

## Translation

### Minutes of the Eleventh Meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum

Date: 17 December 2013 (Tuesday)  
Time: 2:30 p.m.  
Venue: The Hall, Hung Hom Community Hall  
42 Bailey Street, 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  
Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung  
Ms Peggy Poon Wing-yin  
Ms Siu Yuen-sheung  
Dr Tang Bo-sin  
Mr Wen Choy-bon  
Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching  
Mr Michael Ma Chiu-tsee Director, Planning & Design, Urban  
Renewal Authority (representing  
Executive Director (Planning &  
Project Control), Urban Renewal  
Authority)  
Ms Jessica Ho Yuen-ching Assistant Secretary (Urban  
Renewal)<sup>4</sup>, Development Bureau  
(representing Ms So Chui-ying,  
Winnie, Principal Assistant  
Secretary (Planning and Lands)<sup>4</sup>,

		Development Bureau
	Mr Richard Siu Yee-lin,	Acting District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department
	Mr Yeung Min	Senior Engineer/Kowloon District Central, Transport Department (representing Mr Pang Wai-shing, Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department))
	Mr William Tsui Yiu-leung	District Officer (Kowloon City), Home Affairs Department
Secretary:	Ms Lily Yam Ya-may	Chief Town Planner/District Urban Renewal Forum, Planning Department
Absent:		
Members:	Ms May Fung Mei-wah	
In Attendance:	Mr Adrian Cheung ]	Public Engagement Consultant
	Mr Kwok Hiu-chung ]	A-World Consulting Ltd
	Mr Geoffrey Chan ]	Planning Study Consultant
	Ms Ebby Leung ]	AECOM Asia Company Ltd.
	Mr Billy Au Yeung ]	
	Dr Ho Wing-chung ]	Social Impact Assessment Consultant
	Ms Chan Ka-yan ]	Social Capital and Impact Assessment Research Unit, Department of Applied Social Studies, City University of Hong Kong

**The Chairman** welcomed Members and the Study Consultants to the meeting of the Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum (“DURF”). As the S.K.H. Holy Carpenter Church Community Centre in Hung Hom was under refurbishment, the present meeting was conducted at the Hung Hom Community Hall. He also

welcomed Mr Richard Siu Yee Lin, Acting District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department and Mr Yeung Min, Senior Engineer, Transport Department to the meeting.

#### **Agenda Item 1 Confirmation of the Minutes of the Tenth Meeting**

2. **The Secretary** said that the Secretariat circulated the draft minutes of the tenth meeting of DURF to Members by email on 23 September and received proposed amendments. The revised minutes of meeting were emailed to Members on 13 December. The Secretariat then received the proposed amendment to paragraph 31 of the minutes from another Member. The replacement pages of the relevant minutes of meeting (i.e. pages 7-8) were tabled for Members' information at the meeting. As agreed by Members, the **Chairman** announced that the minutes of meeting after amendment were confirmed.

#### **Agenda Item 2 Matters Arising**

3. **The Chairman** invited the Secretary to report on matters arising and the Secretary reported to Members matters arising from the public education promotion programme mentioned at the last meeting. The Secretariat submitted the funding application for the programme to the Urban Renewal Fund (URF) at the end of August and later in response to the views by the URF's board of directors, the Education Working Group reviewed the programme and decided that it would not be conducted at the present stage and would withdraw the funding application. Members were informed of the decision of the Education Working Group by email on 25 October by the Secretariat. Without any objection from Members, the Secretariat withdrew the funding application from the URF on 5 November.

4. Without any comments from Members, the Chairman ended discussion on the above agenda item.

#### **Agenda Item 3 Draft Stage 2 Public Engagement Report for Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (Discussion Paper No: DURF KC/08/2013)**

5. **The Chairman** invited Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah, the convener of the Public Engagement (PE) and Social Impact Assessment (SIA) Steering Group, and the

representative of the PE Consultant, Mr Adrian Cheung to report on the draft Stage 2 PE Report.

6. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** stated that the PE and SIA Steering Group deliberated the draft Stage 2 PE Report at its meeting on 5 December and expressed views on it. After discussion, the Steering Group agreed in principle to adopt the draft report and the Consultant also amended the draft report in response to the views of the Steering Group members. The Steering Group proposed DURF to consider and accept the relevant document.

7. **Mr Adrian Cheung** reported to Members details of the draft Stage 2 PE Report, the major views received from the public and the responses of the Consultants. In addition, he also gave a brief account of the public's views on the proposed SIA mitigation measures and their views in respect of other areas.

8. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah and Mr Adrian Cheung for their report and invited Members to discuss the draft Stage 2 PE Report.

9. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** opined that the draft report was a comprehensive report and expressed concerns on the following two aspects:

- (a) On the proposals in respect of the 13 Streets, she agreed to the inclusion of the area into the Redevelopment Priority Area and understood the Consultant's proposal to sub-divide the "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") zone of 13 Streets was to speed up the redevelopment pace. However, because of the large development scale of 13 Streets, she opined that the sub-division would most unlikely attract private developers in participating in the redevelopment. As such, DURF should propose that the redevelopment be led by the Urban Renewal Authority (URA). She also stated that as the area was connected to the Kai Tak Development Area and To Kwa Wan, its traffic problem should be improved through the redevelopment of 13 Streets in spite of the Consultant's proposal to connect the 13 Streets site with the Kai Tak Development Area by a pedestrian walkway; and
- (b) She raised no objection to the Consultant's proposal that consideration be made by the authorities concerned to exempt the small sites from

the provision of parking spaces on redevelopment in the Lung Tong Nga Tsin Wai Road area so as to maintain the shop-lined streetscape. On the other hand, she also agreed to the proposal on the provision of additional parking spaces at the Kowloon City Municipal Services Building on redevelopment. However, she hoped that the authorities concerned would monitor the number of parking spaces in the area when considering the exemption of parking space requirement to ensure adequate supply of public parking spaces.

10. **The Chairman** noted the concerns expressed by Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching and stated that the parking space issue at the Lung Tong Nga Tsin Wai Road area had been considered by the Planning Study Consultant. As for the 13 Streets issue, he understood that Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching would like to see improvement to the ancillary transport facilities in the area through redevelopment. He suggested the Planning Study Consultant or the District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department to comment on the concerns by Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching. **The Chairman** also invited Mr. Michael Ma Chiu-tsee and Ms Jessica Ho Yuen-ching to respond to Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching's proposals.

11. **Mr. Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** stated that he had noted the residents' views and pointed out that except the 13 Streets, the Redevelopment Priority Area also included the 5 Streets and Eight "Wan" Streets areas where the building conditions were worse than those of 13 Streets. Under Operation Building Bright the building conditions of 13 Streets were improved when compared with other areas. He stated that many objective factors including the conditions of the buildings, living environment etc. must be considered by URA when spending public funds on redevelopment projects. In formulating its business plans, URA would consider the recommendations of DURF and submit its business plans to the Financial Secretary for approval.

12. **Ms Jessica Ho Yuen-ching** added that the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (URP), apart from providing reference to the Government, would also serve as a reference by the public and different organisations (including private developers, URA and property owners). She believed that the proposals of DURF would provide guidelines to facilitate them in considering the direction for future development and making decision on participating in the redevelopment.

13. **Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung** opined that DURF should reflect the residents' views but did not agree that DURF should propose redevelopment of any

area be led by URA or any private organisation. He pointed out that the stakeholders would have varied views on the implementation of redevelopment projects. In addition, URA had already had its own current mechanism for selecting redevelopment projects. He opined that URA should be allowed to decide on the redevelopment projects in the area according to its current mechanism. If DURF proposed URA to lead the redevelopment project of a particular area, he was worried that it might not be in line with the current mechanism, and might give rise to unnecessary public expectation.

