

tpbpd@pland.gov.hk

寄件者: [REDACTED]
寄件日期: 2021年06月16日星期三 3:20
收件者: tpbpd-
主旨: MONG KOK OZP S/K3/32 and URA THISTLE STREET DEVELOPMENT

AMENDMENTS TO THE APPROVED MONG KOK OZP S/K3/32 and URA SHANTUNG STREET/THISTLE STREET DEVELOPMENT S/K3/URA4/1

Item A1 – Incorporation of the area covered by the approved Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Anchor Street/Fuk Tsun Street Development Scheme-Plan (DSP) No. S/K3/URA1/2 into the Plan and zoning the area as “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Hotel” with stipulation of building height restriction.

Items A2 and A3 – Incorporation of the area covered by the approved URA Prince Edward Road West/Yuen Ngai Street DSP No. S/K3/URA2/2 into the Plan and zoning the area mainly as “OU” annotated “Historic Buildings Preserved for Commercial and/or Cultural Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction and a small portion shown as ‘Road’

Items A4 and A5 – Incorporation of the area covered by the approved URA Shanghai Street/Argyle Street DSP No. S/K3/URA3/2 into the Plan and zoning the area mainly as “OU” annotated “Historic Buildings Preserved for Commercial and/or Cultural Uses” with stipulation of building height restriction and a small portion shown as ‘Road’.

Dear TPB Members,

Items A1 – A5 are housekeeping exercises. Support height restrictions.

However on behalf of the community and in line with growing public sentiment with regard to the preservation of historical and cultural, it is clear that when it comes to such projects the URA makes changes to the structures that destroy their identify and integrity. This is particularly visible in the Shanghai Street project. Not only have the facades been altered and out of context appendages added, the shiny glass frontage and gaudy lights completely destroy the ambiance.

Internally nothing has been preserved. All the tiling, staircases and other features were sent to the landfill and replaced with the usual shopping mall bland and boring grey tile effect. While certain changes had to be made with regard to catering for the disabled, etc, it was not necessary to completely strip the building of all references to its past.

TPB members unfortunately approve this vandalism and must share the blame for the conversion of historic buildings into nothing more than fractured shadows of their original selves. A large compound like Tai Kwun can still retain some authenticity but the smaller sites are lost forever.

Re Thistle Street, comments made in November are still applicable.

Mary Mulvihill
[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: "tpbpd" <tpbpd@pland.gov.hk>
Sent: Friday, November 13, 2020 11:39:00 PM
Subject: URA Shantung Street / Thistle Street Development YTM 012

URA Shantung Street / Thistle Street Development YTM 012

Scheme Area : 2,796sq.m / PR 9 plus 1.7 GIC, 2,850sq.m, not included / 120mPD / 2.490sqmm retail / 300 Units / 43 Vehicle Parking / ??? Private OS

Dear TPB Members,

Instead of taking the opportunity to increase the Local Open Space in MKK, the plan in fact is taking over part of the existing Thistle Street Rest Garden. MKK already has a marked deficit of LOS. Opportunity should have been taken to enlarge the footprint of the garden.

While URA claims it will open the OS up, it will in fact enclose it within a high wall effect development.

In return the URA is up to its usual tricks, "Create a sunken plaza of about 200sq.m, connecting to the entrance of the re-provisioned POS and retail shops at basement to bring vibrancy to the community." Nobody is fooled, this is to provide an entrance to the retail and will bring no benefit to the garden or to park goers. In fact the tranquility of the garden will be disturbed by the additional commuter flow.

Provision of about 2,850sq.m. non-domestic GFA for GIC uses to bring more planning gains to the community. No details provided While this is 20% of the GFA, when taken into the context of the number of current residents who will no longer enjoy affordable homes in the area, it is not adequate compensation to the community.

Again why is the site not being used for affordable housing instead of yet another for profit development? Developers are busy buying up units and there have recently been a number of compulsory sales in the district. Demand for private units is therefore being more than well catered for while poorer residents are being gradually replaced and forced to move to other districts that are a long way from the many employment opportunities they currently enjoy.

That this is a template for the many URA projects planned in YauMong in the coming years, it is clear that the intention is to gradually relocate grassroots citizens to the peripheries, out of sight and out of mind.

Mary Mulvihill