

HONG KONG TOWN PLANNING BOARD

CONFIDENTIAL

(downgraded on 5.1.2007)

**Minutes of 873rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 8 December 2006**

Agenda Item 7

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only).]

Draft Urban Renewal Authority Stone Nullah Lane/Hing Wan Street/
King Sing Street Development Scheme Plan No. S/H5/URA2/1
Consideration of Representations No. TPB/R/S/H5/URA2/1-1 to 53 and
Comments No. TPB/R/S/H5/URA2/1-C1 to C4
(TPB Paper No. 7724)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Secretary said that as the subject Development Scheme Plan (DSP) was prepared by and one of the comments on representations was submitted by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA), the following Members had declared interests in this item:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Mrs. Ava Ng as the Director of Planning | - being a non-executive director of URA who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau as the Director of Lands | - being a non-executive director of URA who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Ms. Margaret Hsia as the Assistant Director (2) of Home Affairs Department | - Being a co-opt member of the Planning, Development and Conservation Committee of URA who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Mr. Walter K.L. Chan | - being a non-executive director of URA who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Mr. Y.K. Cheng | - being a member of HK Housing Society (HKHS) who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim | - having current business dealings with URA and HKHS who submitted Comment No. 4 |
| Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong | - having current business dealings with URA who |

submitted Comment No. 4

[Mr. Michael K.C. Lai](#)

- being an ex-member of URA who also submitted Comment No. 4 having connection with St James Settlement who was the representer of Representations No. 45 and 48

2. The Secretary informed Members that Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong, Mr. Walter K.L. Chan, Mr. Michael K.C. Lai, Mr. Y.K. Cheng, Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim and Ms. Margaret Hsia had declared interests in this item and tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members noted that Mrs. Ava Ng and Mr. Patrick L.C. Lau had already left the meeting.

3. Mr. B.W. Chan informed the meeting that he was a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS who was one of the commenters for Comment C4. Members considered that his interest in this item was indirect and agreed to allow him to hear the presentation but he should not be allowed to express any views or participate in the deliberation session.

4. The Chairperson said that on 21.7.2006, the draft DSP No. S/H5/URA2/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 53 valid representations were received during the 2-month exhibition period and 4 comments were received during the 3-week publication of the representations. As the representations were similar in nature, the Board had agreed to hear them collectively.

Presentation and Question Session

5. [Ms. Christine Tse, District Planning Officer/Hong Kong \(DPO/HK\)](#) of Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting. The following representers, [commenters](#) and [their](#) representatives were also invited to the meeting:

Representation No. 1

H15 Concern Group

Representer

Mr. Tsui Yik-yiu

)

Mr. Chow Chun-yam

)

Mr. Lee Wai-yi

) Representer's Representatives

Mr Tse Pak-chai

)

Mr. Ng Kam-chiu

)

Mrs. Kim Fok Lai-jing)

Representation No. 9

Mr. Siu Yu-kwan)
Representer

Representations No. 14 and 45

The Management Committee of the Community)
Economy Project, St. James Settlement

Ms. Wong Sau-ping)
Representer's Representative

Representation No. 26

Miss Wong Ka-ling)
Representer

Representation No. 29

Ms. Fung Pui-see, Stephanie)
Representer

Representation No. 31

Mr. Sham Hok-man, Desmond)
Representer

Representation No. 33

The Group for Preservation of Blue Houses)
Community

Mr. Tse Kam-wing)

Mr. Lau Hung-kuen)

Ms. Huen Sze-mui)

Ms. Wong Sau-ping)
Representer's Representatives

Ms. Lee Tsui-mei)

Mr. Chan Tat-yi)

Mr. Lam Kwok-wai)

Dr. Szeto May)

Dr. Chen Yun-chung)

Mr. Tse Pak-chai)

Ms. See Pui-fung, Stephanie)

Mr. Siu Yu-kwan)

Mr. Yip Chi-fai)

Mr. Lai Ka-chun)

Representation No. 34

People's Democracy Fund) Representer

Dr. Szeto May, Mirana) Representer's Representative

Representation No. 35

Community Culture Concern) Representer

Dr. Chen Yun-chung) Representer's Representative

Representation No. 38

Ms. Huen Sze-mui) Representer

Representation No. 42

Miss Tai Yi-lin) Representer

Representation No. 43

Working Group on Heritage Conservation and) Representer
Cultural and Leisure Activities of the Cultural and
Leisure Services Committee, Wan Chai District
Council

Ms. Wong Ying-kay, Ada, JP) Representer's representatives

Miss King Mary Ann Pui-wai)

Representations No. 46

Miss Lee Wai-yi, Livina) Representer

Representation No. 47

Members of a Community Economy Project) Representer

Ms. Cheng Shuk-jing)

Ms. Leung York-wai) Representer's Representatives

Ms. Wong Shun-fan)

Representation No. 48

The Wan Chai Livelihood Museum, St. James

Settlement

Mr. Cheung Hei-ming)
Mr. Chan Kam-shing)
Mr. Chan Tat-yi)
Mr. Ng Kam-chiu)
Mr. Liu Ka-yi)
Ms. Leung Lai-yin)
Ms. Chow Hei-shuen)

) Representers' Representatives

Representation No. 49

Mr. Yeung Kin-bun	Representer
-------------------	-------------

Representations No. 50 and 51

Miss Lee Wai-yi, Livina	Representers' Representative
-------------------------	------------------------------