14. **Mr. Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** agreed to the views of Dr Lawrence Poon Wing-cheung and did not agree to the designation of priority sites within the Redevelopment Priority Area. After making recommendations on the Redevelopment Priority Area by DURF, he noted that some tenants of old buildings were evicted by their owners leading to a reduction of units for letting in the area thereby bringing about negative impact on these tenants. He was of the view that the public should not be given too high expectations as it would undermine the interests of the lower stratum.

15. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** stated that she, as a member of DURF, had the obligation to reflect local opinions and proposed that the redevelopment of 13 Streets should be led by URA. Whether the proposal was accepted by URA or not would be a decision on the part of the Government. She also pointed out that it was not the first time the area was included into the Redevelopment Priority Area. Similar recommendation with that currently proposed by DURF was made in the report on District Aspirations on Urban Renewal in Kowloon City conducted by the Chinese University of Hong Kong commissioned by the Kowloon City District Council. She was of the view that only acceleration of the redevelopment pace could reduce the problems arising from speculation.

16. Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching hoped that the traffic of the area would be improved following the redevelopment of 13 Streets and requested that the redevelopment be led by URA. **The Chairman** noted her wish and opined that the two issues could be addressed separately and asked Ms. Connie Wong Wai-ching about her concerns.

17. In response, **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** said that planning and ancillary transport facilities played a very important role in regional development and hoped that the To Kwan Wan area would be benefited from the development of Kai Tak

through improvement on traffic connectivity. Because of the strategic location of 13 Streets, it was proposed that there should be ancillary transport facilities and public facilities in the area. As the private developers were often profit-oriented, she was worried that the anticipated social benefits might not be achieved after the sub-division of the “CDA” zone. As such, for social benefits, it was hoped that URA would lead the redevelopment and develop the transport and relevant ancillary facilities in the area.

18. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** pointed out that the relevant public opinions were reflected in the PE Report. As the relevant public opinions involved issues related to the Planning Study, it was proposed to be discussed later.

19. **Mr Adrian Cheung** added that the public’s concern on ancillary transport facilities in the 13 Streets area, road connectivity, the role played by URA in redevelopment and the overall supply of parking spaces in the Lung Tong Nga Tsin Wai Road area were recorded in the PE Report.

20. **The Chairman**, in concluding the agenda item, proposed that the draft PE Report be accepted by Members and Members agreed to such decision. The report would be uploaded onto the website of the URP for public inspection. As for the concerns of Ms Wong, he proposed the Planning Study Consultant to respond at the discussion of the next agenda item.

#### **Agenda 4 Draft Working Paper 5 of Planning Study on Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (Discussion Paper No: DURF KC/09/2013)**

21. **The Chairman** invited Dr. Tang Bo-sin, convenor of the Planning Study Steering Group and Mr Geoffrey Chan, representative of the Planning Study Consultant to report to Members on the draft Working Paper 5 on Recommended Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (RURP).

22. **Dr. Tang Bo-sin** stated that the Planning Study Consultant had communicated with relevant Government departments and organisations for the completion of the draft RURP. The Working Paper was discussed at the Planning Study Steering Group meeting held on 6 December and the Steering Group endorsed in principle the paper. The Consultant amended the draft paper in light of the views of the Steering Group members. It was recommended by the Steering Group that the paper be considered and accepted by DURF.

23. **Mr Geoffrey Chan** pointed out that the Consultant had made reference to the Stage 2 PE and SIA findings and made adjustments to the proposals of the RURP in light of the various views by the concerned parties. The public basically agreed to the direction of the proposals. He introduced to Members the proposals of the draft RURP.

24. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Geoffrey Chan for his report and added that the Planning Study Consultant in drafting the proposals had taken into consideration the SIA information and proposed mitigation measures. Regarding the concerns of Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching on the sub-division of the “CDA” zone of 13 Streets, **the Chairman** invited responses from Mr Geoffrey Chan and Mr Richard Siu Yee-lin.

