vacant possession basis) of the affected property plus an ex-gratia allowance and an incidental cost allowance for purchase of the affected property. The incidental cost allowance would cover payment of removal expenses and expenditure relating to the purchase of a replacement property and the legal cost incurred in the sale of the affected properties to URA as claimed by Tin Chuen Church. URA had a special policy for church owning and using its own properties, which would result in a compensation close to that for domestic properties which was evaluated based on a notional 7-year-old replacement flat. Since the affected premises of Tin Chuen Church included a building in single ownership, the compensation might also be calculated based on the redevelopment value of the building (assuming redevelopment of the building on its own) plus the allowances. The exact amount of compensation could only be determined at the acquisition stage and there was no such compensation policy of URA

for any interim or permanent arrangements for the church gratis and without costs; and

- (c) as the price of non-domestic floor areas in the market was falling, Tin Chuen Church might be able to purchase another property in the vicinity upon receipt of the compensation. At the request of Tin Chuen Church, URA had been looking for vacant premises in the neighbourhood for its replacement. Two premises in proximity to the Prince Edward Station were offered to the church recently but they were not accepted by the church. URA would keep on assisting the church to search for replacement premises.

68. In response to the follow-up questions of the same Member, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representative, said that since the first meeting with Tin Chuen Church led by URA's Managing Director, URA had maintained communication with the church regarding various issues, including planning-related matters, lease clauses, potential replacement premises and principles of compensation, etc. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD replied that the GIC facilities to be provided at Site B would include LCSD's reprovisioned sports/recreational facilities with upgraded standards and new sports/recreational facilities, the Department of Health's permanent district health centre and SWD's new social welfare facilities including Integrated Family Service Centre and 60-place Special Child Care Centre. SWD would invite suitable NGOs to run the facilities and provide the services according to their current practice.

69. Noting the contribution and social functions of Tin Tuen Church in the community and that some areas at Site B were proposed for commercial uses, a Member asked whether URA could consider allocating 670m² floor area for the reprovisioning of the church. In response, Mr Kwan Yee Fai Mike, R47's representative, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that there would be sufficient non-domestic space at the commercial floor areas at Site B and the podium of Site A1 to accommodate the floor area required by the church. The non-domestic commercial portion of the future development would not be for sale because of management concerns. The church could choose to rent the premises at Site A1 or Site B if considered appropriate.

70. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that 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. As all the hearing sessions were completed, the Board would deliberate on the representations in closed meeting later 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.

71. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.