Comments No. C2 and C4

Comment No. C2

Mr. Lai Ka-chun	Commenter
Mr. Lam Kwok-wai)
Mr. Lau Hung-kuen)
Ms. Huen Sze-mui)
Ms. Wong Sau-ping)
Ms. Lee Tsui-mei)
Mr. Tse Kam-wing)
Mr. Chan Tat-yi)
Mr. Cheung Hei-ming)
Mr. Chan Kam-shing)
Ms. Chan Ka-yi)
Mr. Ng Kam-chiu)
Mr. Yip Chi-fai)
Mr. Liu Ka-yi)
Ms. Leung Lai-yin)
Ms. Chow Hei-shuen)
Mr. Tsui Yik-yiu)
Ms. See Pui-fung, Stephanie)

) Commenters' Representatives

Mr. Siu Yu-kwan)
Mr. Tse Pak-chai)

Comment No. C4

Urban Renewal Authority) Commenter
Hong Kong Housing Society)
Mr. Daniel Lau)
Mr. Francis Law) Commenter's Representatives
Mr. C.H. Pang)
Mr. Michael Ma)

6. The Chairperson noted that sufficient notice had been given to the remaining representers and commenters but they had either indicated that they would not attend and be represented at the hearing or had no reply. The Chairperson suggested and Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the remaining representers and commenters.

7. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation , Ms. Christine Tse did so as detailed in Paper No. 7724 and made the following main points:

- (a) the background and need for the preparation of the Plan under section 5 of the Urban Renewal Authority Ordinance were detailed in paragraph 4 of the Paper;
- (b) subject of representations – in brief, the issues raised by representers No. 1 to 53 mainly focussed on the future land uses of the area, preservation of existing building mass, local character and community network, culture and history of the subject site which were summarized in paragraph 2 of the Paper;
- (c) grounds of representations – the grounds of representations and proposals were summarized in paragraphs 2.3 – 2.16 of the Paper;
- (d) comments – the commenters' comments on the representations were summarized in paragraphs 3.1 – 3.2 of the Paper. In brief, Comment No. C1 was in support of Representations No. 1 to 53; Comments No. C2 and C3 were in support of Representation No. 33, and Comment No. C4 was in response to Representations No. 1 to 53;

- (e) PlanD's views – based on the planning considerations and assessments as stated in paragraphs 5.6 – 5.22 of the Paper, PlanD recommended to partially meet the representations by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone but not to uphold the remaining parts of the representations.

8. The Chairperson then invited the representers and their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

Representation No. 1 (H15 Concern Group)

9. Mr. Tsui Yik-yiu of the H15 Concern Group said they supported the Group for Preservation of Blue Houses Community (BHPG).

10. Mr. Ng Kam-chiu made the following main points:

- (a) the rehousing process was too slow. For those who were willing to move, HKHS should expedite the relocation procedures. For those who preferred to stay, details of interim accommodation and renovation works and timing for moving back should be made known. URA/HKHS did not pay sufficient regard to the residents' needs and rehousing arrangements;
- (b) residents should be given a choice to remain so as to keep the social spirit of the area and achieve genuine preservation rather than just keeping the premises as empty antiques;
- (c) the residents' views should be considered in taking the detailed proposals forward; and
- (d) the Livelihood Museum, which was a recollection of the valuable historical nostalgia and the livelihood of the grass root in Hong Kong's early years, should be given a permanent site.

11. Mr. Tse Pak-chai made the following main point:

- (a) he disagreed with DPO's response as stated in paragraph 5.18 of the Paper, i.e. that preserving the social network was a rehousing issue to be addressed

by URA. The purposes of urban renewal strategy were to preserve both the social character and the social network. Without the people, their stories and daily activities within the tenement buildings, it would be meaningless to keep these hollow artefacts; and

- (b) preserving the social network should be part of the planning intention and residential uses should be included as a Column 1 use.

12. In response to the Chairperson, the representatives confirmed there was no additional presentation for Representation No. 1.

Representation No. 9

13. Mr. Siu Yu-kwan made the following main points:

- (a) he was a researcher and had participated in the project on the preservation of Stone Nullah Lane organized by the Wan Chai District Council (WCDC);
- (b) regarding planning intention, elaboration on social network was required as it represented the core of the local culture and community interaction. There was a lack of information and guidelines on how to preserve the internal features and architectural characteristics of the buildings;
- (c) as the 3 groups of buildings, i.e. the Blue House (BH) and Grey House in Stone Nullah Lane, Yellow House in Hing Wan Street and Orange House at 8 King Sing Street, together represented a cluster each symbolizing its unique architectural styles straddling different time frame, they should be taken as an integrated whole for preservation in a comprehensive manner;
- (d) regarding land use, 'Flat' should be allowed as Column 1 use to allow local residents to stay; and
- (e) according to his research, the pre-war tenements usually comprised multiple uses. URA's proposals to develop the themes of 'Tea' and 'Medicine' would only reflect a partial glimpse of the past. History was not preserved in archives as written documents alone, but also through informal oral historical account and life experiences. Hence the existing residents and

their social significance should be respected in taking forward the preservation proposals.

[Dr. Lily Chiang arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

14. Ms Wong Sau-ping, the representative for Representations No. 14 and 45, requested to change the order to allow the representatives for Representation No. 43 to make their presentation first as they had to leave early. Members acceded to the request.