25. **Mr Geoffrey Chan** stated that the public generally agreed to the sub-division of the “CDA” zone of 13 Streets. Though there were diverse views on the number of sub-division, the Consultant proposed formulating a planning brief for the 13 Streets “CDA” zone irrespective whether it was sub-divided into 2 or 3 CDAs in order to regulate future development. This would include connectivity between the CDAs after sub-division and the building of a pedestrian walkway within the site to connect with Kai Tak Development Area to ensure that the overall development of the area in the future would not be affected by the sub-division proposal. According to public views, it was proposed that consideration on the provision of public facilities, open space, parking facilities, the development requirements on connectivity between sites and their surrounding areas should be made in the planning brief. Through regulations under the planning brief, he hoped that the worries of Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching on the sub-division proposal would be eased.

26. **Mr Richard Siu Yee-lin** added that the planning brief primarily aimed at stipulating the development parameters of the sites including the requirements for the provision of facilities, parking spaces and ancillary transport facilities. When a planning application was submitted by an applicant in respect of the “CDA” zone to the Town Planning Board (TPB) under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance, TPB would consider the planning application to see whether it complied with the relevant development requirements laid down in the planning brief. He pointed out that TPB provided a 3-week public consultation period for the planning application so that the public could comment on it.

27. **The Chairman** pointed out that no matter the “CDA” zone of 13 Streets was sub-divided or not, the authorities concerned could regulate its development and



traffic design by means of the planning brief. The current proposals of DURF could be included into the planning brief and TPB was responsible for regulating its future development in accordance with the planning brief.

28. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** pointed out that as a TPB member, he understood that no matter whether the applicant was a private developer or a Government department, the planning application in respect of the “CDA” zone had to meet the TPB requirements including the submission of traffic impact assessment, environmental impact assessment and visual impact assessment. He also stated that DURF currently made proposals on the planning direction only and details for their implementation in future would be left to the relevant departments and organisations for consideration and decision. DURF could not make detailed proposals outside its ambit.

29. **Mr Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** was of the view that the redevelopment of 13 Streets might not improve traffic connectivity between the old district and Kai Tak Development Area because the 13 Streets “CDA” zone was not directly connected with Kai Tak Development Area while the “CDA” zone was to regulate traffic connectivity within the site. He agreed to the views of Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah that with proper regulation, private developers could also carry out redevelopment as in the case of Eight “Wan” Streets where some redevelopment projects were led by private developers. Furthermore, he supported the proposal on the sub-division of the “CDA” zone of 13 Streets from the angle of social impact. He estimated there were about 1 600 to 1 800 households and 260 plus vehicle repair workshops in 13 Streets. Redevelopment after sub-division would minimize the problem arising from the removal of a large number of residents and vehicle repair workshops at the same time and would reduce the impact on the community.

30. **Ms Connie Wong Wai-ching** understood that TPB would carefully scrutinise the future development and the overall provision of traffic and community facilities in the area. However, she was concerned that even though the “CDA” zone of 13 Streets were sub-divided, there might not be adequate incentives for private developers to conduct redevelopment at an appropriate time. In addition, Ms Wong had concerns on the development of the nearby Kai Tak Development Area and opined that the proposed Environmentally Friendly Linkage System of Kai Tak Development Area, apart from connecting with Kwun Tong, should also be extended to the west to To Kwa Wan. Ms Wong had sought advice from outside professionals who pointed out that 13 Streets might be a suitable location for the extension of the

system. As such, she hoped that the authorities concerned would note the proposal when considering the overall planning of the area.

31. On the “Flat-for-flat” (“FFF”) arrangement by URA, **Mr. Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** pointed out that such arrangement mentioned in the Working Paper was the current policy of URA and the “FFF” arrangement was applicable to all future redevelopment projects by URA. URA had reserved flats in the Kai Tak Development Area for the “FFF” arrangement and they were now under construction. He believed that upon the completion of those “FFF” flats, there would be ready-to-occupy flats for choice by the eligible owners when URA carried out new redevelopment projects in Kowloon City. **Mr Geoffrey Chan** noted the views by Mr Michael Ma Chiu-tsee and would use the words “continued to implement” instead of “proposed”.

32. Without further comments from Members, the **Chairman** concluded the agenda item and agreed to accept the draft Working Paper 5 on RURP.

