

CONFIDENTIAL

(Downgraded on 7.2.2025)

**Minutes of 1329th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.1.2025**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Ms. Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr. Rocky L.K. Poon

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

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

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

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

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr. Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr. Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr. Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr. Ben S.S. Lui

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Dr. Tony C.M. Ip

Mr. Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Mr. Simon Y.S. Wong

Director of Lands
Mr. Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr. Ivan M.K. Chung

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Katy C.W. Fung

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

1. The meeting was resumed at 3:50 p.m. on 17.1.2025.

Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

Agenda Item 1

[Closed Meeting]

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.]

Deliberation Session

2. The Secretary reported that Members' declaration of interests had been made in the morning session of the hearing on 8.1.2025 and would be recorded in the relevant minutes of meeting. No further declaration of interests had been received from Members since then.
3. The Secretary said that all Members attending the subject deliberation session had participated in all or part of the 2-day hearing sessions, and Members should apprise themselves of the views expressed during the 2-day hearing, particularly the part they did not attend, through viewing the video recordings of the hearing sessions circulated to Members before the meeting.
4. The Chairperson said that the hearing sessions for the consideration of the representations on the draft Urban Renewal Authority Sai Yee Street/Flower Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/1 (the DSP) were held on 8 and 9.1.2025. The meeting would now proceed to the deliberation of the representations. The Chairperson then invited the Secretary to briefly recapitulate background of the DSP, major views/grounds/proposals of the representers in their written and oral submissions, and responses from relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds) and the Urban Renewal Authority (URA).

5. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, the Secretary recapitulated the following main points covered in the hearing sessions:

Background

- (a) the Master Urban Renewal Concept Plan (MRCP) formulated under the District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS) commissioned by URA had provided a blueprint for five development nodes (DN). The DSP, which included the proposed Waterway Park, covered the northeastern part of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN. It was the first project to realise the MRCP recommendations under YMDS;
- (b) on 15.3.2024, URA submitted the draft DSP No. S/K3/URA5/A to the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) for consideration. On 23.8.2024, the DSP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month statutory exhibition period, a total of 767 valid representations were received;
- (c) the purpose of the DSP was to facilitate the restructuring and re-planning of the area. The DSP, with a total site area of about 29,315m², comprised Site A and Site B. Site A consisted of five sub-sites, in which various aged buildings with unsatisfactory conditions would be redeveloped. The “Single Site, Multiple Use” (SSMU) model would be adopted at Site B for comprehensive development, with upgraded and new government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and the Waterway Park. Retail units would also be provided at Site B to reprovision the affected businesses at Site A;
- (d) the five sub-sites of Site A (i.e. a larger one (Site A1) and four smaller sites (Sites A2-A5)) were occupied by 23 buildings aged from 64 to 76 years. They were zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use (1)” (“OU(MU)1”) on the DSP. The building height (BH) restriction of Site A1 was 150mPD while the BH restriction of Sites A2 to A5 was one storey. In URA’s notional scheme, Sites A2 and A3 were proposed mainly for public open space (POS) while Sites A4 and A5 would each accommodate single-storey retail facilities

together with open space for public passage and gathering. Overall, with the “linked-site” approach, the maximum total plot ratio (PR) of Site A could reach 9 and the maximum domestic PR was 8.5. An at-grade POS of not less than 800m² would be provided;

- (e) Site B comprising 2 sub-areas (i.e. Sub-areas (1) and (2)) was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use (2)” (“OU(MU)2”) on the DSP. It was currently occupied by several existing GIC facilities and open space. Under URA’s notional scheme, by adopting the SSMU model, Sub-area (1) was mainly proposed for residential and commercial development with retail and GIC uses while Sub-area (2) included a multi-purpose GIC complex, a sizable Waterway Park, ground-floor retail frontage and low-rise retail facilities. The BH restrictions of Sub-areas (1) and (2) were 150mPD and 30mPD respectively. A POS of not less than 16,200m² would be provided within Site B, in which not less than 8,800m² would be at-grade. An underground public vehicle park (PVP) would also be provided;
- (f) among the 767 representations received, 70 were supportive, 13 were partly supportive and partly opposing, 674 were opposing/providing adverse views, and 10 provided views;