Representation No. 43 (Working Group on Heritage Conservation and Cultural and Leisure Activities of the Cultural and Leisure Services Committee, Wan Chai District Council)

15. Ms. Wong Ying-kay, Ada, JP made the following main points:

- (a) Wan Chai had lost too much of its valuable heritage in the past. The community was particularly concerned when the Blue House scheme was announced as this would be their irreversible opportunity to preserve this area and no mistakes could be afforded. The use of BH had undergone evolving transformation to suit the social needs. The drastic changes brought about by URA/HKHS was not in keeping with the organic growth in the past 80 years. Planning should provide flexibility for diversified uses and enhance integration of the past and future to maintain the social network, so as to allow organic growth of the area to continue. Such requirements was also included in the Planning Brief (PB) for the H15 scheme;
- (b) including 'Flat' as a Column 2 use would allow residents to stay subject to application to the Board. It would serve the purpose better if it was a Column 1 use; and
- (c) the Blue House (BH) was different from other conservation projects, such as the Marine Police Headquarter, as it involved premises with people rather than just vacant buildings. It would be undesirable to vacate the residents to make way for other uses such as the themes of tea and medicine. Reference could be made to successful cases overseas, such the revitalization project in Coin Street of South Bank in London, which retained the lower floor of the premises for original residential uses with local souvenir shops, and turning the upper floor to prestigious restaurant to

subsidize the project.

16. Miss King Mary Ann Pui-wai made the following main points:

- (a) the community did not welcome ideas which involved drastic changes. The most treasured elements to be retained were the people and the internal building features telling the living history;
- (b) the uses of the BH reflected the changes in the social environment over time. The crucial point was how best to integrate with the existing livelihood and its surrounding uses, but not a replica of the H9 and H19 projects; and
- (c) in terms of future management, HKHS would need to allow organic growth of the area and avoid compromising future options.

[Ms. Anissa Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Representations No. 14 and 45 (The Management Committee of the Community Economy Project, St. James Settlement)

17. Ms. Wong Sau-ping tabled additional submission and made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Wan Chai, a local tourist guide for heritage trips and a representative of a group which operated a local co-op shop on the ground floor units at the Yellow House. The group was set up with the aim to enhance community building and mutual support;
- (b) as the nature of the co-op might be different to 'social welfare facility' in the schedule of uses, she proposed to include 'social and community service facility' as a Column 1 use;
- (c) what interested students, teachers and visitors most were the special features inside the tenements, such as the wooden staircase, cockloft, partitioned rooms, the way residents in the closely packed cubicles could live without kitchen and toilet. More importantly, visitors enjoyed listening to the memories of residents. Even if more visitors could be received accommodated with the vacation of BH as proposed by HKHS, it would be a pity if the residents as living history were gone;

- (d) the Orange House was part of the cluster of buildings which symbolized the different lifestyles in the evolving development of pre-war residential premises in early Hong Kong. Standing in the vacant site, one could visualize a panoramic view of all the components of the cluster. If the Orange House was demolished, one would be exposed to the unsightly highrise buildings and exposed to polluted air emitted from the surroundings. Neither would it be environmentally friendly to install expensive screening wall as visual buffer. Retaining the premises for social activities could also generate rent to subsidise the project.

18. The representative for Representation 26, Miss Wong Ka-ling, requested to change the order to allow the representatives for Representation No. 47 to make their presentation first as they had to leave early. Members acceded to the request.

Representation No. 47 (Members of a Community Economy Project)

19. Ms. Leung York-wai tabled additional submission to Members and made the following main point:

she was a helper of the second hand co-op set up under the Community Economy Project with the aim to provide community support, bridge the gap between the rich and the poor, provide sharing and encourage self upgrading. The co-op should be retained.

20. Ms. Wong Shun-fan made the following main points:

- (a) the co-op should be retained. 'Social and community service facility' should be added as a Column 1 use. History and people were equally important as there would be no future without the past and present;
- (b) the locals did not favour significant changes that would alter the social fabric of the BH area; and
- (c) the Orange House should be kept for social activities and green uses, including rooftop organic farm. Economic activities could work together with social integration.

21. Ms. Cheng Shuk-jing made the following main point:

- (a) the age of the building at 74A Stone Nullah Street in the Paper should be over 70 years instead of over 60 years, as pointed by a local resident. For the Orange House, what matter more was not the age and status of this building (whether it was graded or not), but rather it formed an integral component of the total cultural entity which justified group conservation together with other buildings within the cluster.

Representation No. 29

22. Ms. Fung Pui-see, Stephanie made the following main points:

- (a) putting 'Flat' as a Column 2 use did not address the fundamental issue in the planning framework, nor the problems facing residents and their role in the decision making process;
- (b) due to the division of responsibilities between the Board and the URA, the implementation issues were outside the ambit of the Board. While the residents were concerned about how planning would affect them, they were not sure which agency to approach, thus giving rise to anxiety on the impacts of the plans on their daily life;
- (c) as URA was entrusted with the authority to handle the people issue, there was query on how public consultation and engagement were conducted. Based on the URA's responses to the representations, the local concern were regarded as detailed planning and implementation issues to be addressed at a later stage. Local views should have been taken into account in the forefront rather than being left after decision had been made;
- (d) notwithstanding that a special committee was set up under the WCDC, without the inclusion of local stakeholders in the membership, matters would be left in the hands of decision makers who might not be familiar with the area in coming up with plans in the lack of sufficient information and thorough local engagement;

[Prof. Nora F.Y. Tam left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (e) there was a need to improve the co-ordination and communication between the Board and URA. Check and balance should be maintained to ensure

the accountability of URA in achieving the objectives of the urban renewal strategy, with due regard to public consultation. The H15 scheme had already demonstrated the lack of respect to preserving the social network; and

- (f) it should be a requirement, instead of a request, for URA to conduct proper Social Impact Assessment (SIA) to comprehensively assess the impacts to the residents affected.

23. The Chairperson noted that the representatives from URA and HKHS present in the same meeting should be fully aware of the views expressed.