#### **Agenda 5 Draft Stage 2 Social Impact Assessment Report for Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City (Discussion Paper No: DURF KC/10/2013)**

33. **The Chairman** invited Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah, convenor of the PE and SIA Steering Group and Dr Ho Wing-chung, representative of the SIA Consultant to report on the draft Stage 2 SIA Report to Members.

34. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** stated that the PE and SIA Steering Group had discussed the draft Stage 2 SIA Report at its meeting on 5 December and agreed to accept the proposed SIA mitigation measures. Members of the Steering Group also put forth their views on the draft report. The Consultant had made corresponding amendments to the report in response to the views by the Steering Group. It was proposed that the report be considered and accepted by DURF.

35. **Dr Ho Wing-chung** reported to Members on the work and findings of the Stage 2 SIA. He gave an account of the major work of the Stage 2 SIA, the views and expectations of the various social groups on the approach of the mitigation measures as well as the existing support services and measures related to urban renewal. Dr Ho Wing-chung then explained to Members the three proposed mitigation measures including Information Kit on Urban Renewal, One-stop Information and Support Centre as well as promotion and enhancement of the existing

supporting services and measures. Finally he reported to Members the views of the members of the Study Working Group and the responses by the Consultant.

36. **The Chairman** thanked Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah and Dr Ho Wing-chung for their report and invited Members to put forth their views on the draft Stage 2 SIA Report.

37. **Mr. Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** pointed out that URA had set up its first “Urban Renewal Resources Centre” in Tai Kok Tsui and a similar resource centre might also be set up in the Ma Tau Wai area in the future. However, he would like to clarify that under the present policy, the resources centre would only provide information on the redevelopment projects led by URA. He opined that redevelopment projects led by URA would involve different compensation policies while redevelopment led by private developers incurred mainly private transactions and would involve lease and legal matters etc. and thus differed from the former one. However, the “Urban Renewal Resources Centre” would provide venues for the non-government organisations (NGOs) to hold information sharing sessions and he encouraged other organisations and groups to hold similar activities at its venue to help the public who were in need of such service.

38. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** stated that the Study Steering Group noted the limitation of services provided by URA’s resources centre and hoped that the resources centre would lend its premises for releasing information to the residents affected by redevelopment so as to achieve its objectives of providing one-stop services.

39. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** pointed out that the demographic characteristics of the area were recorded in the report. He asked the Consultant whether studies and assessment on the future demographic changes in the area and related social impacts would be conducted.

40. **Dr Ho Wing-chung**, in response, stated that as there were no definite redevelopment projects at present, the residents were not sure whether they would move out. As such, there might be difficulties in assessing the future population and social impact. Thus no such assessment was conducted. Dr Ho pointed out that the Consultant had asked the residents about their wish for local re-housing in the questionnaire survey. Different responses were found from the residents of different areas, for example, there was a higher percentage of residents in the Lung Tong Nga

Tsin Wai Road area aspiring for local re-housing when they were affected by redevelopment while the percentage of residents of the 13 Streets and Eight “Wan” Streets asking for local re-housing was comparatively lower.

41. **The Chairman** added that assessment on the social impact after redevelopment was a major issue. According to overseas experience, such assessment would be made when there were details on definite redevelopment projects. He was of the view that the authorities concerned needed to conduct such assessment in the future.

42. **Mr Michael Ma Chiu-tsee** shared with Members URA’s experience in the tracking survey on residents affected by redevelopment. As most of the residents were unwilling to respond after they were given compensation upon removal, the survey result served limited purpose. He pointed out that only major redevelopment projects merited tracking survey and at present it was not suitable for DURF to conduct such assessment studies.

43. **Mr Ho Hin-ming** clarified that he only proposed Planning Department, through projecting the future population in the area, to estimate the requirements for community facilities after redevelopment by making reference to the demographic changes in other redevelopment areas. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** agreed to such proposal and opined that if the authorities concerned had more data in hand, the future development planning would be facilitated. He proposed that the authorities concerned could collect relevant data through the Housing Department and the Census and Statistics Department or conduct tracking surveys through the elderly centre in the area.