Supportive Representations

Major Grounds/Views

- (g) the DSP would meet the ever-changing social needs through re-planning in a comprehensive manner. The living conditions would be improved by addressing the issue of aged buildings with poor physical conditions and building management. Land resources could be optimised by adopting the “linked-site” approach and SSMU model to provide upgraded and new GIC facilities;
- (h) the Waterway Park would become a focal point for public enjoyment. The proposal would bring vitality to the area while reinforcing the unique

character of the Flower Market. A balance between redevelopment needs and minimising adverse impacts on the Flower Market had been struck;

- (i) by strengthening pedestrian connections, revitalise the back lanes, and providing underground PVP, the traffic conditions in the area could be improved. URA would provide proper reprovisioning/relocation arrangements for the affected parties;

Response from Government B/Ds/URA

- (j) the supportive views were noted;

Adverse Representations

Boundary-related: 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) Excluded

Major Grounds/Views

- (k) the DSP deprived the six aged buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) of the redevelopment opportunity, which shared the same building age category as Sites A2 to A5 and were “three-nil” buildings. Taking into account the poor building conditions and maintenance, and sub-standard building design constraining the provision of standard fire service installations, 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) should be incorporated into the DSP;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (l) according to URA, a basket of factors, including building conditions, impact on the Flower Market operation, ease of acquisition, etc., had been taken into account in site selection. It was considered viable for a separate single redevelopment of a reasonable scale on its own in view of its larger site area of about 600m² at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.);

- (m) more flower shops would be affected (the number of affected shops would increase from 26% to 31% of the total about 120 shops in the Flower Market) if 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were included;
- (n) URA would continue to support the rehabilitation and preventive maintenance of the nearby buildings. While the DSP was only the first phase of the entire DN, the remaining phases would be progressively pursued in future;

Boundary-related: Prince Edward Building at Site A1 Included

Major Grounds/Views

- (o) it was unreasonable to incorporate Prince Edward Building completed in 1960 into the DSP as the building was well-maintained;
- (p) Prince Edward Building, located at a prominent location i.e. the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market (龍頭), was well-visited. The proposed redevelopment would adversely affect patronage and the business of the flower shops;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (q) according to URA, a basket of factors had been taken into account in site selection. For Prince Edward Building within Site A1, the stairway leading to the lift lobby posed difficulties for the physically disabled and the elderly. As the issue could not be resolved by rehabilitation alone, its redevelopment was considered necessary by URA. The southern triangular portion of Site A1 was previously subject to a BH restriction of 20mPD on the Mong Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for air ventilation. It was part of a private lot with an area of less than 300m² and no structure should be erected under the lease but commercial activities were allowed. Site A1, in particular its southern part, strategically served as part of the “Urban Waterway” identified under YMDS;

- (r) while the flower shop operators on the ground floor of Prince Edward Building opposed the DSP, about 44% of residents in the upper floors indicated support for the proposed redevelopment in the freezing survey. The survey revealed that 27% of the residents were aged 65 or above and 8% were aged between 60 and 64;

Boundary-related: Large proportion of Government Land Included

Major Grounds/Views

- (s) it was not justified to include a large piece of government land in Site B in the DSP, which accounted for about 90% of the entire DSP area;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (t) through restructuring under the SSMU model, URA aimed to leverage the project to address the aged recreational facilities with segregated public spaces through a comprehensive mixed-use development with the provision of upgraded and new GIC/sports/recreational facilities with a GFA of about 20,000m² and a sizable at-grade POS including the Waterway Park with an area of about 16,200m² at Site B;
- (u) under the mixed comprehensive development at Site B, the PR of Sub-area (2) for GIC and POS provision was 0.5 whereas development would be concentrated at Sub-area (1) at a maximum PR of 9;