Representation No. 31

24. Mr. Sham Hok-man, Desmond tabled additional submission for Members. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, he made the following main points:

- (a) it was proposed to amend the planning intention to:
 - preserve 8 King Sing Street;
 - extend the scope of preservation to cover the entire internal and external building features;
 - fulfil the preservation of social network;
 - allow cultural, community and commercial uses;
 - under the major premise of not bringing negative influence to the original residents and local community, introduce Artist-in-Resident and Local Community Histories Studio to preserve the histories of local community;

[Prof. Nora F.Y. Tam returned to join the meeting]

- (b) 'Flat' should be moved from Column 2 to Column 1 use and 'social and community service facility' should be included as a Column 1 use;
- (c) large scale tourism was not in line with conservation. Artist-in-Resident and Local Community Histories Studio could be introduced to enhance community cohesion, preserve the histories of local community and bring revenue. This could be achieved by turning vacant flats to artist residence/studios, while their work must relate and respond to the local community

hence flat for local residents was a must; and

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To, Dr. T.N. Ng and Mr. B.W. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (d) demolition of 8 King Sing Street would destroy the integrity of the scheme leaving a vacuum in the history of the area. URA's response that private residential use would restrict public appreciation of the historical buildings was unreasonable. The existing residents should be given a choice to stay.

Representation No. 33 (The Group for Preservation of Blue Houses Community) (BHPG)

25. Mr. Tse Kam-wing tabled additional submission for Members consideration. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, he made the following main points:

- (a) the Group reiterated the need to retain the entire cluster of buildings and preservation of social network should be reflected in the planning intention;

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the Blue House area was perhaps the only well-preserved pre-war clusters in Hong Kong reflecting the unique architectural styles, i.e. brick structures with balcony, high ceiling, wooden ceiling/floor and tile paving. The existing community co-ops should be retained in the Yellow House. The Orange House should not be deprived due to building age to make way for additional open space;

[Dr. T.N. Ng and Mr. B.W. Chan returned to join the meeting and Dr. James C.W. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (c) the social network of the BH area could be appreciated from 3 perspectives, namely the geographical aspect which gave an unique locational identity, human relationship that offered social ties that could not be reversed once residents were relocated; and social functions lending mutual support in the livelihood and daily interaction, especially for the old residents;
- (d) the internal/external features together with the streetscape formed a round-the-clock spatial and social interaction of the area. HS's proposals, such as tea museum, did not respect such culture but would turn the area

into dark streets at night. There was also little information on how to integrate with the existing uses, such as medicine shop, bone setters, barber and neighbouring car repair workshops, into the social fabric;

[Dr. James C.W. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (e) regarding development themes, a 'livelihood' theme was proposed for the Blue/Grey House for keeping the existing ground floor uses and upper floor for residents or as social venues; the Yellow House would be suitable for 'social enterprises' as nurturing ground for the creative sector, community resource centres, co-ops, craft shops and cultural tourism; while the Orange House was considered ideal as artist studios/exhibition venue for rental purposes. The streets/open space could serve as bazaar, street market and performing venue; and
- (f) future implementation should be on a joint-operation basis. As the renovation work had been co-ordinated by quasi government agency, future operation could be taken up by a management committee with participation of stakeholders based on a bottom-up approach, including WCDC, relevant groups and the locals. In terms of funding, donation from charity agency could be sought and the scheme was expected to be self-financing with revenue from rental, project-specific adoption and sponsorship plans; and
- (g) as the renovation of pre-war buildings was not clearly specified in the Buildings Ordinance, consideration should be given to how the current regulations could be adopted and standards met for the Blue House scheme.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

26. With the aid of some plans, Mr. Chan Tat-yi, a member of the Livelihood Museum, made the following main points:

- (a) the following suggestions should be considered by URA/HKHS in formulating the detailed plan for the project:
 - the Orange House should not be demolished;
 - the Livelihood Museum under planning should be retained to complement the role of formal museums, through display of grass

- root collections and local culture. URA should ensure ways to achieve community sustainability in its proposals;
- major tourism development generating increase in traffic and impacts on the neighbouring car repair workshops was not supported;
 - localized cultural tours could be part of the school curriculum for civic education and integrated with attractions in other parts in Wan Chai to present a comprehensive multi-dimensional package tour for visitors so as to revitalize the whole district;
 - the BH was recommended by an international artist group as a focal venue for resident artists in Hong Kong; and
- (b) it was prudent to consider and approve the scheme after sufficient information on demolition and comprehensive study findings were available.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

27. The Chairperson requested speakers to be more focussed and specific on their presentations so as to allow time for others to give their views.

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

28. With the aid of a video, Mr. Lai Ka-chun made the following main points:

- (a) the existing residents expressed the following points during their interviews:
- those preferred to move out was concerned about the lack of details on rehousing, compensation and timing;
 - some wished to stay due to accessibility, low rent and kinship ties, but was concerned about details of renovation and temporary accommodation;
 - some wondered why there was recent increase in rent while they were asked to move out,
 - a 3-person family hoped to be re-housed to a 2-room unit; and
 - there was confusion due to little information and lack of proper channel to express their views; and

[Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen left the meeting. Messrs. Mr. Felix W. Fong and Donald Yap left the

meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (b) since the URA's social services team had not provided adequate information to address their concerns, the locals had no alternative but to take this opportunity to express their concerns to enable the Board to take an informed view on the Blue House scheme based on adequate assessments and consultation.

29. The Chairperson said that the Board was mindful of the representers' comments but clarified that the Board was not in a position to consider issues concerning the role of the URA and implementation aspects. However, representatives from URA/HKHS present at the same meeting would be able to explain the issues and relay the concerns to the respective agencies for further consideration.

[Messrs. Felix W. Fong and Donald Yap returned to join the meeting at this point.]