44. **The Chairman** noted the comments and concluded the agenda item. Without further comments from Members, he announced that the draft Stage 2 SIA Report was accepted.

**Agenda Item 6      Recommendations of Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City  
(Discussion Paper No: DURF KC/11/2013)**

45. **The Chairman** pointed out that the recommendations of the URP as stated in the paper were made based on the consultancy reports and views collected from local residents as discussed under the above 3 agenda items. He expected that Members, after discussion following the briefing by the Secretary, would accept the contents (i.e.

Annex of Discussion Paper No: DURF KC/11/2012) as a blueprint for the recommendations to be submitted to the Government by DURF in the future. He invited the Secretary to explain the contents of the paper to Members.

46. **The Secretary** explained to Members the contents and structure of the URP Report to be submitted to the Government. She pointed out that the report mainly contained three parts namely the introduction, recommendations of the URP and the concluding remarks. The introduction of the report included the background for the formulation of DURF, its work objectives, the proposed urban renewal areas and the process through which the urban renewal plan was formulated. The part on recommendations of the URP consolidated the urban renewal proposals of the Planning Study and the SIA mitigation measures while the part on concluding remarks proposed the Government to take follow-up actions for the implementation of the recommendations according to the actual situation and to announce the implementation progress at appropriate time. **The Secretary** stated that the Secretariat was drafting the introduction of the report which would be circulated to Members for comment upon completion. She invited Members to comment on the recommendations and comments could also be sent to the Secretariat after the meeting. If the paper was accepted by Members, the recommendations part therein would be the blueprint for the compilation of the URP Report. The Secretariat would also circulate the other parts of the report to Members for their consideration and acceptance.

47. **The Chairman** added that it was anticipated that the URP Report would be submitted to the Secretary for Development for consideration next month. The Secretariat would continue to collate the relevant information and prepare the introduction of the report which would be sent to Members for consideration later. He hoped that Members would focus their discussion on the part on recommendations of the URP Report (i.e. the Annex of the discussion paper) and invited Members to express their views.

48. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** asked when Members should express their views if they would like to comment on the recommendations. The Secretary in response stated that the views by Members should be submitted to the Secretariat by the end of December. **The Chairman** added that the views on amendments to wording could be submitted to the Secretariat after the meeting. However, Members were requested to put forth their views at the meeting if conceptual amendments were involved.

49. **Ms Christine Kwok Mun-ye**e stated that the proposals contained in the Planning Study Working Paper were in greater details while the report submitted to the Government was relatively brief. She was concerned about how the detailed arrangements of the recommendations would be considered by the Government when they were submitted to the Government by DURF. **The Secretary** in response said that the report submitted to the Government would summarise the recommendations by the Consultants who would prepare the final reports by consolidating the findings of the studies. The reports would explain the details of the recommendations and their formulation process. As the final reports would take time to prepare, the Secretariat would first submit the URP Report to the Government for consideration while the final reports prepared by the Consultants would be submitted to the Government for consideration of the details of the recommendations later.

50. **The Chairman** added that the URP Report would briefly introduce the Consultants' recommendations. As for the details of the Consultants' recommendations, reference could be made to their final reports. He pointed out that both the URP Report and the two final reports prepared by the Consultants would be submitted to the Government. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** proposed to add an index in the URP Report to facilitate cross-referenc to the Consultants' final reports.

51. **Ms Christine Kwok Mun-ye**e enquired about the ways to submit the URP Report by DURF, for example introducing and discussing with Development Bureau the recommendations of the report. **The Secretary** stated that the recommendations of the URP involved coordination with and follow-up actions by Government departments and the Consultants had consulted the relevant Government departments or the bureaux during the process of formulating the recommendations and made amendments to them in the light of their comments. Thus most recommendations of the URP were basically feasible and would be followed up by relevant departments. However, some recommendations required detailed studies later, for example, the recommendation on the development of a vehicle repair centre. **The Chairman** added that communications with relevant Government departments or bureaux were made when the URP was formulated and recommendations that were not feasible were ruled out. As such, no special way to submit the report to the Government was required. As the implementation of the recommendations and their detailed arrangements involved factors such as resources constraint etc., it was believed that the Government would need time to consider the recommendations by DURF.