Adverse Impacts on Flower Market

Major Grounds/Views

- (v) the proposed redevelopment would destroy the integrity and vibrant ambience of the Flower Market, resulting in a loss of its unique character and established community network. Replacing the traditional Flower Market with shopping malls would not favour the development of Hong Kong's

tourism and economy;

- (w) re-establishment of the Flower Market should be undertaken by way of “replacing the bazaar by bazaar” (以墟換墟);
- (x) the flower business had not generated significant traffic impact as the logistics arrangements were usually conducted during non-peak hours;
- (y) the proposed back lane revitalisation had neglected the operational needs of retail businesses as the back lanes served as temporary storage areas and resting spaces for workers;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (z) the DSP had struck a balance between the need for redevelopment and minimising the impact on the Flower Market, affecting only 26% of existing operators and 19% of the total gross floor area (GFA) of existing flower shops;
- (aa) ground-floor retail shop frontage would be established at Site A1 and Site B, creating additional spaces for retail activities and facilitating the further expansion of the Flower Market precinct. Those at Site B would be available at an earlier stage for the reprovisioning of the affected businesses in Site A. Open-air space outside the shops would allow for the display of flowers and outdoor florist-related activities;
- (bb) URA would assist in identifying suitable premises to enable affected shop operators to relocate and continue operation in the same district as far as practicable. URA would also continue to engage business operators to better understand their operational needs for incorporation into the detailed design of the development, where appropriate;

Tin Chuen Church (天泉堂)

Major Grounds/Views

- (cc) Tin Chuen Church, located at 225-227 Sai Yee Street since 1950s, was deep-rooted in the community and had been providing social services and charitable activities to the local community. Relocating the church might deprive the grassroots of the opportunities to seek and receive assistance;
- (dd) there had been a lack of proper consultation and the Social Impact Assessment conducted by URA had underestimated the contributions of Tin Chuen Church;
- (ee) the premises occupied by the church were owned by Tin Chuen Church. A special re-provisioning arrangement, including financial support, was requested for the church to relocate with the same area and continue its services within the Flower Market area;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (ff) according to the Notes of the DSP, 'Religious Institution' was always permitted in the non-residential portion of the future development;
- (gg) 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. URA would offer an owner of the property, including Tin Chuen Church, the market value of the affected property plus relevant ex-gratia allowances;
- (hh) at the request of Tin Chuen Church, URA had been searching for vacant units in the neighbourhood for its replacement. The non-domestic commercial portion of the proposed redevelopment 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. URA pledged to proactively assist the church in identifying suitable premises for its relocation in the nearby area

upon request;

GIC Facilities/Waterway Park at Site B

Major Grounds/Views

- (ii) the proposed redevelopment would disrupt the provision of sports and recreational facilities for a long time during the construction period without appropriate transitional arrangements;
- (jj) the proposed design of the Waterway Park deviated from the original proposal under YMDS, which was not a revitalised water channel and would reduce the POS;

Response from Government B/Ds/URA

- (kk) URA was liaising with LCSD on the transitional arrangements for the affected sports and recreational facilities during the construction stage, including the provision of an alternative sports venue;
- (ll) the water in the decked nullah contained a large amount of pollutants, microbes and strong odour-causing chemicals. For the sake of public hygiene and environmental safety, water features would be provided above and/or along the decked nullah. Re-opening of the decked nullah remained a long-term vision as stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the DSP;

Traffic Issue

Major Grounds/Views

- (mm) traffic was busy in the Flower Market, and there were vehicle-pedestrian conflicts. Traffic would be adversely affected by the proposed redevelopment and during construction;

Responses from Government B/Ds/URA

- (nn) the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted had confirmed no adverse traffic impact on the local area with implementation of proposed improvement works, such as widening of signalised crossings at Prince Edward Road West and Sai Yee Street, and widening of footpath at Playing Field Road;
- (oo) a PVP and its underground pedestrian connection with the Flower Market Road were proposed at Site B;
- (pp) three potential pedestrian connections would be explored, including (i) between Sites A1 and B; (ii) from Site A1 towards Nathan Road/MTR Prince Edward Station; and (iii) between Site B and Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground;
- (qq) construction TIA would be conducted during the implementation stage;

Inadequate Consultation

Major Grounds/Views

- (rr) the public and stakeholders were not fully consulted as details of the proposal were not provided, and the survey conducted was not genuine; and

Response from Government B/Ds/URA

- (ss) in addition to the previous meetings held with stakeholders, URA would continue to engage stakeholders to better understand and address their concerns.

