

Translation

Minutes of the Second Meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum

Date: 25 August 2011 (Thursday)

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Venue: The Hall, 4/F, S. K. H. Holy Carpenter Church Community
Centre, No.1 Dyer Avenue, Hung Hom, Kowloon

Present:

Chairman: Dr Greg Wong Chak-yan

Members: Mr James Mathew Fong

Mr Ho Hin-ming

Rev Hor Yiu-man

Ms Christine Kwok Mun-yee

Mr Daniel Lau King-shing

Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah

Ms Peggy Poon Wing-yin

Ms Siu Yuen-sheung

Dr Tang Bo-sin

Mr Wen Choy-bon

Mr Wong Kam-sing

Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching

Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying

Executive Director (Planning
and Project Control), Urban
Renewal Authority

Ms Winky So Yuen-ling

District Officer (Kowloon
City), Home Affairs
Department

Mr Eric Yue Chi-kin

District Planning Officer
/Kowloon, Planning
Department

Mr Lee Wai-bun Chief Traffic Engineer
 /Kowloon, Transport
 Department
Ms Winnie So Chui-ying Principal Assistant Secretary
 (Planning and Lands),
 Development Bureau

Secretary: Ms Lily Yam Ya-may Acting Chief Town Planner
 /District Urban Renewal
 Forum, Planning Department

Absent:

Members: Ms May Fung Mei-wah
 Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung

In attendance: Mr Robin Lee Kui-biu Acting Commissioner for
 Heritage, Development Bureau

Agenda Item 1 Confirmation of Minutes of First Meeting

The Chairman welcomed all members to the meeting. He also invited the Secretary to brief Members on the minutes of meeting.

2. **The Secretary** said that requests had been received from two Members for amendment to the draft minutes of the first meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (“DURF”). Subsequently, the Secretariat added post-meeting notes to paragraphs 25 and 26. The revised minutes of meeting were forwarded to Members by email on 18 August 2011. No other amendment was received afterwards. As agreed by Members, the Chairman announced that the minutes of meeting were confirmed.

Agenda Item 2 Matters Arising

Proposed Work Plan and Work Items

3. **The Secretary** indicated that at the first meeting Members had noted the content of the Work Plan and suggested that the timetable for implementation of the Work Plan should be discussed at the second meeting. The matter would be discussed under Agenda Item 5.

Date of Meeting

4. On 5 July, the Secretariat forwarded the meeting schedule up to June 2012 to Members by email and had also uploaded the schedule to the DURF's website for public inspection.

Site Visits

5. **The Secretary** reported that three site visits to Hung Hom, To Kwa Wan, Lung Tong and Ho Man Tin Sub-districts had been organised by DURF on 11, 20 and 27 July 2011 respectively. The report on site visits would be discussed by Members under Agenda Item 4.

Agenda Item 3 Future Use of Cattle Depot (Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/04/2011)

6. **The Chairman** welcomed Mr Robin Lee Kui-biu, Acting Commissioner for Heritage, Development Bureau, and invited him to introduce the existing conditions and future use of the former Ma Tau Kok Animal Quarantine Depot (Cattle Depot). Mr Lee briefed Members on the historical background, architectural features, the current usage and management of the Cattle Depot. He pointed out that since management of the site had been transferred from the Government Property Agency to the Commissioner for Heritage's Office of the Development Bureau commencing April this year, changes had been made in the management to improve public accessibility, and the visitor flow had increased accordingly. Moreover, the Commissioner for Heritage's office also facilitated the exchange between the artists and the public through

organising activities and exhibitions. He stated that the Cattle Depot falls within an area partly zoned “Government, Institution or Community” and partly zoned “Open Space” on the Outline Zoning Plan (“OZP”). In considering its future use, it was necessary to balance between planning, adaptive re-use and conservation. He hoped that Members would offer opinions to facilitate the formulation of a revitalization plan for the Cattle Depot.

7. **The Chairman** pointed out that DURF is the forum for the residents of Kowloon City to express opinions. Apart from consulting Members, the Commissioner for Heritage’s Office could consider co-operating with DURF to seek the views of the residents.

8. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** considered that the Cattle Depot was the main open space in the district. He supported the retention of the current “Government, Institution or Community” and “Open Space” zones to restrict development. He also pointed out that the existing number of tenants in the Cattle Depot was too few. He suggested that consideration should be given to develop the site into a centre of social enterprises, and that the backyard of the Cattle Depot should be designated for park use and new concepts in terms of design and management should be introduced, such as the reduction of railing. Furthermore, facilities in respect of health and exercise should be increased for the use of the local residents.

9. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** opined that to revitalise the Cattle Depot, traffic facilities should be put in place to attract more visitors. He indicated that traffic facilities could be provided at the backyard area of the Cattle Depot and the site could also be developed into a plaza and performance venue. In addition, he pointed out that the existing one storey height restriction restricted the site for further development. He suggested that in preservation of the old buildings, consideration could be given to erect additional structures similar to glass house for the display of art works to achieve the effect of integrating the old and new. He also asked about the operating mode of the Cattle Depot in future and the publicity and promotion arrangements.

10. **Rev Hor Yiu-man** indicated that in recruiting tenants, attention should be focused on the connection between the tenants and the community. Further, he supported the provision of more performance space to attract more visitors.

11. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** remarked that the existing space available in the Cattle Depot was insufficient and the visitor flow was still too small. She considered that with the preservation of the existing buildings, the Cattle Depot should get optimum usage and should continue to be for art-related uses in future. However, more art types should be introduced. In addition, the existing mode of the art studio should be changed. Consideration should be given to incorporate conditions for management in future, stipulating that the Cattle Depot be opened to the public to a certain extent so as to increase the visitor flow. Besides, the existing “Government, Institution or Community” area had to be retained, whereas the backyard area zoned “open space” could be further modified by incorporating more performance venues and additional structures could be suitably erected. In the long run, the Cattle Depot should integrate with some space of the nearby 13 Streets, or even to integrate with the planning of Kai Tak New Development Area, linking with feature attractions like Lung Tsun Stone Bridge and Harbour Park and developing tourism trails to promote tourism. Lastly, she suggested to increase the access points of the Cattle Depot to strengthen its connection with the surrounding areas.

12. **Mr Wen Choy-bon** considered that the Cattle Depot had very great development potential. Although the current visitor flow of the Cattle Depot showed a slight increase with the improvement of public accessibility, the visitor flow was still low. He reckoned that the Cattle Depot should increase other types of arts other than visual art and organise more exhibitions to attract visitors. In addition, as there is a good number of ethnic minorities living around the 13 Streets, he suggested that more harmonising cultural activities could be organised. In the long run, open space provision could be increased and reading rooms be put in place and the vacant backyard should be efficiently designated for the use of the local residents.

13. **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** suggested that sculptures should be established at the entrance of the Cattle Depot to reflect its past history as a quarantine depot. The backyard area could be developed as low-density exhibition hall, reading room and performance venue to integrate with open space development and thereby increasing the visitor flow. Nevertheless, she pointed out that since the Cattle Depot is near the gas works, future development should be carefully designed during revitalisation.

14. **Ms Peggy Poon Wing-yin** suggested that while the Cattle Depot is developed into an artist village, education elements could be included, for example, to organise guided tours to introduce the history of the Cattle Depot and related cultural life. She also suggested renting out the existing vacant units to the local bodies or organisations to fully utilise the vacant space.

15. **Mr Daniel Lau King-shing** was of the opinion that the “Art” theme of the Cattle Depot at present was too general. Special features and themes should be introduced for the future revitalisation. He also pointed out that the space of backyard should be used to enlarge the existing scale of the artist village, and diversified activities should be introduced to attract the public. Further, he considered that the future operators should co-ordinate the publicity arrangements and take the operation cost into account, and should not rely on public funding in the long term.

16. **Ms Christine Kwok Mun-yee** enquired about the operation mode of the Cattle Depot in future. Moreover, she indicated that the local organisations had difficulty in looking for event venues. She suggested that the Cattle Depot could be opened as an area for local activities. Apart from raising the utilization rate, the artists could make use of this opportunity to publicise arts activities and promote their art works.

17. **Mr James Mathew Fong** expressed the opinion that the biggest problem facing the artists today was the heavy rent. He indicated that the government, Hong Kong Arts Development Council, Hong Kong Jockey Club and relevant organizations had already put

forward quite a few plans, including the measures for industrial building revitalization and rent concession to assist in arts development. The Cattle Depot, however, might not have enough favourable attractions to tenants. Thus, when introducing the revitalisation plan, the prevailing situation and demand had to be taken into account. Furthermore, he held the view that art should be popularised and commercialised. He considered that the building cluster of the Cattle Depot could be used for art education and art work exhibitions to achieve the above two objectives.

18. In response, **Mr Robin Lee Kui-biu** indicated that at the present stage he mainly hoped to listen to Members' views. He agreed with Members' proposal of introducing suitable activities into the space of the Cattle Depot to facilitate exchange between artists and the community. It would be more appropriate if the relevant activities could match with the atmosphere of the Cattle Depot and the creative art theme. In addition, he pointed out that the Commissioner for Heritage's Office was studying the development proposal of the backyard area, but they believed that there was little opportunity for high-density development. As regards the comment of a Member that the Cattle Depot was near the gas works, he said that the foundation works including relevant risk assessment had commenced. In planning for the long term revitalisation plan, the study of some short-term improvement measures had begun, for example, the amenity improvement plan outside the Cattle Depot. Regarding the mode of operation, the existing Revitalising Historic Buildings Through Partnership Scheme was managed and operated by non-profit-making organisations. The operators had to support the relevant items in terms of management and publicity. The Commissioner for Heritage's Office had not given any preference or made decision on the future operation of the Cattle Depot at this stage. When specific proposals were available in the future, co-operation would be sought with DURF to consult the residents before finalizing the proposals.