52. Without further comments from Members, **the Chairman** concluded the agenda item and announced that the part on recommendations of the URP was accepted in principle. For any amendments to wording, Members could send them to the Secretariat by the end of the month. The Secretariat would continue to consolidate the report and would circulate it to Members for their consideration and acceptance. Members agreed to the decision.

#### **Agenda 7 Any Other Business**

53. **The Chairman** raised the following items for discussion by Members:

##### *Follow-up actions after the Submission of the Urban Renewal Plan for Kowloon City*

54. **The Chairman** proposed the preparation of a pamphlet using colour illustrations, clear and simple words to introduce the recommendations of the URP submitted to the Government so that the local residents could be informed of the recommendations of DURF. The pamphlet could also be distributed to the stakeholders such as those residents who had participated in the DURF activities, chairmen of owners' corporations as well as relevant organisations and groups, or to the public through the concerned district office of the Home Affairs Department. In addition, the Education Working Group, in coordination with such work, could play a public education role by introducing the work of DURF and the URP to the local residents, the social service organisations or schools etc. in the coming months. He invited comments from Members on the above proposal.

55. **Dr Tang Bo-sin** agreed to the proposal but was of the view that in releasing information, efforts should be made to avoid creating unnecessary doubts and negative social impact such as the impact on the supply of local residential units and rent level resulting from the refusal to sell or let by the property owners which would cause inconvenience to the residents. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** and **Ms Siu Yuen-sheung** agreed to the concern raised by Dr Tang Bo-sin and proposed that a remark be included in the publication that the plan was proposed by DURF and its implementation was still subject to consideration by the Government or relevant organisations.

56. **Mr William TSUI Yiu-leung** agreed that a pamphlet on the recommendations of the URP should be compiled. He also proposed that a press release should be made for comprehensive information dissemination.

57. **Mr Wen Choy-bon** agreed to the proposal to introduce the recommendations of the URP to the public by simple and clear presentation. The residents might have doubts when they received the pamphlet. Thus he suggested that the recommendations be explained at the district council meeting to facilitate the district council members to respond to the questions raised by the residents in the future. **The Chairman** was of the view that the work could be followed up by the Education Working Group.

58. In response to Mr Ho Hin-ming's enquiry on when the URP Report would be officially submitted so that the relevant education work could be initiated, the **Chairman** stated that Members were required to submit their comments on the recommendations contained in the report to the Secretariat on or before 31 December. The Secretariat would collate Members' comments and the report in January before circulating the draft report to Members for consideration and acceptance. It was estimated that the report would be submitted to the Government by the end of January and a press release on it would be issued on the date of submission. Later the Education Working Group could commence its work and introduce the recommendations of the URP to the public including liaising with the district council and their members. Details of the work would be followed up by the Education Working Group.

#### Review on the Work of DURF

59. **The Chairman** stated that the urban renewal approach of DURF was the first one ever undertaken in Hong Kong. He proposed that a review on the past work should be made by the Planning Study Steering Group, the SIA and PE Steering Group as well as the Education Working Group for experience sharing and improvement proposals. **The Chairman** hoped that relevant experience would be discussed at the next meeting and he invited Members to comment on his proposal.

60. Members indicated their support to the review. **Mr Timothy Ma Kam-wah** opined that the review might serve as reference for the setting up of District Urban Renewal Forum in other districts.

#### Change of Secretariat Staff

61. **The Chairman** stated that Ms Lily Yam Ya-may, the Secretary would be transferred to another post at the end of December and she would be replaced by Ms



NG Suk-kwan, Sandy. On behalf of DURF, **the Chairman** thanked Ms Yam for her efforts and wished her all the best in her new post.

62. There being no other business for discussion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

**Secretariat**  
**Kowloon City District Urban Renewal Forum**  
**December 2013**