6. The Chairperson thanked the Secretary for her presentation and invited Members' views on the consideration of the representations. The Secretary reported that a few Members who had attended the hearing sessions but were not able to attend the deliberation session had conveyed

their views on the DSP.

7. While noting the strategic location of the project in YMDS, a Member expressed not supporting the DSP. The Member was concerned that URA had not fully addressed the concerns of the representations received, such as the impact brought by the proposed redevelopment on residents, shop operators and Tin Chuen Church. Clarification regarding the visual permeability of the Waterway Park, functions of the “Urban Waterway” and future management of the public space was lacking. It was not convincing to justify the redevelopment of Prince Edward Building simply because the lift lobby was accessible only via a stairway, which posed difficulties for the elderly residents. It would be futile to revitalise the back lanes as the “Third Street” of the Flower Market unless they were widened. URA should conduct extensive consultation, revise the design and seek practical solutions to address the concerns raised by representers.

8. The vast majority of Members supported the DSP and agreed that the proposed redevelopment should proceed. With a view to honing the proposal from planning to execution, Members had the following views and suggestions:

General

- (a) the hearing sessions were fruitful, which enabled the project proponent, the representers and Members to exchange views and comments on the proposed redevelopment. During the hearing sessions, most representations were not substantiated on the concept, layout, development parameters and technical feasibility of the proposal or DSP. Some representers, who were not residents, attended the meeting to support the redevelopment. This third-party endorsement of the proposal was encouraging;
- (b) the engagement conducted and the responses given by URA were generally considered inadequate. Instead of unveiling the details in a piecemeal manner upon enquiry, URA should provide more information and a holistic overview of the redevelopment and restructuring of the Flower Market area. More efforts were required to re-imagine the cultural landmark of the project. The operation details and needs of the flower shops should be thoroughly and carefully considered to ensure better relocation arrangements. For instance,

the design of indoor and outdoor spaces could allow the display of tall plants. A participatory approach should be adopted to engage the residents and shop operators to reach consensus on how to run the Flower Market after redevelopment. Continuous engagement would be key to maintaining the unique character and ambience of the Flower Market. Given that the proposed redevelopment might take more than 10 years to complete, URA should consider expediting the implementation programme to minimise disruption;

The DSP

- (c) the hearing sessions focused on 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.), Prince Edward Building and the large proportion of government land included but the essence of the DSP should be the Waterway Park and the restructuring of GIC facilities at Site B. To avert the impression of demolishing and redeveloping the entire Flower Market, the project should be renamed and repackaged to emphasise the vision of the Waterway Park and Site B;
- (d) by allowing the development potential of smaller and isolated sites (i.e. Sites A2 to A5) to be transferred to the larger and more strategically located site (i.e. Site A1), the “link-site” approach would optimise land use. Achieving SSMU at Site B would provide sizable POS with more space for expansion of the Flower Market and upgraded and new GIC facilities to meet the district needs. Besides, provision of a PVP with about 220 public car parking spaces and L/UL facilities would help address the existing traffic issues. Through comprehensive restructuring, the proposed layout and design would improve the overall traffic flow and pedestrian environment in the vicinity;

Waterway Park

- (e) the current design of the Waterway Park in the form of a thin water body over the decked nullah weathered the original concept of a genuine “Urban Waterway” advocated under YMDS. While it remained uncertain when the nullah could be uncovered, the long-term vision of opening up the nullah and revitalising it as part of the Waterway Park should be properly documented.