30. Mr. Lau Hung-kuen made the following main points:

- (a) being a resident in the Grey House, he requested that the buildings should be preserved intact during the renovation, but not compromised due to compliance with fire safety and building standards per se; and
- (b) preservation should not be for profit but to pass on the legacy we inherited to our future generations

31. In response to the Chairperson, the representatives confirmed they had completed their presentations for Representation No. 33.

[Mr. K.Y. Leung left the meeting at this point.]

Representation No. 34 (People's Democracy Fund)

32. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Dr. Mirana May Szeto made the following main points:

- (a) as a researcher and teacher, she would present the findings of a BH research project which was a multi-disciplinary study on the cultural, historical and community aspects of the area;
- (b) the planning intention should be revised to include:

- preservation of 2-8 Hing Wan Street and 8 King Sing Street including exterior and interior features;
- residential use;
- preservation of social network of local community to allow cultural, community and commercial uses;

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the unified views of the 53 representations, including 115 individuals and 7 groups, would form the planning mandate for further consideration. Redevelopment did not imply 'demolish and rebuild' while the planning and preservation policy need to focus on 'let live and let be';

[Dr. Lily Chiang left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (d) responses to URA's comments:
 - retention of 8 King Sing Street, which was an integral part of the layered cluster, would not defeat the planning intention. The built form should be kept intact and tenants allowed to stay to retain the original usage and cultural landscape in the planning intention;
 - to minimize negative impacts, residents should have a choice to stay while early relocation should be arranged for those desired to move;
 - disagreed that including original residents would restrict public enjoyment of the historical buildings and amenities. Instead, tenants could be part of the living history and also serve as tour guides thus contributing to the appreciation of the heritage;
 - renovation involving substantial alterations would be undesirable causing irreversible impacts and downgrading of the graded premises;
 - as an alternative plan, it was proposed to: (i) keep the residential use and allow tenants to participate in cultural tourism; (ii) turn vacant premises to rental residential-work space for artists; and (iii) integrate cultural programme with the living culture for education purposes;
 - disagreed that the majority intended to move out as the social impact assessment (SIA) was not conducted comprehensively. There was no impact assessment on its neighbourhood, which comprised car repair, ironsmith and metal works industries with expertise in antique car repair and custom-made metalware;

- the Board should refrain from taking a view in the lack of detailed plan and proper SIA;
- URA's proposal for stereotypical landscape area was not supported and BHCG's suggestion for community venue should be considered;

[Prof. Peter R. Hills left the meeting at this point.]

- (e) a bottom-up participatory planning strategy involving stakeholders should be adopted as basis for informed decision making to ensure accountability and transparency; and

[Dr. Lily Chiang returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) responses to comments in TPB Paper No. 7724:
 - 8 King Sing Street and residential use should be retained. BHCG's plan was more desirable;
 - 'Flat' should be a Column 1 use. The zoning need to be changed to "OU" annotated "Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community, Commercial and Residential Uses"; and
 - URA/HKHS's proposals need to be formulated through a transparent process before submission to the Board.

Representation No. 35 (Community Culture Concern)

33. With a powerpoint presentation, Dr. Chen Yun-chung made the following main points:

- (a) in contrast to the trend for converging different cultures into monoculture, he would advocate for divergence in keeping the local characteristics. In defining local culture, one need to understand whose culture, who to consume and who were the victims;
- (b) the URA's objectives were to preserve the community network and put heritage buildings to proper uses as a living and functional part of the community but not historical artefacts for display. But such objectives seemed not to have been respected. The social network could be preserved with the original people as an asset and a functional component of the living space and culture;

(c) he proposed the following:

- 'Flat' and 'community facilities' should be a Column 1 uses, with residential use included in the planning intention;
- flexibility should be adopted in residential usage, with priority to both the original residents and local residents to keep the living culture. Community artists engaged in innovative activities, cultural tourism and living experience type of residence could be allowed;
- Orange House should be preserved for tourism and commercial uses;
- Yellow and Orange House as artist venue, i.e. local history studio and community artist village;

(d) the redevelopment plan should aim to achieve URA's objectives with transparency and consultation. Stakeholders should be invited in URA's advisory committee for better public engagement. More information on detailed proposal and rehousing should be provided.

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Representation No. 38

34. Ms. Huen Sze-mui made the following main points:

- (a) being an aged resident in the BH, she preferred to stay due to the convenient location which was close to her workplace and hospital, as well as her close ties with the neighbours; and
- (b) she wanted to have more room to invite her relatives to come and live with her in future.

[Mr. Felix W. Fong left the meeting at this point.]

Representation No. 39

35. Mr. Lai Ka-chun said Mr. So Leung had already expressed his views in the video interview that he had presented in Representation No. 33.

Representation No. 42

36. Miss Tai Yi-lin made the following main points:

- (a) URA had announced the scheme prior to specific proposals and adequate consultation with the locals. This seemed to deprive the right of existing residents and uproot the local culture. Approving URA's proposal would pre-empt alternative plans and future public views; and
- (b) the intention to change the landuse and demolish some premises to make way for some grand ideas would only provide the empty hardware but not genuine preservation. What the community expected were community-based facilities and revitalized premises with a human-oriented approach. Those who preferred to remain should be respected.

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Representations No. 46, 50 and 51

37. In reply to the suggestion by Ms. Lee Wai-yi, Livina to take a lunch break, the Chairperson explained that it would be up to individual attendees to decide whether to continue or withdraw from the hearing proceeding conducted by the Board.