19. In concluding the discussion, **the Chairman** indicated that Members generally considered that the existing utilisation rate and visitor flow of the Cattle Depot were inadequate, and hoped that the area inside the Cattle Depot, including the vacant backyard, could be opened to the

public as far as possible to bring benefit to the community. Members also considered that the artists in the Cattle Depot could strengthen their relationships and communications with the public. The Chairman expressed his wish that the Commissioner for Heritage's Office could consult the public as soon as possible, and indicated that DURF was delighted to co-operate with the Office in consulting the public.

**Agenda Item 4 Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum –
Report on Site Visits
(Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/05/2011)**

20. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to introduce the content of the Paper. The Secretary reported to Members on the three site visits conducted by DURF in July 2011, the key points of discussion raised by Members and district councilors in attendance during the site visits, and the views of the residents collected.

21. Members noted the content of the report.

**Agenda Item 5 Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum –
Proposed Work Plan and Work Items
(Discussion Paper No.: DURF KC/06/2011)**

22. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to brief Members on the content of the Paper. The Secretary indicated that having regard to Members' discussion on the work plan of DURF at the first meeting, the Secretariat had prepared the proposed work plan and work items for Member's consideration. The relevant work items included the Study on Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City ("the Study"), Social Impact Assessment ("SIA"), public engagement activities, submission of a recommended plan to the government, public education / outreach programmes and monitoring work. The Secretary elaborated on the content of the work items.

23. **Dr Tang Bo-sin** supported to conduct the SIA. He enquired about the difference between the baseline information of SIA and the Study.

24. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** asked about the scope of the Study and whether the Study aimed at examining the feasibility of the renewal proposal or identifying the public's needs. He also supported conducting the SIA, and stated that this aspect had been neglected in the past urban renewal projects. Besides, the result of the SIA would help the consultants of the Study to take account of the need of the affected people in formulating the urban renewal proposal.

25. **Ms Winky So Yuen-ling** enquired about the division of labour and coordination between the SIA and the Study.

26. **The Chairman** pointed out that SIA was a proposal under the new "Urban Renewal Strategy" ("URS") and the baseline involved might be even more extensive than that of the Study, such as some social capital and the long term influence of urban renewal proposals on the society.

27. In response, **the Secretary** said that the Study would make some baseline studies on the situations in the Kowloon City District, while the SIA would gather community information in the relevant areas based on the preliminary urban renewal proposals. However, there was little experience in conducting SIA, and the detailed study approach of the SIA would be proposed by the expert consultant. With regard to the correlation between the two studies, the Secretary pointed out that while the two studies were undertaken simultaneously, they had to maintain in close connection. On completing stage 1 public consultation, the consultant of the Study would provide its preliminary views on Kowloon City urban renewal proposals to the consultant of SIA for conducting stage 1 assessment of the SIA. The consultant of the Study would then make reference to the result of SIA to formulate the urban renewal plan and action area plans and submit the proposal to DURE. After DURE's consideration of the proposals, stage 2 public engagement activities would be conducted to seek public views on the urban renewal proposals. The urban renewal proposals would be amended to reflect the public views collected. The result of the SIA would also be updated accordingly.

Hence, the consultants of the two studies had to co-operate closely for the completion of the relevant studies.

28. **Dr Tang Po-sin** considered that it would be of benefit to conduct the Study and SIA separately by two independent consultants. Nevertheless, consideration could be given to lengthen the time for conducting the SIA so as to match with the timeframe of the Study.

29. **The Chairman** pointed out that conducting the Study and SIA independently would enhance the acceptance of the study, and the impact of the proposal on the society could be examined from the more extensive and long term perspective.

30. **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** supported to conduct the Study and the SIA. She suggested that the consultants should carry out site inspections to deepen their understanding of the local situation and provide professional advice on the proposed redevelopment or rehabilitation areas. In tandem with public engagement and the SIA, suitable proposals could therefore be formulated.

31. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** supported the proposed studies under the work plan, given that they would take account of expert opinion and views received during the public engagement process. She indicated that the public had diverse views on urban renewal. She suggested that the expert consultants should explain the considerations in formulating the proposals to the public, and let them understand that their views had been fully considered. The future proposed plan would then gain the support of the public.

32. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** asked whether the ambit of the relevant studies and DURF initiatives also concerned for private developments.

33. **The Chairman** responded that the ambit of DURF was for Kowloon City old district and there would not be a differentiation in private development, government projects or Urban Renewal Authority (“URA”) projects.

34. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** indicated that she had participated in the review of URS. In her opinion, the objective of the Study was to reach a consensus with the public under the current planning provision with a view to formulating redevelopment, rehabilitation, revitalisation and heritage preservation areas, and to setting the implementation priority and approach. The SIA was a means of public engagement for consulting the public on the social impacts involved in urban renewal plan, and the relevant result would be conducive in the formulation of the urban renewal plan. She was concerned that as the SIA and the Study would conduct public engagement activities simultaneously, some work might overlap and cause confusion to the public. Consideration could be given to conduct public engagement activities by the SIA consultant.

35. **The Chairman** took the view that to avoid confusion, public engagement activities could be conducted in the name of DURF or the activities might be coordinated by one of the study consultants.

36. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** was of the opinion that the public's concern was on the redevelopment of the whole old district, particularly on the impact of a single development or redevelopment project on the whole old district, such as environmental hygiene and traffic problems. He enquired whether there was a channel for the public to give their views, and how the developer would carry out the design of individual projects taking into account public's views upon the completion of the Study.

37. **Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying** clarified that the Study did not aim at individual projects, including the projects to be implemented by URA. Indeed, it would reflect the local residents' aspirations on urban renewal approach and give clear message to the government or private developers.

38. **Ms Winnie So Chui-ying** pointed out that the public could provide their views on individual redevelopment projects under the existing planning and lands system. The role of DURF is to examine urban renewal initiatives from a regional perspective. DURF would propose the urban renewal approach for individual sub-areas, for example, whether individual sub-area was more suitable for redevelopment or rehabilitation, whether redevelopment was more suitable to be undertaken by URA or private developers, or even the rezoning of the existing larger

comprehensive development area into a number of smaller comprehensive development areas to expedite the urban renewal process.

39. **The Chairman** considered that private development involved private property rights. The public might have difficulties in expressing their views on individual projects. On the other hand, the role of private developers in urban renewal should not be neglected. DURF could suggest providing incentives for the private developers to enhance the planning for individual projects. Also, the private developers could understand public aspirations through public engagement activities, and improve their proposals, hence reducing the impacts of the proposals on the community.

40. **Mr Eric Yue Chi-kin** explained the existing planning system to Members. He indicated that Kowloon City District fell within an area covered by a number of Outline Zoning Plans (OZP). Depending on the zonings and development nature of individual projects, the degree of public engagement in the planning process might vary. If a project was always permitted under the OZP, the developer did not have to submit a planning application for approval. If a particular project required planning permission from the Town Planning Board (TPB), the public would be given opportunities to give comments on the application for TPB's consideration. Moreover, he enquired about the details of the SIA timetable.

41. In response, **the Secretary** stated that the SIA and the Study would be conducted interactively. From the beginning to the end of the two studies, the consultants of both studies would provide information to each other and put forth proposals under their relevant ambit.

42. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** asked about the channel for Members to support the study work.

43. **The Chairman** suggested that Members could actively participate in various public engagement activities and meet the local residents in person while the Planning Department would be responsible for following up the relevant study work. Having regard to Members' opinions, the Secretariat might have to refine the content of the relevant

work plan. Since the study work would be commencing early next year and it would be time-consuming for the Secretariat to apply for funding from the Urban Renewal Fund and to conduct the consultant tendering process, he asked Members to endorse the proposed work plan and work items. Members endorsed the proposed work plan and work items.

44. **Mr James Mathew Fong** suggested that the scope and detailed content of the two studies be circulated to Members to reach a consensus. Members noted his suggestion.

Agenda Item 6 Any Other Business

45. **The Chairman** invited Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying to introduce briefly the “demand-led” and “facilitator” pilot schemes of URA. Ms Tam briefed Members on the two schemes, including the objective, vision, principle, application requirement, anticipated progress, selection principles and application criteria.

46. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** enquired about the difference between “demand-led” and “facilitator” schemes and the calculation of undivided shares for buildings with a common staircase connecting between different lots. In response, Ms Iris Tam Siu-ying said that the main difference between the two schemes was that the selected “demand-led” redevelopment project would be included in the annual business plan of URA. If the project was finally authorized by the Secretary for Development, URA would make the relevant ownership an acquisition offer. As for the “facilitator” scheme, URA would only provide facilitating service to assist the owners in assembling the land ownership for sale. URA would not be involved in the acquisition, compensation, rehousing and land resumption work. She further indicated that under the “demand-led” scheme, if a building on the site encroached on two lots, and there was a staircase connecting them, only the consent of 67% of the undivided shares holders of the two lots, on average, would be required.

Date of Next Meeting

47. **The Chairman** announced that the next meeting would be held on 8 November 2011.

48. There being no other matters for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Secretariat

Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum

August 2011