As suggested by some representers, flowers, a vital element in the Flower Market, to be connected with water could be the theme of the Waterway Park. Beyond a flower appreciation hotspot, both components constituted a colourful landscape and appealing environment for public enjoyment and various seasonal events;

- (f) to safeguard public hygiene and address environmental safety concerns, the current design of the Waterway Park incorporated appropriate water features along the decked nullah alignment, which would not preclude the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah. Should the water quality problem be resolved, the concrete deck covering the nullah could be removed in future. Sewer misconnection upstream was illegal and should be tackled. The offensive odour and waste water were also discharged at the outlet at the Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter, making poor water quality with odour in the typhoon shelter. Relevant government departments were urged to allocate more resources to improve the water quality of the nullah as early as possible. This would be beneficial to the future redevelopment of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway DN in the district as the nullah was located in the central part of the urban area. Positive impact on the water quality of Victoria Harbour would also be envisaged;

- (g) the current design of the Waterway Park was considered satisfactory if public space would be featured for photo-taking, recreation and resting. It did not matter whether the Waterway Park would be in the form of either water features above the decked nullah or a revitalised water channel by uncovering the nullah. The ample space unleashed at Site B should embrace a design with built-in characteristics of the Flower Market so that the new (i.e. Site B) and the old (i.e. the Flower Market) could be blended with enriched local character. The Waterway Park, the proposed low-rise retail shops and the Flower Market should be managed in a coherent manner. They should be designed to form a larger bazaar to recall the history of the Flower Market. The outdoor open-air space might accommodate more flower stalls and cultural and creative activities, serving as an extension of the shop frontage. Streetscape improvement and building rehabilitation works in the neighbourhood should embrace the same

spirit of the bazaar. Bringing out the historical values of the nullah and the Flower Market at Site B would forge a landmark destination in the district. It could become a new tourist spot with appeal to both locals and visitors;

Pedestrian Connection

- (h) to enhance the accessibility of the Flower Market, a possible footbridge connecting Site B with Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground in the north, and a possible subway across Sai Yee Street in the west would be explored subject to further study with reference to the underground facilities and pedestrians' preferences. These connections, especially the linkage with Prince Edward Station, were considered crucial for crowd dispersal and necessitated early implementation;
- (i) the sports facilities at Boundary Street Recreation Ground and Boundary Street Sports Centre No. 1 and No. 2 might be closed for several years. Interim linkages should be provided to facilitate local residents' access to alternative facilities such as Tai Hang Tung Recreation Ground during this period;

Revitalisation of Back Lanes

- (j) the back lanes were narrow and mainly used for back-of-house operation of flower shops. If the revitalisation works were confined to such a small area, the impact would be negligible. It was recommended to extend the streetscape improvement works to the surrounding areas, including Flower Market Road and Yuen Ngai Street. Improvements such as repaving pavements, installing street furniture, painting façades, special design for railings and creating photographic icons outside the DSP would generate synergy effect. URA was encouraged to engage the community in the back lane revitalisation, which could be carried out before redevelopment to build trust and foster better relationships. The costs would not be too high and the benefits from the proposed improvement works could be realised within a shorter timeframe;

Flower Market

- (k) some Members had visited the Flower Market recently and shared their observations. The Flower Market was not confined to Flower Market Road but extended to its surrounding areas. Since the proposed redevelopment at Site A occupied only a minor portion of the Flower Market, the ambience of the Flower Market would not be significantly affected. The cultural characteristics and operational routines of the Flower Market along Flower Market Road and corresponding part of Prince Edward Road West would be retained. Most of the flower shops operated within the premises, and only the open area at the southern triangular portion of Site A1 gave an impression of a bazaar. Although the roads outside the shops were designated as restricted zones 24 hours daily, they were frequently used for passenger drop-offs and loading or unloading of goods by the flower shops;
- (l) as a place of history, culture and commerce, the proposed redevelopment involving the Flower Market was bound to be controversial. After years of growth, the infrastructure had inevitably become outdated and required amelioration. For instance, Tsukiji Market (築地市場) was relocated to Toyosu Market (豊洲市場) in Tokyo in 2018. Until now, there were still opinions that Toyosu Market had lost the market ambience of Tsukiji Market but the fishmongers considered it a significant improvement in facilities and overall environment of the market. URA's proposal for an in-situ expansion of the Flower Market was considered a more favourable option than relocating the market elsewhere. Proper implementation by URA would be vital. URA should make reference to the successful examples of Shanghai Xintiandi (上海新天地) and Foshan Xintiandi (嶺南天地), which exemplified the blending of old and new. It was essential to retain the ambience of the existing Flower Market after redevelopment. While the number of flower shops affected was limited, efforts should be made to minimise the impact on the Flower Market during construction. The survival of the Flower Market in its bazaar style throughout the redevelopment process should be maintained