38. Ms. Lee Wai-yi, Livina tabled additional submission and made the following main points:

- (a) planning for the BH cluster, which was not for vacant land and buildings, should be people-oriented with an emphasis on the software aspects rather than relying on the 'demolish to rebuild' approach. Given the unanimous concern of all the representations, the Board should consider whether there was a need to make a hasty decision in the lack of comprehensive assessment lest the plans could not be reversible;

[Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan and Dr. Daniel B.M. To returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) the physical features of BH, including balcony, were able to ensure the safety and security of the area. In terms of local economy, the social ties would render neighbourhood support, e.g. self care for children and the aged, without resorting to government subsidy;
- (c) her comments in the representation were not adequately addressed and regarded as implementation issues. In particular the preservation of social

network should be included in the planning intention and the SIA must be properly undertaken by URA to reassess the impacts and housing needs of the residents;

- (d) regarding conservation, the fundamental principle would be to preserve the artefacts if there were no people; but keep the living community together with the buildings if possible; and
- (e) she had consulted other artists who unanimously echoed similar concern.

39. On behalf of the representer of Representation No. 50, Ms. Lee Wai-yi, Livina made the following additional points:

- (a) the Orange House with its unique architectural style should be preserved. The blue colour for the BH was not preferred;
- (b) an open design competition was proposed to be organized to seek public views for the future development of the area; and
- (c) the open space should be managed by the local community.

40. On behalf of the representer of Representation No. 51, Ms. Lee Wai-yi, Livina tabled further submissions for Members' consideration and made the following additional points:

- (a) expressed great disappointment on the response to his views raised.

[Mr. K.K. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Representations No. 26

41. Ms. Wong Ka-ling made the following main points:

- (a) affected residents should be given a chance to stay as a basic right if they so wished; and
- (b) the human experience should be treasured as part of the cultural history in addition to preservation of the empty walls.

[Mr. K.K. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Representation No. 48 (The Wan Chai Livelihood Museum, St. James Settlement)

42. Mr. Chan Kam-shing made the following main points:

- (a) the Livelihood Museum, set up 2 years ago to gather local collections for display, was recently given a unit in the BH. As preparation were in progress for opening in early 2007, they were informed that the tenancy would expire in late 2007. They were not informed about how the URA scheme would affect them;
- (b) the aim of the Museum was to encourage bottom-up participation. In conducting local tours, the students and visitors were interested in rebuilding the past through the personal narration of the residents and sharing their experiences. URA's grand proposals would not be in keeping with the community aspirations which was to revitalize the vanishing history and the multi-layered living culture of the area;
- (c) as the locals did not have a channel for communicating their views nor were they being consulted and provided with information of proposals, representation to the Board had become the only option; and
- (d) as some residents received different information regarding rehousing from various sources, they were confused about how the plan would affect them.

Representation No. 49

43. Mr. Yeung Kin-bun made the following main points:

- (a) being a researcher in history and culture, he considered that preservation of social network should emphasize 'people before profit';
- (b) for renovation, only necessary alteration works with minimum impacts to the buildings should be allowed;
- (c) would a proper SIA be conducted with input from relevant community resources?
- (d) demolition of Orange House would not only destroy the building cluster but also constitute visual impacts as visitors would be exposed to the unsightly high-rises; and

- (e) the rationale for excluding car showrooms from 'Shops and Services' was doubtful as the car repair workshops also had its economic and social contribution to the community.

44. The Chairperson then invited the commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their comments to the representations.

45. The Chairperson commented that as some commenters of Comment No. 2 had already given their views in the previous presentations as representers, she would invite the commenters for Comment No. 4 to respond first.

[Dr. Lily Chiang left the meeting at this point.]

Comment No. 4

46. Mr. Daniel Lau made the following main points:

- (a) according to the survey conducted since end of March 2006, the majority of residents expressed preference to relocate, especially to housing estate as a means to upgrade living conditions, while some would prefer to stay. There were similar findings through contacts by the special team of the Salvation Army since April 2006;
- (b) rehousing would be dealt with under the current policies and procedures. HKHS would continue to liaise with the residents regarding their housing needs. Affected resident would be offered a choice of getting compensation. They would be able to choose the location of housing to suit their needs and suitable units would be reserved for such purposes. Older residents could consider moving to HKHS's nearby aged home at Kat On Street to be run by the St. James Settlement;
- (c) based on the assessment by Chinese University (CU), the ungraded Orange House was considered to be of low heritage and architectural merit with no significant linkages with the other buildings. Given the existing shortfall of open space in Wan Chai, the retention of the Orange House would reduce the planned open space to 150 ft² which was not to the public benefit;
- (d) further assessment would be required to demonstrate the acceptability of

upgrading the premises for residential use, in conservation, structural and design aspects. As there was need to strike a balance from the conservation as well as building safety perspectives, it would be premature to cast a view on this issue; and

- (e) the special committee set up under the WCDC was to consult stakeholders and provide guidance for development and its membership would include local representatives. The tea and medicine themes were only broad suggestions to be further considered. They would keep an open mind on the detailed proposals after consultation.

Comment No. 2

47. Messrs. Chan Tat-yi, Siu Yu-kwan, Tse Pak-chai and Lai Ka-chun made the following main points:

- (a) if the Board approved the project prior to the completion of the abovementioned assessment, it was uncertain if the Board could further consider the plan later on;
- (b) one option in CU's report was to retain the buildings as status quo. It was not sure if all the premises in this scheme were dangerous buildings. The report also advised that minimal alteration should be done to retain the buildings. HKHS should formulate the conservation plan based on such recommendations and release the details for public consultation;
- (c) the area of open space without Orange House was 150 m² instead of 150 ft²;
- (d) compared with commercial and tourism uses which were Column 1 uses, residential use would involve similar renovation work but with lower loading and less traffic flow, hence should not be discarded on technical grounds and put as a Column 2 use;
- (e) the survey findings should be released for public information; and
- (f) there was confusion in the rehousing arrangement.

