

# TOWN PLANNING BOARD

TPB Paper No. 10605

For Consideration by  
the Town Planning Board on 22.11.2019

**DRAFT URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY KAI TAK ROAD/SA PO ROAD  
DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN NO. S/K10/URA1/1**

**INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT  
FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS**

**DRAFT URBAN RENEWAL AUTHORITY KAI TAK ROAD/SA PO ROAD  
DEVELOPMENT SCHEME PLAN NO. S/K10/URA1/1**

**INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT  
FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS**

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 On 5.7.2019, the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K10/URA1/1 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) (**Plan P-1**). The development scheme area, originally partly zoned “Residential (Group A)2” (“R(A)2”) and partly an area shown as ‘Road’ on the Approved Ma Tau Kok Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K10/24, was excised from the OZP and designated as “R(A)” on the DSP (the Site) with the stipulation of a building height restriction (BHR) of 120mPD<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 URA proposed a high-density residential development with provision of a sunken plaza connecting to Kai Tak Development Area, an underground public vehicle park and commercial uses on lower floors of the development at the Site. The “R(A)” zone is subject to the same domestic and total plot ratio (PR) restrictions for the original “R(A)2” zone under the OZP, i.e. maximum PR of 9 for a building that is partly domestic and partly non-domestic and PR of domestic part not exceeding 7.5. According to the Notes of the “R(A)” zone under the DSP, an underground public vehicle park shall be provided as required by the Government. The Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) of the Plan is at **Annex I**.
- 1.3 The draft Ma Tau Kok OZP No. S/K10/25 incorporating the excision of the DSP area from the OZP was also exhibited on 7.5.2019 and the hearing arrangements for consideration of the representations and comments in relation to the OZP will be considered by the Town Planning Board (the Board) at the same meeting (TPB Paper No. 10604).
- 1.4 During the two-month exhibition period of the draft DSP, a total of 90 representations were received. On 5.10.2019, the representations were published for three weeks for public comments and 14 comments were received. Amongst them, 11 comments were made in accordance with the revised requirements set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B (TPB PG-No. 29B)<sup>2</sup> by providing the full name as shown on the

---

<sup>1</sup> “R(A)2” sites under the OZP are subject to BHR of 80mPD as stipulate on the OZP, while sites with an area of 400m<sup>2</sup> or more are subject to a BHR of 100mPD as stipulated in the Notes.

<sup>2</sup> According to TPB PG-No. 29B on Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance, which have taken effect since 1.1.2019, representers/commenters/further representers and their authorized agents are required to provide their full name as shown on the HKID card/passport and their HKID card/passport number (only the first four alphanumeric characters are required) in the submission. For submission with no full name, incomplete and/or illegible names or no HKID

Hong Kong Identity (HKID) card/passport and the first four alphanumeric characters of HKID card/passport number. Three submissions were made without providing the required identity information, and were treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance.

- 1.5 One of the 11 comments (**Annex VI**) is neither related to any of the representations nor amendments to the Plan, as such, the Board is invited to consider whether the comment is invalid pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance.
- 1.6 The list of valid representers and commenters and the summaries of the representations and comments are shown at **Annexes II, III, IV** and **V** respectively and the location of the representation sites is shown on **Plan P-2**.

## **2. The Representations and Comments**

- 2.1 The 90 representations include 20 supporting representations, 66 adverse representations, and 4 expressing concerns. Their views are briefly summarized as follows:

### Supporting (20)

- 2.2 The 20 supporting representations (**R1** to **R20**) were submitted by a Kowloon City District Council (KCDC) member of Lung Shing Constituency and 19 individuals. They are mainly on the grounds that the redevelopment would improve the living environment, address illegal parking and local traffic congestion through the provision of car park, provide retail shops, public space/facilities and greenery, address housing needs, and enhance connectivity with Kai Tak Development and surroundings areas. Some representers also propose to enlarge the boundary of the DSP and provide more carparking spaces and social facilities.

### Adverse (66)

- 2.3 The 66 adverse comments<sup>3</sup> (**R21** to **R86**) were submitted by a concern group (舊區街坊自主促進組), the chairperson of the Thai Migrant Workers Union and 64 individuals. Among them, 65 representations are submitted in four standard formats, and 18 of them also provide additional comments and proposals. The major grounds of objection are mainly related to (i) adverse impacts of the redevelopment plan; (ii) unsatisfactory resettlement/relocation and compensation arrangements for residents, business operators, workers and organisations; (iii) destruction of local character and social network, in particular for the Thai community; (iv) problems in freezing survey and absence of consultation documents in Thai and other languages. Some representers provided suggestions to (i) alleviate the adverse impacts of the redevelopment; (ii) redo the freezing survey accurately and provide translation of consultation documents in Thai and other languages; and (iii) provide social facilities.

---

card/passport number, the representation/comment/further representation concerned may be treated as not having been made.

<sup>3</sup> Seven representers (**R67** to **R73**) attached a submission written in Thai.

### Providing views (4)

- 2.4 Four representations (**R87** to **R90**) provided views. Among them, three representations (**R87** to **R89**) submitted by Christian Oi Hip Fellowship (基督教愛協團契), Kwok Fan Yeung Virture-Promoting Association, Hong Kong Limited (香港郭汾陽崇德總會有限公司) and one individual are related to the concerns on the redevelopment plan as it would affect the operation of and/or services provided by the concerned organizations. Besides, one representation (**R90**) submitted by an individual is related to the concerns on the provision of open space, pedestrian and community facilities in the area.
- 2.5 There are ten valid comments. **C1** submitted by URA responses to all representations (**R1** to **R90**). **C5**, with 194 signatures enclosed, is submitted by **R1** mainly requesting the extension of DSP boundary, expediting urban renewal and provision of community facilities. **C9** submitted by an individual provides comments to preserve the social network of Thai community. The other comments mainly provide views on provision of community facilities and carparking spaces, support the redevelopment and/or raise concerns on compensation and rehousing.

## **3. Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments**

- 3.1 Under section 2A of the Ordinance, the Board is empowered to appoint a Representation Hearing Committee (RHC) from among its members to consider representations and comments, propose amendments to the Plan to meet/partially meet representations, consider further representations in respect of the proposed amendments, and consider whether to vary the proposed amendments upon consideration of any adverse further representations. Since only 90 representations and 10 valid comments were received and most are of similar nature, it is considered more efficient for the full Board to consider the representations and comments without resorting to the appointment of a RHC. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. The arrangement would not delay the completion of the representation consideration process.
- 3.2 Under section 6B(6) of the Ordinance, the Board may determine whether the representation and the related comments shall be considered at the same meeting and whether they shall be considered individually or collectively. As the representations and comments are related to similar concerns on the impacts of the redevelopment plan as highlighted above, it is suggested to consider the representations and comments collectively.
- 3.3 To ensure the efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled in January 2020.

## **4. Decision Sought**

- 4.1 The Board is invited to note pursuant to sections 6A(2) and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance that three comments on representations without the required identity information as

mentioned in paragraph 1.4 is treated as not having been made.

4.2 The Board is invited to consider whether:

- (a) the comment at **Annex VI** as mentioned in paragraph 1.5 is invalid pursuant to sections 6(A)2 and 6A(3)(b) of the Ordinance;
- (b) to appoint a RHC for consideration of the representations and comments; and
- (c) the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraph 3 above.

## 5. Attachments

<b>Annex I</b>	Notes and ES of the draft URA Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road DSP No. S/K10/URA1/1
<b>Annex II</b>	List of the Representers (R1 to R90)
<b>Annex III</b>	List of the Commenters (C1 to C10)
<b>Annex IV</b>	Summary of the Representations
<b>Annex V</b>	Summary of the Comments on Representations
<b>Annex VI</b>	Comment on Representation for consideration on validity
<b>Plan P-1</b>	Draft Urban Renewal Authority Kai Tak Road/Sa Po Road Development Scheme Plan No. S/K10/URA1/1
<b>Plan P-2</b>	Location Plan of the Representation Sites