- (m) the rendering of the artist's impression of the retail frontage design along Sai Yee Street in Drawing H-13 of TPB Paper No. 10991 (the Paper) depicted a flower mall enclosed by glass windows. To address the concerns on the design, URA was advised to espouse the co-existence of old and new markets in this highly urbanised area. A design that combined both traditional and modern elements could help to preserve the ambience of the Flower Market. Areas outside the shop frontages could be utilised for outdoor flower stalls and various activities so as to enhance the vibrancy of the market. The development agreement between URA and the developer should ensure affordable rents for flower shop operators and event organisers. Interim arrangements such as reprovisioning of shops from Site A1 to Site B should be implemented to facilitate smooth transitional operation and maintain the robustness of the businesses;

Prince Edward Building at Site A1

- (n) the main area of the Flower Market concentrated at Flower Market Road and the corresponding part of Prince Edward Road West. The flower shops on the ground floor of Prince Edward Building represented a relatively minor portion of the whole Flower Market. Some representers highlighted that the open area outside Prince Edward Building was suitable for wholesale business of tall plants. Such operation could potentially be relocated to other premises with high floor height in the area. Historically, the Flower Market had previously operated without the open area retail shops outside Prince Edward Building. There were no sufficient justifications to accentuate the importance of those flower shops as they might be operated by one or two owners with vested interests. Whether the area around Prince Edward Building was the most flourishing part of the Flower Market and seen as the front part at the entrance of the Flower Market (龍頭) as claimed by some representers was debatable;
- (o) on one hand, the flower shops on the ground floor of Prince Edward Building were frequented by visitors, which appeared to be the most vibrant part at the entrance of the Flower Market. On the other hand, the other end of the Flower Market was accessible through a pedestrian footbridge and a shopping mall and

hotel linking to MTR Mong Kok East Station. The entrance of the Flower Market would depend on where to enter the market. Visitors might park at MOKO or ride the train to the Mong Kok East Station and walk to the Flower Market from the east through Flower Market Road or ride to the Prince Edward Station and enter the market from the west at Prince Edward Building. There was no specific part of the Flower Market officially designated as the front/entrance (龍頭) or rear (龍尾);

- (p) while Prince Edward Building itself did not have conflict with the “Urban Waterway” having regard to its building layout with an open area in the west, it was generally agreed that the location of Prince Edward Building was strategic as part of the “Urban Waterway” under YMDS, which formed an essential part of Site A1 in the project. There would also be a possible subway across Sai Yee Street connecting with Site B, which was planned to extend towards Prince Edward Station. Should Prince Edward Building be excluded from the DSP, the framework recommended under YMDS could no longer be implemented. Upon redevelopment, URA should keep the flower shop frontage and the bazaar-like ambience at the open area at the southern triangular portion of Site A1, serving as a gateway with its appeal to the patronage of the Flower Market;
- (q) it was not unreasonable to redevelop the Prince Edward Building with an age of 64 years. Based on URA’s freezing survey, about 44% of residents supported the DSP. Also, acknowledging that elderly households preferred redevelopment, URA should pursue the proposal to meet the expectation of the residents;

38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.)

- (r) judging from the appearance in photos, the external building condition of 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) did not appear to be severely run-down. URA, in consultation with the property owners, was in a better position to consider and decide whether or when to redevelop the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) instead of incorporating them into the DSP at this

junction. Although its redevelopment could be left to private developers due to the larger site area, maintaining the building condition by rehabilitation could suffice for the time being. If the buildings continued to deteriorate and were not acquired by the private sector eventually, URA, with its ongoing commitment, would have both statutory and moral obligations to take up the redevelopment of the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) for urban renewal in the area. Noting that the buildings at 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) were of similar age as those at Sites A2 to A5, while it might not be appropriate to include them in the DSP for various reasons, URA was advised to reconsider redeveloping 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in its future project, as appropriate;

Tin Chuen Church

- (s) the main concerns of Tin Chuen Church was not planning-related. Noting that URA intended not to sell the non-domestic commercial portion of the future development, the church could choose to rent the premises at Site A1 or Site B if considered appropriate. URA had a special policy for the church in respect of compensation. It was not anticipated that the church would have great difficulties in searching for replacement premises of 670m² in Mong Kok under the current market condition after receiving compensation. URA was advised to maintain communication with the church on relocation matters; and

Other

- (t) in view of the current economic situation, the office market might remain stagnant in the coming few years. Considering that a commercial tower was proposed at Site B in the notional scheme, URA was advised to exercise caution in planning the development in order to avoid any negative impact on the project funding.

Conclusion

9. The Chairperson concluded that the majority of Members were in support of the DSP

and agreed that it should not be amended to meet the representations. All the grounds of the representations had been addressed by the responses from government B/Ds and URA as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentation and responses made by the government representatives and URA's representatives at the hearing.

10. Noting Members' views and concerns, the Chairperson recommended that the following comments be conveyed to URA or relevant departments for consideration and follow-up as appropriate:

- (a) in the subsequent implementation of the DSP project, URA should consider integrating the themes of "flowers" and "water" in the design of the Waterway Park. In addition, URA should consider blending old and new, as well as flowers and water, in the design concept and layout, and promoting co-ordinated management of the proposed redevelopment;
- (b) taking into account the building age and "three-nil" building status as well as other relevant considerations, URA was strongly suggested to seriously consider including 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) in its future project. As 38-48 Flower Market Road (even nos.) was zoned "OU(MU)" on the Mong Kok OZP, the redevelopment could be taken forward without the need for rezoning;
- (c) URA should consider maintaining the bazaar style of the open area at the southern triangular portion of Site A1 for flower shop operation upon redevelopment;
- (d) to align with a shared vision between the Government and URA, amendments to the ES to clearly reflect the long-term vision of opening up the nullah and revitalising it as part of the Waterway Park subject to improvement in water quality had already been made as agreed by the Board when considering the draft DSP in July 2024. Relevant government departments, including the Environmental Protection Department and the Drainage Services Department, should be requested to consider allocating resources to improve the water quality of the nullah leading to the Waterway Park so that the vision of removing the deck and re-opening the nullah within the Waterway Park could be

materialised in the future;

- (e) an early implementation of the proposed pedestrian connections to enhance the accessibility and vitality of the Flower Market should be critically considered;
- (f) there were uncertainties regarding the effectiveness of the proposed revitalisation of the back lanes. URA should attempt to broaden the revitalisation works to other areas outside the DSP for an impactful effect of the revitalisation;
- (g) given fluctuations in the property market, URA should consider carefully the proportion of the commercial component at Site B; and
- (h) the public engagement conducted by URA so far was perceived as inadequate by the relevant stakeholders. URA ought to strengthen the engagement approach and enhance exchange with the residents, shop operators and other community stakeholders so that their views could be solicited throughout the redevelopment process for the success of the project with the local character and ambience of the Flower Market maintained.

11. Accordingly, the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) would write to URA and relevant government departments requesting them to take note of Members' concerns and suggestions.

12. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the supportive views of **R1(part), R2 to R18, R19(part), R20, R21, R22(part), R23(part), R24, R25(part), R26, R27(part), R28, R29(part), R30(part), R31 to R35, R36(part) to R38(part), R39 to R59, R60(part), R61(part) and R62 to R83**, and views provided by **R730 to R732, R735, R742, R746, R749, R756, R758 and R759**.

13. The Board decided not to uphold **R1(part), R19(part), R22(part), R23(part), R25(part), R27(part), R29(part), R30(part), R36(part) to R38(part), R60(part), R61(part), R84 to R729, R733, R734, R736 to R741, R743 to R745, R747, R748, R750 to R755, R757 and R760 to R767**, and considered that the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Sai Yee Street/Flower

Market Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA5/1 (the DSP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) the DSP is prepared to facilitate the first project of the Nullah Road Urban Waterway Development Node to be implemented by URA as part of the restructuring and re-planning of the area under Master Urban Renewal Concept Plan of District Study for Yau Ma Tei and Mong Kok (YMDS). The DSP has included Sites A1 to A5 involving various aged buildings with unsatisfactory conditions to facilitate their redevelopment. The “linked-site” approach is adopted in Sites A1 to A5 to allow for the provision of at-grade public open space (POS) and low-rise retail facilities therein while maximising the development potential. Redevelopment of Site B has adopted the “Single Site, Multiple Use” model for a mixed comprehensive development to optimise its development potential, to provide a sizable Waterway Park, and to re-provision the existing government, institution or community (GIC) facilities with upgraded standards along with additional facilities. The DSP is considered appropriate to facilitate the comprehensive redevelopment of the concerned areas. There is no strong justification to revise the DSP boundary;
- (b) a number of measures have been proposed under the DSP project to preserve and enhance the distinctive character of the Flower Market, including the retail shops along Sai Yee Street and Flower Market Road. The DSP project has struck a balance between meeting redevelopment needs and minimising disruption to the Flower Market operation;
- (c) to realise the “Park n’ Walk” concept under YMDS, an underground public vehicle park will be provided within Site B with underground connection to the southern part of the Waterway Park and other improvements to pedestrian facilities as an integral part of the DSP for improving walkability and connectivity. Other separate initiatives including beautification works and potential pedestrian connections are also proposed for further exploration to upgrade the pedestrian environment and enhance connectivity with the surroundings;

- (d) the currently proposed design for the Waterway Park is a prudent and practical solution, taking into account environmental hygiene and the vision of realising the waterway landscape concept under YMDS. As specified under the Explanatory Statement of the DSP, the design of the proposed Waterway Park should not preclude the possibility of re-opening the decked nullah, which remains a long-term vision of the DSP;
- (e) with the adoption of various urban design proposals including staggered building heights and wind enhancement measures, adverse visual and air ventilation impacts are not anticipated. All the Old and Valuable Trees, Stone Wall Trees and mature trees will be retained, and relevant Government guidelines and technical circulars will be complied with for tree preservation and compensation;
- (f) as compared with the existing POS affected by the DSP, there is a net increase in POS of about 1,185m² under the DSP. As for the proposed GIC facilities, their total gross floor area is more than three times the GFA of the existing provision for meeting community needs. URA will explore ways in liaison with the relevant bureaux/departments to minimise adverse impacts on the provision of GIC facilities;
- (g) relevant technical assessments have been submitted by URA to demonstrate the technical feasibility of the proposed development, and no insurmountable problems from traffic, environmental and drainage perspectives are anticipated. Relevant legislations, government requirements and guidelines will be observed by URA during implementation; and
- (h) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the DSP have been duly followed. While compensation and rehousing/relocation arrangements fall outside the scope of the DSP and the jurisdictions of the Board, URA will continue to engage local stakeholders and residents on the redevelopment, and will provide necessary assistance to the affected shop operators and community institutions as appropriate.”

14. The Board agreed that the DSP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, were suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

15. The Secretary reminded Members that according to the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29C, the Board's decision on the DSP upon hearing of representations would be kept confidential for 3 to 4 weeks after the meeting.

16. The meeting was closed at 5:30 p.m.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan and Mr Derrick S.M. Yip joined, and the Vice-chairperson left this session of the meeting during deliberation.]