48. Messrs. Michael Ma and Daniel Lau of Comment No. 4 made the following main

points:

- (a) the building assessment would also consider the use and structural aspects. Other than loading aspect, there was a need to provide ancillary facilities including kitchen and toilets for individual residential units, whereas centralized ancillary facilities could be adequate for commercial uses. This explained the need for detailed study and the reason for putting residential use as a Column 2 use subject to planning permission from the Board. This would address the technical concerns and accord sufficient planning control;
- (b) while a conservation plan for the Grades I Historical Buildings should be submitted to the Board, the method of conservation, management and maintenance of these pre-war buildings would also be required;
- (c) the area of open space without the Orange House was 150 m²;
- (d) at the time of the structural survey, the existing premises were not considered as dangerous buildings; and
- (e) rehousing arrangement could not be initiated before the scheme was firmed up under URA's current practice. However, HKHS would adopt proactive measures to take residents for flat inspection so as to keep them better informed although actual rehousing procedures would commence later.

49. Members raised the following points:

- (a) what uses and activities were allowed under the DSP and whether these would be able to satisfy the aspirations of the residents, such as shops, exhibition, museums;
- (b) while restaurant was a Column 1 use, residential use with lower usage and floor loading was a Column 2 use;
- (c) whether WCDC had been consulted and what were their views;
- (d) given the shortage of open space what would be the impact on the provision if the Orange House was not demolished;

- (e) if there was specific requirement for provision of 220m² open space in the BH scheme, the Orange House would need to go;
- (f) if residents were allowed to stay, whether URA could accommodate the revitalization activities; and
- (g) the findings and figures of the survey on rehousing needs of the residents affected.

50. Ms. Christine Tse had the following responses:

- (a) under the “OU” zone, uses including ‘Eating Place’, ‘Education/Visitor Centre’, ‘Exhibition or Convention Hall’, ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’, ‘Shop and Services (Excluding Motor-vehicle Showroom)’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ acceptable to the Social Welfare Department (SWD) were always permitted. The representers’ proposals for local/community shops and exhibition venues for cultural/art activities were permitted;
- (b) while ancillary facilities were required for individual residential units, centralized ancillary facilities could be adequate to serve commercial uses and eating place subject to further study. To address such technical concerns, it was considered prudent to include residential use as a Column 2 use so that the Board could accord appropriate planning control;
- (c) WCDC was consulted on the DSP and the Planning Brief on 16.5.2006 and they expressed the following views:
 - HKHS should continue to consult the community in future;
 - there was concern on the financial viability given the heavy expenses on maintenance and repair;
 - greater local participation in future management;
 - a representation was submitted by a working group under the WCDC and the representatives had already made the presentation during the meeting; and
- (d) there was an existing deficit of 3.8ha of open space in Wan Chai. The

subject open space would be 220m² including the Orange House. Although the actual area would otherwise be reduced by only 30 m², the comprehensiveness and design feasibility of this open space could be compromised, particularly if some support structures would be required for the premises; and

- (e) there was a requirement for URA to provide open space in the BH scheme.

51. Messrs. Michael Ma and Daniel Lau had the following responses:

- (a) as explained before, a feasibility study would be conducted to ascertain the viability to accommodate specific uses in the premises, although centralized ancillary facilities could be provided to serve commercial and tourism uses. To address the technical concerns for residential use, 'Flat' would be a Column 2 use subject to Board's consideration. Conservation plan for the area, comprising Grades I buildings would be submitted to the Board to ensure the preservation, management and maintenance aspects;
- (b) according to the survey in March 2006, out of the 28 households, 13 strongly supported the scheme, 9 had no views while 6 raised objection. Out of the 28 interviewees, 19 preferred to be relocated to public housing estates.

52. The Chairperson asked if any representers, commenters and their representatives would raise any further clarifications following the above presentations by DPO and URA/HKHS.

53. Ms. Wong Sau-ping, Messrs. Chow Chun-yam and Tse Ka-chai raised the following main points:

- (a) as 'Social Welfare Facility' only referred to those approved by Social Welfare Department (SWD), the existing co-op at Orange House might be excluded which was unreasonable. Therefore 'Social and Community Service facility' should be included as a Column 1 use;
- (b) the SIA conducted by HKHS did not provide an option to stay and hence a leading survey; and

- (c) social network should be included in planning intention.

54. In response, Ms. Christine Tse replied that under the Definition of Terms adopted by the Board, 'Social Welfare Facility' referred to services to meet the welfare needs recommended by the Director of Social Welfare (DSW) and for providing community services to the general public. Application to SWD might not be required if the services provided by the co-op was social welfare in nature. If the facility was a shop, it might be considered as 'Shop and Services'.

55. As the representers, commenters and their representatives had finished their presentations and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson informed them the hearing procedures had been completed, and the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives and PlanD's representative for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

56. The meeting was adjourned for a break at 2.15pm.

[Dr. James Lau, Messrs. Stanley Y.F. Wong and B.W. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

57. The meeting was reconvened at 2.25 pm.

Deliberation Session

58. The Chairperson noted that the crucial planning issues raised by representers and their representatives that need to be considered by Members under the purview of the Board were namely, inclusion of 'Flat' as Column 1 use, retention of the Orange House and how best to ensure incorporation of social network in the planning of the project. These should be considered taking into account the public views, relevant planning considerations and the technical assessments. In addition, there was also a strong public sentiment on how consultation and local engagement could be undertaken by URA and HKHS to address the concern of the community at the early stage so as to reduce public concern. In this regard, she suggested to take the matter up with URA to explore way to improve communication and future consultation strategy so as to better inform the stakeholders. On residential use, the Chairperson noted that there would be planning control for 'Flat' as a Column 2 use, while a

conservation plan for the scheme would be submitted to the Board.

59. Views of Members were summarized as follows:

- (a) the Board would be able to exercise planning control for 'Flat' as a Column 2 use subject to detailed study;
- (b) if technically feasible, residential development could still be permitted on application; and
- (c) individual ancillary facilities were required for the residential units.

60. Members agreed to include 'Flat' as a Column 2 use to allow greater flexibility and accord appropriate planning control. The Chairperson pointed out that the retention of Orange House would hinge not only on the area of the open space but the overall planning of the area and the public benefit arising from such provision.

61. Views of Members were summarized as follows:

- (a) the Orange House was considered to be of low heritage and architectural merit in the previous assessment;
- (b) the Orange House was different to the graded BH in historical value hence should not be treated alike. Its retention might affect the scheme as a whole;
- (c) the impact of the open space should be considered in the light of the overall quality of the development and the community benefit. There was a need to strike a balance between the planning gain to the general public and the local community. The rationale for such approach could be clearly explained to the public;
- (d) as this local open space would have little impact on the overall provision in the district, the issue was whether to meet the local request;
- (e) given the public sentiment on the retention of Orange House, a minimum area for open space requirement might be indicated to allow flexibility in implementation; and

- (f) it would be prudent to allow residential use subject to HKHS's further study.

62. Members generally did not support retention of 8 King Sing Street. A Member opined that the sentiment of the representers were mainly due to misunderstanding on the role of URA which could be addressed by URA through better communication and comprehensive consultation.

63. A Member highlighted the need for URA to further consider the preservation of the social network in future consultation. Another Member echoed support and noted that statements on social network had been included in the planning brief of the H15 project to serve the same purpose. He suggested and Members agreed that similar approach could be adopted in this scheme to address the local concerns.

64. The Chairperson concluded that as the Board had agreed to partially meet the representations by adding "Flat" use in Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU" annotated "Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses" zone, the proposed amendment to the Plan as agreed by the Board would be published for three weeks for further representations in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance.

Representations No. 1 to 35

65. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representations by adding "Flat" use in Column 2 of the Notes of the "OU" annotated "Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses" zone.

66. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the Urban Renewal Authority/Hong Kong Housing Society (URA/HKHS) to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department;
- (c) 8 King Sing Street was considered to be of low heritage and architectural

merits and had not been graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board. There was no strong justification for the preservation of the building. The retention of the building would reduce the provision of the public open space for community use in the area;

- (d) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (e) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

67. The Board also agreed to advise the representers that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representations No. 36 to 39

68. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representations by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

69. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies; and
- (b) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

70. The Board also agreed to advise the representers that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representations No. 40 to 41

71. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to propose any amendments to the Plan to meet the representations for the following reason:

Implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

72. The Board also agreed to advise the representers that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 42

73. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

74. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies; and
- (b) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings.

75. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 43

76. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

77. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the URA/HKHS to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department;
- (c) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (d) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

78. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 44

79. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

80. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the URA/HKHS to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department; and
- (c) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings.

81. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 45

82. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

83. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) the provision of community nursery was not supported as it was not in line with the planning intention to provide public open space;
- (c) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the URA/HKHS to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department;
- (d) 8 King Sing Street was considered to be of low heritage and architectural merits and had not been graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board. There was no strong justification for the preservation of the building. The retention of the building would reduce the provision of the public open space for community use in the area;
- (e) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (f) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition are outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

84. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representations No. 46, 50 and 51

85. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representations by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

86. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) 8 King Sing Street was considered to be of low heritage and architectural merits and had not been graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board. There was no strong justification for the preservation of the building. The retention of the building would reduce the provision of the public open space for community use in the area;
- (c) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (d) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

87. The Board also agreed to advise the representers that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 47

88. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and

Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

89. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the provision of community nursery was not supported as it was not in line with the planning intention to provide public open space;
- (b) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings;
- (c) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

90. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 48

91. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

92. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (c) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

93. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 49

94. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

95. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the URA/HKHS to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department;
- (c) 8 King Sing Street was considered to be of low heritage and architectural merits and had not been graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board. There was no strong justification for the preservation of the building. The retention of the building would reduce the provision of the public open space for community use in the area;
- (d) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings.

96. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 52

97. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

98. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings; and
- (c) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition are outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

99. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

Representation No. 53

100. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially meet the representation by adding “Flat” use in Column 2 of the Notes of the “OU” annotated “Open Space and Historical Buildings preserved for Cultural, Community and Commercial Uses” zone.

101. The Board decided not to propose any amendment to the Plan to meet the remaining parts of the representation for the following reasons:

- (a) the compatibility and feasibility of residential use of the preserved heritage buildings could only be ascertained after detailed studies;
- (b) comprehensive traffic impact assessment would be undertaken by the URA/HKHS to ensure that the Scheme would be sustainable in traffic terms to the satisfaction of the Transport Department;
- (c) it was required under the planning brief for URA/HKHS to submit a conservation plan for the historical buildings, and method of conservation as well as the future use, management and maintenance of these buildings;

and

- (d) implementation issues such as rehousing, compensation and acquisition were outside the ambit of the Town Planning Ordinance and purview of the Board.

102. The Board also agreed to advise the representer that the Board would request the URA/HKHS to further consult the relevant stakeholders and community on future uses and management of the project.

103. The Chairperson reminded Members that the Board's decision on the representations and comments should be kept confidential for 3 to 4 weeks in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29A on Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance.