

**Minutes of 1238<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 29.1.2021**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y.S. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)  
Transport Department  
Mr Alex K.K. Au

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department  
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr. Sunny C.W. Cheung

Director of Lands  
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai (a.m.)

Assistant Director (Regional 1)  
Lands Department  
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung (p.m.)

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms W.H. Ho (a.m.)

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Carmen S.Y. Chan (a.m.)

Mr W.C. Lui (p.m.)

## **Opening Remarks**

1. The Chairperson said that the meeting would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

## **Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

### **Confirmation of Minutes of the 1237<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 15.1.2021**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1237<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 15.1.2021 would be sent to Members. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 1.2.2021, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were sent to Members on 30.1.2021 and confirmed on 1.2.2021 without amendments.]

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

### **Matters Arising**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The Secretary reported that there was no matter arising.

**Sai Kung & Islands District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/SK-SKT/22

Proposed 19 Houses in “Residential (Group E)2” Zone, Lots 8 S.B, 9 S.A and 9 S.B in D.D.  
212 and Adjoining Government Land, 1 Hong Kin Road, Sai Kung  
(TPB Paper No. 10710)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

4. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/ Sai Kung &  
Islands (DPO/SKIs), PlanD

*Shing Fung Group Property* ]

*Investment Ltd* ]

Mr Wu Yim Chung ]

*Lanbase Surveyors Limited* ]

Mr Rock Tsang ] Applicant’s representatives

Mr Anson Lee ]

*Ho & Partners Architects Engineers* ]

*& Development Consultants Ltd* ]

Mr Geoffrey Wong ]

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. She then invited PlanD’s representative to brief Members on the review application.

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs,

PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10710 (the Paper).

7. The Chairperson then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Anson Lee, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) it was noted that the major concern of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) on the application was the land use incompatibility issue with a concrete batching plant (CBP) located to the northwest of the application site (the Site), which would cause dust and noise nuisances to future residents of the proposed development. From his understanding, EPD would not support the application due to industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem even if the technical assessments conducted by the applicant could demonstrate that the environmental issues could be tackled in technical terms. This was the reason why the applicant had not submitted any environmental assessments to address the dust and noise nuisances in the review application;
- (b) the proposal was in line with the planning intention of the "Residential (Group E)2" ("R(E)2") zone for phasing out existing industrial uses through redevelopment/conversion for residential use while the I/R interface problem that might be caused was due to the existence of the CBP which was a temporary use permitted under a short term waiver (STW). There was a land use conflict between the long-term (the proposed residential development) and short-term (the existing CBP) uses. It was unreasonable for the RNTPC to reject a long-term use of residential development on the ground that it was incompatible with the temporary existing use of the CBP;

- (c) even if the application was approved, the applicant would still need to apply to the Lands Department (LandsD) for a land exchange to effect the proposal. Conditions on the submission of an Environmental Assessment (EA) prior to construction works could be imposed in the lease to address the environmental issues. Besides, it was estimated that it would take at least 5 to 7 years for completion of the land exchange process and construction of the proposed residential development. Should the Government wish to pursue the long-term planning intention of the Site for residential use, there was still time for the Government to tackle the land use incompatibility problem by terminating the STW and/or relocating the CBP to other areas; and
- (d) if the application was approved by the Board, the applicant was willing to submit an EA to the satisfaction of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP).

9. Mr Wu Yim Chung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) Sai Kung had been transforming into a tourist spot and a residential area with pleasant environment. The existing industrial operations in the area such as the CBP, which would create land use incompatibility problem, should be phased out;
- (b) with a view to realising the planning intention of the "R(E)2" zone, the land owner submitted two applications for residential development at the Site in 2016. However, the applications were subsequently withdrawn due to the difficulties to liaise with relevant government departments to resolve the I/R interface problem and other technical issues; and
- (c) the Board was urged to give a positive indication to the land owner that the planning intention of the "R(E)2" zone would be pursued, such that the land owner could proceed with the proposed residential development and undertake the necessary technical assessments in accordance with the

requirements of relevant government departments. Alternatively, should the Board consider residential development not a suitable use at the Site, an alternative land use zoning should be recommended such that the land owner could prepare a development proposal in accordance with the revised planning intention. Otherwise, the Site would remain vacant and its development potential could not be realized.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun joined the meeting during the presentation of the applicant's representatives.]

10. The Chairperson remarked that the current review application was for the Board to review the RNTPC's decision on the s.16 application instead of reviewing the government's land administration policy or advising relevant government departments on how the implementation aspect of the proposed development should be handled.

11. As the presentations from the representatives of PlanD and the applicant had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

*Designation of the "R(E)2" zone*

12. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the background of zoning the Site and its surrounding area to "R(E)2" on the Sai Kung Town (SKT) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (the OZP);
- (b) development control for the "R(E)" sub-zones on the OZP; and
- (c) whether relevant government departments were notified of the "R(E)2" zoning for the Site and its adjacent CBP site.

13. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) prior to the publication of the first SKT OZP in 2005, majority of the land within the planning scheme area had been developed. In view of



the existing industrial uses, including open storage yards, warehouse and CBP at the junction of Hiram's Highway and Hong Kin Road, the area was zoned "R(E)2" on the first SKT OZP with a view to encouraging the private land owners to phase out the industrial uses through redevelopment/conversion for residential use on application to the Board. The zoning of the area had remained unchanged since then. For any development in the "R(E)2" zone, the applicant was required to conduct technical assessments and propose effective mitigation measures to address the I/R interface problem;

- (b) the "R(E)2" zone covering the Site and the adjoining areas now occupied by storage and part of the CBP was subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 0.75, site coverage (SC) of 40% and building height (BH) of 9m (2 storeys over 1 storey of carport). Another "R(E)" sub-zone, the "R(E)1" zone, located to the northeast of the Site (i.e. at the junction of Hong Tsuen Road and Chui Tong Road), was subject to a maximum PR of 2, SC of 40% and BH of 8 storeys (excluding basements); and
- (c) it was a general practice to send notifications to relevant government departments and the public when new OZPs or amendments to OZPs were gazetted.

#### *The Concrete Batching Plant*

14. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the reason for continuous renewal of the STW for the CBP despite its non-compliance with the planning intention of the "R(E)2" zone;
  - (b) the mechanism for terminating the STW for the CBP; and
  - (c) whether there was any plan to relocate the CBP adjacent to the Site to other areas.

15. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, made the following responses:

- (a) various parcels of private agricultural land to the northwest of the Site had been granted with STWs permitting the uses and structures for CBP and storage. The CBP commenced operation since 1997, before the Site was zoned “R(E)2” on the first SKT OZP gazetted in 2005. As the CBP was a use in existence before the publication of the first OZP and had continued since it came into existence, no action was required to make such existing use conform to the OZP;
- (b) LandsD advised that according to the terms and conditions of the STWs for the CBP, the STWs might be terminated by either party (the waiveree or the Government) by serving a three calendar months’ notice. Whilst there was a mechanism to terminate the STWs, there was no guarantee that such termination notice would be served by the Government to facilitate the proposed development under the current planning application. Each application would be considered by LandsD based on its own circumstances; and
- (c) the Government had undertaken a review on the demand and distribution of CBPs in Hong Kong. Given the operational requirement and need for the CBPs to be located close to the construction sites, CBPs had been established in different districts in Hong Kong. The CBP adjacent to the Site was the only CBP in Sai Kung and accounted for about 1.5% of the concrete production in the market. As CBPs were privately owned, their relocation was a market-led decision. There was currently no information on the relocation of the concerned CBP.

*I/R Interface Problem*

16. Some Members raised the following questions to the applicant’s representatives:

- (a) the reasons for not submitting an EA to address EPD’s concerns;

- (b) whether any other technical assessments had been conducted for the proposed residential development at the Site; and
- (c) how long the Site had been owned by the applicant.

17. In response, Messrs Wu Yim Chung, Rock Tsang and Anson Lee, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points:

- (a) although an EA was not submitted, the applicant's environmental consultant had consulted EPD regarding the environmental concern on the proposed residential development. EPD verbally advised that while the proposed residential development might be able to meet the technical requirements with the provision of mitigation measures to address the noise and dust nuisances from the nearby CBP, the application could not be supported due to land use incompatibility problem unless there was a committed programme to phase out the CBP. Given that there was financial implication for the preparation of EA and the chance of EPD's approval was slim, the applicant decided not to submit an EA at the moment. However, should the application be approved, approval conditions regarding the submission of an EA and implementation of the mitigation measures identified therein to the satisfaction of DEP could be imposed. Similar requirements could also be included in the lease;
- (b) two applications for residential development at the Site were submitted in 2016 and 2017. While the applications were withdrawn subsequently, a traffic impact assessment had been conducted at that time and it was noted that the traffic impact of the proposed development was acceptable; and
- (c) the Site was acquired by the applicant's father for storage of construction materials before the adjacent CBP commenced its operation.

18. A Member sought clarification on the claim of the applicant's representatives that EPD would not support the application if there was I/R interface and land use incompatibility problems even though the environmental concerns arising from the proposed residential

development could be addressed. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, said that DEP, whose comments had been incorporated in the Paper, objected to the application as the proposed residential development, which was located less than 5m from the nearby active CBP, would create land use incompatibility problem. Besides, the information submitted by the applicant failed to address the I/R interface problem and there was no assessment on other environmental concerns, such as noise and dust.

19. The same Member followed up and asked what assessment criteria EPD would adopt to handle similar applications with I/R interface problem. In response, Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung, Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), EPD, said that land use compatibility was one of the major criteria and EPD would normally not support an application if the I/R interface problem could not be resolved. According to Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), a buffer distance of at least 100m was required for uses (including residential use) that were sensitive to dust nuisance. For the subject application, the distance between the proposed residential development and the CBP was as short as 5m. The applicant failed to address the potential I/R interface problem and other environmental concerns. Particularly, the noise and dust nuisances caused by heavy vehicles and spillage of concrete slurry from concrete mixers should be addressed. As such, EPD had raised objection to the application following the same assessment criteria adopted in the consideration of a previous application, namely a residential development of Peninsula East at 9 Shung Tak Wai. Regarding the similar application (No. A/K15/119) in Yau Tong Industrial Area (YTIA) mentioned by the applicant, DEP had not raised objection since there was some prospect of the existing CBP being phased out upon the identification of suitable site(s) in Tseung Kwan O Area 137 for supporting CBPs, and an EA was submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that the proposed development would be environmentally acceptable with implementation of a number of mitigation measures. As exemplified in the above, for applications with I/R interface problem, EPD would assess each case based on its individual circumstances.

20. In response to some Member's questions, Messrs Rock Tsang and Anson Lee said that the STWs for the area to the northwest of the Site were for both CBP and storage uses, and the area adjacent to the Site was used for storage purpose and the CBP was separated from the Site by the storage area. Hence, the buffer distance between the proposed residential development and the CBP was more than 5m. The applicant was willing to reduce the scale of the proposed residential development so as to increase the buffer distance between the Site and

the CBP. However, the major hurdle of the proposed development was the I/R interface problem. If the subject application was rejected by the Board, relevant government departments would not take the initiative to handle I/R interface problem and the development potential of the Site would be frozen for another decade. The Board was urged to give a direction on how the planning intention of the “R(E)2” zone could be realized so that LandsD could start to review whether the STWs for the CBP would be renewed or the requirements of the STWs would be tightened to address the I/R interface problem.

21. A Member asked if there was any possibility for a joint residential development at the Site and the adjacent CBP site so as to resolve the I/R interface problem. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, said that a joint development at the Site and the CBP site was welcome from the planning point of view as it could resolve the land use incompatibility problem and release the land for residential development. However, whether a joint development could be implemented was subject to the decision of the relevant land owners. In response, Mr Wu Yim Chung, the applicant’s representative, said that according to their understanding, the land owners of the CBP had no intention to redevelop their site for other uses as they found the rental income generated from the CBP satisfactory.

22. Some Members raised the following questions to PlanD’s representative:

- (a) whether the buffer distance of 100m for uses sensitive to dust nuisance as required in the HKPSG could be relaxed;
- (b) whether the requirements of the STWs or licence for the CBP could be tightened up if the subject application was approved by the Board; and
- (c) whether the proposed residential development would create any adverse impact on the Tsiu Hang Special Area and the Lions Nature Education Centre located to the south of the Site.

23. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) the requirement of a buffer distance of 100m for uses sensitive to dust nuisance as stated in HKPSG was a general standard to provide guidance

to development proposals. Whether there was any scope to relax such requirement would be considered by the relevant government departments on a case-by-case basis. It should be noted that the relevant licence for CBP covered both the area occupied by the CBP and the storage area to the immediate north of the Site;

- (b) it was understood that for renewal of the STWs or licence for the CBP, the requirements including operation conditions and appropriate mitigation measures would be reviewed so as to alleviate the environmental nuisances created by the CBP on the surrounding area. Relevant government departments including EPD would provide advice during the process; and
- (c) while there was public concern on the potential traffic and landscape impacts of the proposed residential development on the Tsui Hang Special Area and the Lions Nature Education Centre located to the south of the Site, the traffic impact to be generated from the proposed 19 houses at the Site was considered acceptable. Besides, the proposed development would not affect the vegetation in the surrounding area. Relevant government departments had not raised concerns on those aspects.

#### *Similar Applications in Yau Tong*

24. Noting that some similar applications in YTIA had been approved, some Members enquired on the grounds of approving those applications. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, responded that the YTIA was mainly zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and “R(E)” on the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong and Lei Yue Mun OZP with the intention to phase out the existing industrial uses by comprehensive redevelopments. Planning permissions had been granted for some “CDAs” and “R(E)” sites for residential developments and some of which were completed (e.g. Ocean One, Canaryside, the Spectacle and Peninsula East) with some under different stages of development. The application mentioned by the applicant (No. A/K15/119), which was within the “CDA(3)” zone, was approved with conditions by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board on 15.6.2018. Another application (No. A/K15/121) at a site adjacent to the site under No. A/K15/119 and zoned “CDA(4)” was approved with conditions by the MPC on 26.6.2020. While the proposed developments under

the two applications were adjacent to a CBP which was still in operation, the applicants of both applications had submitted EAs to demonstrate that the proposed development would be environmentally acceptable. To address the possible I/R interface problems, apart from the noise mitigation measures such as acoustic window and enhanced acoustic balcony, the applicants had also committed to provide a number of measures in the building layout design to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts including noise and air nuisance from the industrial operations in the vicinity, for which DEP had no objection to the applications from the environmental perspective. Besides, the Government was proactively studying the feasibility to provide suitable sites in Tseung Kwan O Area 137 for setting up CBPs which could help the relocation of the CBP in YTIA.

25. In response to the Chairperson's question on a comparison of the scale of the proposed residential development in YTIA (No. A/K15/119) and at the Site, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, said that the proposed residential development in YTIA had a larger site area with PR of about 5, while the PR restriction of the subject "R(E)2" zone was 0.75. The scale of the proposed residential developments in YTIA was relatively larger and could provide more flats in the urban area.

#### *Planning Intention versus Short-term Uses*

26. Some Members asked whether the planning intention of the "R(E)2" zone to phase out existing industrial uses by redevelopment for residential use should be actively pursued by the Government so as to address the conflict between long-term and short-term uses as requested by the applicant. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, said that the rezoning of an area occupied by industrial operations into "R(E)2" zone was an act of "up-zoning" incentivising private land owners to phase out existing industrial uses for residential development under the planning application mechanism such that the environmental condition of the area could be improved. However, it would be a market-led development process subject to the business decision of the land owners, and the Government had no intention to force the land owners to undertake actions against their wish. This kind of "up-zoning" should be differentiated from the Government's proactive approach to realize the planning intention and resume land for development in the context of taking forward Government-led projects e.g. New Development Areas (NDAs) and public housing development.

*Others*

27. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, said that the planning of the road widening works for the Hiram's Highway Stage 2 was currently in progress and would not affect the proposed development at the Site.

28. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in the absence of the applicant's representatives and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

Deliberation Session

29. Noting that some Members had queries on whether the Government should adopt a more proactive approach to resolve the land use incompatibility problem in the "R(E)2" zone, the Chairperson explained that the Government had adopted different approaches to facilitate development/redevelopment under different circumstances. While the Government might invoke the Lands Resumption Ordinance to resume private land for development, the power to resume private land could only be invoked after a "public purpose" was established such as for development projects in new towns, public housing, or community facilities under public works programmes. In general, a change in the use of land was facilitated through land use zoning/rezoning under the town planning system. In general, the designation of an area occupied by industrial operations as "R(E)" zone was a kind of "up-zoning" through which land owners would be incentivised to phase out industrial uses through redevelopment/conversion for residential use, which would in turn gradually change the land uses through market forces and hence maximise the development potential of an area. It would be up to the private land owners to decide whether to develop their land as planned on the OZP and the timetable for such development, which was a business decision. However, if the planning intention of an area could not be realized through market forces after a long time and the area had high potential to meet the public need of the society, the Government might consider



suitable measures to expedite the process. For example, as YTIA was located in the urban area with potential for high-density residential developments, the Government was proactively studying the feasibility to identify suitable site(s) in Tseung Kwan O Area 137 for accommodating CBPs so as to expedite the phasing out of the existing industrial uses in YTIA. For the subject “R(E)2” zone which was planned only for low-density residential development, the Government had no plan to interfere the market-led development process at the moment.

30. Members generally acknowledged that the “R(E)” zoning was to provide incentive to encourage private land owners to phase out existing industrial uses for residential development rather than forcing them to move out so as to realize the planning intention. For the subject review application, the Board should review the decision of the RNTPC on s.16 application rather than directing the Government on actions to be adopted in the development process.

31. Some Members did not agree with the applicant’s view that the subject application had revealed a conflict between long-term and short-term uses as the CBP adjacent to the Site was an existing use prior to the gazettal of the first SKT OZP. It was more a conflict between the CBP as an existing use which was tolerated under the Town Planning Ordinance, with the right to continue operation respected, and a new use reflecting the latest planning intention. Such a situation could be expected when the transition from one land use to another was meant to be a gradual process. If the CBP was forced to relocate/cease operation to facilitate private residential development at the Site without clear public interest, it was not in line with the Government’s established policy to pursue the planning intention through market forces in the “R(E)” zoning. Besides, it was noted that there was a need to have CBPs close to the development sites to support construction works from operation point of view.

32. While noting that the area would only support low density residential development, some Members nonetheless raised concerns that the Site and its adjacent area had been zoned as “R(E)2” for more than 15 years but the existing industrial uses had not been phased out satisfactorily. This phenomenon might not be unique to the subject “R(E)2” zone, but also to other “R(E)” zones in general. As such, more incentive might need to be given to private land owners to expedite the redevelopment/conversion process for an early realization of the planning intention. Relevant government departments such as EPD might consider giving more guidance/assistance to those private land owners who wished to undertake redevelopment/conversion projects in accordance with the planning intention of the

“R(E)2” zone.

33. Members noted that the subject application was not comparable to the two approved similar applications in YTIA (No. A/K15/119 and A/K15/121) in that EAs were submitted by the applicants of the two applications to demonstrate that the proposed residential developments would be environmentally acceptable with the provision of a number of measures in the building layout design to mitigate the I/R interface problem. In the subject application, however, there was a lack of assessments on the noise and dust nuisances to demonstrate the environmental acceptability of the proposed development, as well as assessments on sewerage and drainage impacts to demonstrate that the proposed development would not induce adverse impacts on the surrounding area. It was inappropriate for the Board, as requested by the applicant’s representatives in the meeting, to approve the subject application prior to the submission of technical assessments to the satisfaction of relevant government departments.

34. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed that there was no strong reason to depart from the RNTPC’s decision to reject the application as the applicant failed to provide the required technical assessments to demonstrate that the I/R interface problem could be satisfactorily resolved and that the proposed development would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts. The planning intention of the “R(E)2” zone for phasing out of existing industrial uses through development/conversion for residential use should be pursued through market forces and the development time frame was a market-led decision by the concerned land owners. Notwithstanding that, the Government should keep in view the situation and explore possibilities to expedite the redevelopment process should opportunity arise and circumstances so warrant. Meanwhile, the applicant was advised to liaise with the relevant government departments for advice on the possible mitigation measures to address the environmental problems.

35. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reason:

“the applicant fails to demonstrate that the interface problems with the adjacent industrial use can be satisfactorily resolved and that the proposed development would not be subject to adverse environmental impacts.”

[Mr K.K. Cheung left the meeting temporarily, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Stanley T.S. Choi and Y.S. Wong left the meeting during the deliberation session and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

## **Hong Kong District**

### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/24  
(TPB Paper No. 10717)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

36. The Secretary reported that one of the amendment items was to facilitate a public housing development to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). AECOM Asia Co. Ltd. (AECOM), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. (ARUP) and Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (MMHK) were the consultants of HKHA. The following Members had declared interests on the item for being associated/having business dealings with HKHA, the consultants of HKHA, Ms Mary Mulvihill (R2 and C4) and/or Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL) (C1), as well as owning property in the Chai Wan area:

- |                     |   |
|---------------------|---|
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with HKHA  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | - having current business dealings with HKHA, ARUP, MMHK, AECOM and past business dealings with MTRCL |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA and having current business dealings with ARUP     |

- Mr Y.S. Wong - being a member of Funds Management Sub-Committee of Finance Committee of HKHA
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of Arts Centre, which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his serving organisation operating a social service team in Mei Tung Estate which was supported by HKHA and openly bid a funding from HKHA, and co-owning with spouse a flat in Heng Fa Chuen
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society which was in discussion with HD on housing development issues
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD, but not involved in planning work
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having current business dealings with HKHA, MMHK, ARUP and MTRCL and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his former firm having current business dealings with HKHA, MMHK, ARUP and MTRCL and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a member of HKHA  
(as Director of Lands)

Mr Gavin C.T. Tse - being a representative of the Director of Home  
(as Chief Engineer Affairs who was a member of the Strategic  
(Works), Home Affairs Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing  
Department) Committee of HKHA

37. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting, and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Alex T.H. Lai and Y.S. Wong had already left the meeting and Mr K.K. Cheung had left the meeting temporarily. As the interests of Messrs Franklin Yu, Andrew C.W. Lai and Gavin C.T. Tse were considered direct, Members agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Messrs Peter K.T. Yuen, L.T. Kwok (interests regarding his serving organization) and Daniel K.S. Lau were indirect, and the property co-owned by Mr L.T. Kwok had no direct view of the sites covered by the amendment items, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Franklin Yu and Gavin C.T. Tse left the meeting temporarily and Mr Andrew C.W. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

38. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

39. The following government representatives and representer/commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

***Government Representatives***

**Planning Department (PlanD)**

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Louis K.H. Kau | - District Planning Officer/ Hong Kong (DPO/HK) |
| Mr T.W. Ng        | - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 2 (STP/HK2)     |

**Housing Department (HD)**

- |                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Ms Emily W.M. Ip       | - Senior Planning Officer |
| Mr K.Y. Hahn           | - Senior Architect        |
| Mr Alan K.Y. Yuen      | - Senior Civil Engineer   |
| Ms C.Y. Ng             | - Planning Officer        |
| Ms Kenniss H.T. Cheung | - Architect               |

***Representer/Commenter***

R2/C4 – Mary Mulvihill

- |                   |                             |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| Ms Mary Mulvihill | - Representer and Commenter |
|-------------------|-----------------------------|

40. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representer/commenter would then be invited to make oral submission. There was only one representer/commenter making the oral presentation and a total of 20 minutes would be allotted for making the presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer/commenter two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer/commenter had completed her oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representer/commenter. After the Q&A session, the government representatives and the representer/commenter would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would then deliberate on the

representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

41. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr T.W. Ng, STP/HK2, PlanD, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10717 (the Paper).

43. The Chairperson then invited the representer/commenter to elaborate on her representation/comment.

R2 /C4 – Mary Mulvihill

44. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

*Amendment Item A*

- (a) as Representation Site A was close to residential area, the proposed ambulance depot at the site would have significant noise impact on the local residents. The proposed mitigation measures might not be able to reduce the noise impact;
- (b) the government, institution and community (GIC) table in the Paper showed that there was an alarming shortfall of community facilities in Chai Wan including community care services facilities for the elderly, residential care home for the elderly and child care centre. As the aging population was expected to accelerate in the coming 20 years, sites zoned "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") that were suitable for the provision of elderly facilities should be devoted to the provision of such facilities. Priority should be given to the provision of both residential and day care

homes for the elderly at Representation Site A rather than providing accommodation for civil servants;

- (c) the ambulance depot and departmental quarters (DQ) could be provided through the in-situ redevelopment of the existing Chai Wan Fire Station and the relocation of the adjacent driving test centre at the two “G/IC” sites at Sheung On Street, otherwise the driving test centre together with the adjacent Sheung On Street Playground might be taken back for land sale; and

*Amendment Item B1*

- (d) rezoning Representation Site B1 for building a high-rise tower was strongly objected to as the “Green Belt” (“GB”) site was an integral part of the green lung in the densely populated Chai Wan area and almost 500 trees and the vegetation in the surrounding area would be felled/affected without satisfactory compensation. Representation Site B1 was not suitable for residential development due to its close proximity to a liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) storage and the use of un-openable acoustic windows to address the traffic noise issue. The proposed development would also affect the overall visual openness in the immediate neighborhood of Chai Wan. Although there was a shortage in housing land, consideration should be given to providing a living environment that could keep the residents in a healthy condition amid the COVID-19 pandemic.

45. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the representer/commenter had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representer/commenter and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties.



*Amendment Item A*

46. A Member asked whether there were any specific requirements or reasons for choosing the site for a composite development of ambulance depot and DQ. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that Amendment Item A was to take forward a s.12A application which was approved by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board in 2017 for reprovisioning of the existing sub-standard ambulance depot at Hing Wah Estate, which had been in service for more than 40 years with dilapidated facilities, and for expediting DQ projects for disciplinary services departments. A site search for the reprovisioning of the ambulance depot site was conducted by PlanD in 2010 with policy support from the Security Bureau. When identifying a suitable site, a number of factors including the distance between a potential site and the populated area had been considered to ensure that emergency services could be provided to the service area within 12 minutes from the time of call according to the performance pledge of the Fire Services Department (FSD). As the site abutted Chai Wan Road and Siu Sai Wan Road, it was a suitable location for the reprovision of the ambulance depot to serve the area as required by FSD.

47. Noting the suggestion of the representer/commenter that the existing Chai Wan Fire Station at Sheung On Street could be redeveloped in-situ and the adjacent Sheung On Driving Test Centre could be relocated to make way for the provision of the ambulance depot and DQ, the Chairperson asked whether such suggestion had been considered by PlanD. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, said that the sites along Sheung On Street mentioned by the representer/commenter were zoned "G/IC(1)", "G/IC", "O" and "Comprehensive Development Area (1)" ("CDA(1)") on the Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). The area zoned "G/IC(1)" was occupied by an existing fire station which had no redevelopment programme at this stage. The area zoned "G/IC" was occupied by Sheung On Driving Test Centre. According to the Transport Department, it was one of the driving test centres on Hong Kong Island and was an essential facility to provide services to the community. The area zoned "O" was the existing Sheung On Street Playground. The area zoned "CDA(1)" and part of the adjacent "O" zone were the subject of a planning application first approved in 2002 for proposed comprehensive residential development with commercial use and a public transport terminus. As such, the sites along Sheung On Street were not available for the provision of ambulance depot and DQ.

*Amendment Items B1 and B2*

48. Some Members raised the following questions:

*Planning history of the “GB” zone*

- (a) the reasons for zoning the sites as “GB” instead of “Open Space” (“O”) given that Chai Wan Park was located in the close proximity;
- (b) whether there was any guidelines for the provision of “GB” zone in the district;
- (c) why the “GB” site at Cheung Man Road was considered suitable for the proposed public housing development; and

*Proposed public housing development*

- (d) the development parameters of the proposed public housing development including the building height, number of flats and planned population.

49. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, made the following responses:

*Planning history of the “GB” zone*

- (a) in 1980s, site formation works took place in the hilly area for the construction of the Eastern Hospital and residential clusters. A piece of comparatively flat land located to the east of Representation Site B1 was zoned “O” for the development of Chai Wan Park to provide recreational facilities to serve the population in the area. Since open space provision in the district could cater for the needs at that stage of development, Representation Site B1, which was located at a steep slope, was then zoned as “GB” to reflect the condition of the site and to act as a reserve for future use;

- (b) there were no guidelines for the provision of “GB” zone under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines;
- (c) in general, the function of the “GB” zone was to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl. The subject “GB” site, however, was located in a well-developed neighbourhood. As the existing and planned local open space provision was generally sufficient in the Chai Wan Planning Scheme Area, there was no need to rezone the “GB” site to “O”. Given that the “GB” site was sizeable, in close proximity to the existing settlements, and near and accessible to existing roads/infrastructures, it was considered suitable for public housing development to meet the pressing need of the community. Various technical assessments had been conducted to demonstrate that the site was technically feasible for residential use; and

*Proposed public housing development*

- (d) the building height restriction (BHR) stipulated for Representation Site B1 was 135mPD, which was considered compatible with the surrounding residential developments to the north-west and the business area to the southwest, which were subject to BHRs of 120mPD to 140mPD on the OZP. According to the conceptual scheme prepared by HD, the proposed public housing development would provide about 850 flats with a design population of about 2,380.

*Provision of GIC facilities*

50. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the provision of GIC facilities in different areas of Chai Wan;
- (b) the distribution of elderly people in Chai Wan;

- (c) apart from the 60-place day care centre for the elderly to be provided in the proposed public housing development at Cheung Man Road, whether additional social welfare facilities would be provided to cater for the needs of the community; and
- (d) how the lack of social welfare facilities for the elderly in Chai Wan would be tackled by the Government.

51. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, made the following responses:

- (a) the Chai Wan Planning Scheme Area could be divided into three sub-areas, including Hang Fa Tsuen in the north, Chai Wan old area in the south and Siu Sai Wan area in the east. There were quite a number of public housing estates in the older areas of Chai Wan, where GIC facilities for children, youth, elderly as well as family were provided. There were also some GIC facilities for the youth and the elderly provided in Siu Sai Wan and Ha Fa Tsuen areas;
- (b) while no information regarding the geographical distribution of elderly people in Chai Wan was available, according to the 2016 By-census, people aged 65 or above in Chai Wan Planning Scheme Area was about 17.29% which was slightly higher than that of 15.85% in the whole of Hong Kong;
- (c) after further liaison with the Social Welfare Department (SWD), HD would consider providing an additional elderly facility of one team of home care services for elderly persons (no-kitchen based) in the proposed public housing site at Cheung Man Road; and
- (d) the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach with long, medium and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which were in acute demand, including (i) monitoring closely if there were suitable vacant site (e.g. site having potential for housing for incorporation of the welfare facilities) or “G/IC” premises; (ii) identifying suitable land sale sites and

requiring private developers to provide welfare facilities through land sale conditions; (iii) encouraging non-governmental organisations to apply for grants for providing welfare facilities; and (iv) taking forward the initiative of purchasing suitable premises for the provision of welfare facilities as a short term measure.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

52. As Members did not have further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives and the representer/commenter for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representatives/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives and the representer/commenter left the meeting at this point.

### Deliberation Session

#### *Amendment Item A*

53. Members generally agreed that Representation Site A, which was originally zoned for "G/IC", was suitable for reprovisioning the existing sub-standard ambulance depot at Hing Wah Estate and to expedite the DQ development.

#### *Amendment Items B1 and B2*

54. The Chairperson remarked that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to build up land reserve with a view to meeting housing and other development needs, including a review on "GB" sites to explore the possibility for residential use. While the public tended to closely scrutinise the rezoning of "GB" sites for residential development, only one representation objecting to the rezoning of the subject "GB" site was received. Regarding the land required for the provision of 316,000 public housing units in the next 10 years, about 40% came from rezoning exercises. As such, every successful rezoning, no matter how small the number of units of some cases, would contribute to the provision of public housing developments to meet the target.

55. Members generally considered that Representation Site B1 was suitable for public housing development on the consideration that it was located in the urban area, in proximity to Chai Wan MTR station and served with infrastructure and supporting facilities such as the Eastern Hospital. While about 460 trees would be felled at the site, no registered Old and Valuable Tree was identified and mitigation measures would be adopted to alleviate the impacts. It was also noted that some elderly facilities were proposed within the development which were essential to meet the demand for such facilities in Chai Wan. Members generally agreed with the amendments to facilitate an early implementation of the proposed public housing development at the site.

56. In relation to amendments to OZPs in general, a Member, whilst noting that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services, remarked that the inadequate provision of welfare facilities, in particular elderly facilities, was always a public concern and there might be a need for reviewing the strategy on the provision of services for the elderly. To facilitate Members' understanding of the Government's elderly policy and the measures to meet their needs, sharing session could be arranged with the relevant bureau/department at an appropriate time. The Chairperson said the Secretariat would follow up the arrangement of such a sharing session.

57. Members generally considered that other grounds and proposals of the representations and comments in respect of the OZP had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

58. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of R1. The Board decided not to uphold R2 and considered that the draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representation for the following reasons:

“Amendment Item A

- (a) the “Government, Institute or Community (4)” zone with a building height restriction of 100mPD is considered appropriate for the proposed joint ambulance depot and departmental quarters development. Relevant technical assessments have been conducted to demonstrate the feasibility

of the proposed development. No noise issue is anticipated as suitable mitigation measures would be implemented;

- (b) the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach with long, medium and short-term strategies to identify suitable sites or premises for the provision of more welfare services which are in acute demand. Elderly facilities will be provided in the proposed public housing development at Cheung Man Road in Chai Wan to address the current shortfall; and

Amendment Items B1 and B2

- (c) the “Residential (Group A)” zone with a building height restriction of 135mPD is considered appropriate to facilitate the proposed public housing development to meet the housing need of the community. Relevant technical assessments have been conducted to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposed public housing development. There is no insurmountable technical problem after the implementation of all the relevant building design and mitigation measures.”

59. The Board also agreed that the draft Chai Wan OZP, together with its respective Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

60. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:05 p.m.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Dr Roger C.K. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

61. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

62. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Permanent Secretary for Development<br>(Planning and Lands)<br>Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn | Chairperson |
|--|-------------|

|                       |                  |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang | Vice-chairperson |
|-----------------------|------------------|

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)  
Transport Department  
Mr Alex K.K. Au



Chief Engineer (Works)  
Home Affairs Department  
Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Dr Sunny C.W. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1)  
Lands Department  
Mr Albert K.L. Cheung

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

[Messrs K.K. Cheung and Gavin C.T. Tse returned to join, Mr Albert K.L. Cheung arrived to join and Mr Philip S.L. Kan joined the meeting at this point.]

**Sai Kung and Islands District**

**Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/23

(TPB Paper No. 10718)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

63. The Secretary reported that the amendments were to facilitate a proposed residential development on a Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) site in Tung Chung. Dennis Lau & Ng Chun Man Architects & Engineers (Hong Kong) Limited (DLN) and Hyder Consulting Limited (Hyder) were two of the consultants of MTRCL. A representation and a comment (R53/C7) were submitted by Ms Mary Mulvihill, and a comment (C1) was submitted by MTRCL. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| Mr Peter K.T. Yuen | - being a member of the Board of Governors of Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects;               |
| Mr K.K. Cheung     | - his firm having current business dealings with DLN, Hyder and MTRCL, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;        |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai   | - his former firm having current business dealings with DLN, Hyder and MTRCL, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - having past business dealings with MTRCL; and   |

Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative co-owning with a friend a property in Tung Chung.

64. Members noted that Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. As the interest of Mr Peter K.T. Yuen was indirect, Mr K.K. Cheung had no involvement in the proposed development project and the representer's/commenter's submissions, and the property of Professor T.S. Liu's close relative had no direct view of the representation site (the site), Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

65. The Secretary reported that a petition letter had been received from an Islands District Council (IsDC) member, Mr Lee Ka Ho, before the meeting. The petition letter was submitted out of time and should be treated as not having been made under the relevant provisions of the Town Planning Ordinance. Members might however note that Mr Lee had submitted a comment (C3) conveying similar views within the statutory period which were covered in the TPB Paper No. 10718 (the Paper).

66. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

67. The following government representatives, representers and commenters were invited to the meeting at this point:

#### **Government Representatives**

##### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au - Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is)

*Transport Department (TD)*

Ms Fanny S.Y. Hui - Engineer/Islands (E/Is)

**Representers and Commenters**

R12/C8 – Wat Yiu Man Kermit

Mr Wat Yiu Man Kermit - Representer and Commenter

R51 – Wong Yuk Kwan

Ms Wong Yuk Kwan - Representer

R53/C7 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

C3 – 李嘉豪

Mr Lee Ka Ho - Commenter

C4 – Li Chiu Ming

Ms Li Chiu Ming - Commenter

C5 – Leung Chun Wing

Mr Leung Chun Wing - Commenter

68. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers and commenters would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer and commenter would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submissions. There was a timer device to alert the representers and commenters two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers and commenters had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers and commenters.

After the Q&A session, the government representatives, representers and commenters would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

69. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

70. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Raymond H.F. Au, STP/Is, PlanD, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the Paper.

[Mr Franklin Yu returned to join and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

71. The Chairperson then invited the representers and commenters to elaborate on their representations/comments.

#### R12/C8 – Wat Yiu Man Kermit

72. Mr Wat Yiu Man Kermit made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed development, being located at a distance of about 55m only, was too close to Caribbean Coast. The living quality and privacy of the nearby residents would be adversely affected;
- (b) according to a previous government written reply to a Legislative Council member in 2018, during peak hours, the Tung Chung Line (TCL) had already reached 95% of its maximum carrying capacity based on a passenger density of four persons (standing) per square metre. An additional population of 4,000 arising from the proposed 1,300 units would increase the demand for railway services. Besides, the future

Tung Chung East (TCE) Station would not provide extra railway capacity as it shared the same TCL tracks;

- (c) the bus services in Tung Chung North had long been under-provisioned. The future developments in Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) Extension and the currently proposed development might bring negative impact on the bus services;
- (d) the local traffic on Man Tung Road would also be affected. After the opening of the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok (TM-CLK) Link Road, there was traffic congestion on Man Tung Road, which affected the travelling of the residents of Caribbean Coast to the TCNT by shuttle buses. The findings of the traffic impact assessment (TIA) for the proposed development were in doubt as the traffic condition during weekends/holidays might not be taken into account;
- (e) while the proposed residential development with a plot ratio (PR) of 6 and building height (BH) of 184mPD might not be incompatible with the surrounding land uses, it was considered not appropriate to propose such a development at the site given that the surrounding area was rather compact;
- (f) the viewpoints selected in the visual impact assessment (VIA) failed to demonstrate the visual impacts as they were viewed from locations of non-residential use such as the Tung Chung North Park. The views from the residential units of Caribbean Coast blocked by the proposed development had not been assessed by the VIA; and
- (g) it was requested that the future TCE Station should include an exit with direct access and connection to Caribbean Coast to serve the residents.

R51 – Wong Yuk Kwan

73. Ms Wong Yuk Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Caribbean Coast and the proposed development would block the mountain view from her unit;
- (b) the 1,300 flats under the proposed development could not help address the housing shortage problem. Alternative measures to increase housing supply such as relaxation of PR restriction for developments in TCNT Extension and Siu Ho Wan would be better options than the current proposal. Given that the TCNT Extension was already under implementation, the proposed development was considered not necessary;
- (c) a separation distance of 55m only between the proposed development and Caribbean Coast was inadequate, especially under the current pandemic situation. The compact development adjacent to Caribbean Coast would increase health risk;
- (d) the residents of Caribbean Coast were suffering from traffic noise impact from North Lantau Highway (NLH) whilst the proposed development was located even closer to NLH;
- (e) the proposed development would generate adverse impacts on visual and traffic, etc. on the surroundings but no proper local consultation was conducted; and
- (f) should the development project be proceeded, the proposed development intensity should be substantially reduced, say by 50%.

R53/C7 – Mary Mulvihill

74. With the aid of visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) she queried the information on the provision of major community facilities and open space in TCNT presented in Annex VI of Paper, which

was different from that shown in Attachment VI of Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) Paper No. 1/20 discussed on 29.5.2020. She did not understand why the provision of some social welfare facilities would change from deficit to surplus over such a short period of time;

- (b) the future demand for private housing might not be as high as expected by the Government due to the ageing population. In particular, there would be adequate private housing supply in Tung Chung, taking into account the recent pandemic impact on the aviation industry as some related working population, e.g. pilots, were moving out from Tung Chung, and emigration of the middle class in the coming years. On the other hand, there would be an increasing demand for community facilities in the area. Also, there was no information as to why the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site to the immediate southwest of the site was reserved for religious use;
- (c) the topside of the traction substation which belonged to the Government as well as the adjoining “G/IC” zones should be used for the provision of community facilities. Even if the site should be used for housing development, it should be developed for public housing rather than private housing;
- (d) the site, being located in close proximity to two liquefied petroleum gas filling stations, was considered not suitable for residential use. Moreover, the technical assessments conducted by MTRCL were not able to provide independent assessments on air pollution, traffic noise, traffic impact, etc.; and
- (e) the IsDC had raised various concerns on the proposed development, including the provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, traffic and transport, public consultation and implementation programme.



C3 – 李嘉豪

75. Mr Lee Ka Ho made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed amendments involved an infill development atop the traction substation. As there were already many public housing estates in both Tung Chung West (TCW) and TCE, there was no need for additional housing supply within the Tung Chung Town Centre;
- (b) he received a lot of local objections to the proposed development, including some 200 signatures from the local residents. All representations also raised objection to the proposal. At the briefing to IsDC in April 2020, various concerns raised by the IsDC members had not yet been addressed. It was disappointing that the proposal was still submitted to the Board for consideration;
- (c) the transportation problem in Tung Chung was serious and the existing railway services had saturated. There were many committed/planned developments in TCNT, which would add burden to TCL. The TCW extension line also could not help resolve the railway capacity issue given the sharing of the same TCL tracks;
- (d) in terms of road transport, the bus services had long been inadequate especially in Tung Chung North. The annual review of bus services conducted by TD was not effective. After the opening of TM-CLK Link Road, the traffic condition was bad especially in the Tung Chung Town Centre area, which would further be worsened after recovery from the pandemic;
- (e) there were concerns on the inadequate provision of GIC facilities and open space in the area. For instance, there was no sports ground in Tung Chung as well as the whole Islands District. Although there were some social welfare facilities proposed at the site, the facilities would have to be shared among all population in the district. The Government should make use of the concerned “G/IC” sites to provide the much-needed social

welfare facilities to the local community. It was difficult to understand why the concerned “G/IC” sites could not be efficiently developed for GIC uses but could be developed for private housing. It would be inappropriate to provide more housing development without the provision of adequate GIC facilities;

- (f) the proposed development would be subject to traffic noise impact generated from NLH. Complaints on traffic noise were received from the residents of Caribbean Coast. Given that the proposed development was located even closer to NLH, more traffic noise complaints were anticipated; and
- (g) there was insufficient local consultation on the proposed development. The Board was urged to take into account the local views and strike a balance between private and public interests.

#### C4 – Li Chiu Ming

76. Ms Li Chiu Ming made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in Tung Chung for about a year and was sympathetic to those residents to be affected by the development of high-rise buildings at the site, who would no longer enjoy the current nice views; and
- (b) she was concerned about the lack of supporting facilities for the proposed development, and considered that MTRCL should review the GIC provision. The proposed GIC facilities were not for the elderly. There was also a general lack of shops and services and wet markets in Tung Chung. Besides, other supporting facilities such as transport facilities might not be adequate to meet the needs of the future residents.

#### C5 – Leung Chun Wing

77. Mr Leung Chun Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Tung Chung for about 12 years and was also the chairman of a local concern group called Tung Chung Future;
- (b) he objected to the proposed development. Tung Chung was the city gate for the overseas visitors and bad planning in Tung Chung would affect not only the image of Tung Chung but also Hong Kong as a whole. The proposal was for profit-making rather than benefits of the community;
- (c) the proposed development would bring about adverse impact on the adjacent Tung Chung North Park and affect the living quality of the local residents. Open spaces were important to the local community which provided connection, nodes of activities and gathering as well as open areas for sunlight. He was concerned whether suitable facilities could be provided at the site to enhance the function of Tung Chung North Park and the connection between the two;
- (d) there would be adverse air ventilation impact on Tung Chung North Park as the air temperature there would be increased due to blockage of air flows by the proposed development;
- (e) the separation distance of about 55m at Man Tung Road was not adequate. The security within the neighbourhood might also be a concern as the area was mainly surrounded by tall buildings;
- (f) residents in the area generally had to wait for a long time for shuttle buses from railway station to home and vice versa at the moment. Without the provision of adequate public transport facilities, the future residents of the proposed development might tend to drive rather than take public transport which would aggravate the road traffic on Man Tung Road; and
- (g) various local issues should be resolved first prior to giving consideration to the current proposal. The Board was urged to take into account local views

and to plan Tung Chung in a comprehensive manner so as to create a better living environment for the local people.

78. As the presentation from the government representatives, representers and commenters had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the government representatives, representers and commenters to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

#### *Housing Need*

79. A Member asked about the rationale for using the site for housing development. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD said that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply including implementation of new development areas and new town extension, review of “Green Belt” sites and transforming of brownfield sites in recent years. As stated in the 2015 Policy Address, it was the Government’s initiative to explore the potential for topside development at railway stations and other railway facilities with an objective to increase housing supply. In that relation, the sites now occupied by the Tung Chung traction substation and Pak Shing Kok ventilation building in Tseung Kwan O had been identified by MTRCL with potential for housing development atop. MTRCL thus submitted a proposal with a conceptual scheme and technical assessments for residential development at the site.

#### *Development Intensity*

80. A Member enquired about the relevant considerations for the proposed development intensity, and whether there was scope to reduce the development intensity. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD explained that the site was located at the fringe of the existing TCNT which was predominantly occupied by high-rise high-density developments with a maximum PR of 6 for housing developments. A PR of 6 for the proposed private housing development at the site was in line with the prevailing government policy and considered compatible with such urban context. With a view to optimising the development potential of the site and taking into account the development intensity and BH of the surrounding

developments, a maximum PR of 6 and a maximum BH of 185mPD for the site which were similar to the nearest residential development, Caribbean Coast, to its northwest was considered appropriate.

### *Conceptual Layout*

81. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the proposed use of the structure to the south of Tower 1 at the site as shown on Plan H-6a; and
- (b) whether the podium garden and resident garden were proposed for public or private use.

82. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) to the south of Tower 1 would be a 2-storey residents' clubhouse of about 32mPD in height; and
- (b) both the podium garden and resident garden were proposed for use by the future residents. It was common practice that private open space was provided in private residential developments to serve their residents. There were a number of existing open spaces in the nearby areas, including Tung Chung North Park, and planned open spaces in TCNT and its extension for public enjoyment.

### *Urban Design, Visual Impact and Air Ventilation*

83. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was any planning standard on building separation;
- (b) the distance between the proposed residential towers and Caribbean Coast; and

- (c) the layout and disposition of residential towers, whether the proposed development would create a ‘walled effect’, and details of the air ventilation performance of the local area with the proposed development.

84. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) while there was no standard for building separation stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the proposed development should have to comply with the Buildings Ordinance in respect of natural lighting and ventilation requirements which would be scrutinised at the building plan submission stage;
- (b) the minimum distance from the proposed development (i.e. Tower 1) to Caribbean Coast was about 55m. The conceptual scheme was indicative only and the layout and disposition of building blocks could be further refined at the detailed design stage. It should also be noted that in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunities and balancing other relevant considerations. As such, in conducting VIA for the proposed development, the views from publicly accessible vantage points instead of private places/developments were assessed; and
- (c) the three proposed residential towers atop the traction substation were dispositioned with due consideration to the site constraints, such as the existing traction substation, tunnel portal and pumping station, and potential impact in terms of air ventilation of the area. According to the air ventilation assessment (AVA), under the annual and summer prevailing wind conditions, NLH and Man Tung Road running in northeast-southwest direction served as effective wind corridors for wind penetration through the area. The AVA report revealed that although some localised impacts on the “G/IC” site to the immediate southwest of the proposed development under the annual and summer conditions and the Tung Chung North Park under the annual condition were observed, some enhancement on the

ventilation performance along Hei Tung Street under the annual condition was also observed. As the site was elongated and lying parallel to the major wind flow direction, it was anticipated that the proposed development would not have significant impact on the overall wind environment of the area. Given the site constraints and limited developable space, the air ventilation impact of the proposed development had been minimised with the provision of mitigation measures, including two proposed 15m-wide building separations between residential towers, under the conceptual scheme. In finalising the future development scheme at the detailed design stage, the future developer should take into account the proposed mitigation measures in the AVA report to alleviate the potential impact of the development.

85. In response to a Member's question on the specific impact of the proposed development on Tung Chung North Park, Mr Leung Chun Wing (C5) said that the proposed development would affect the adjacent Tung Chung North Park in terms of blocking view, obstructing air ventilation, and raising temperature.

#### Traffic Noise

86. In response to a Member's enquiry on the traffic noise from NLH on the proposed development, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD explained that an environmental assessment including assessment on traffic noise impact had been conducted by MTRCL. For NLH, being a trunk road, a minimum buffer distance of 20m was required for sensitive use such as residential development to reduce air quality impact in accordance with the HKPSG. The proposed development was about 40m to 50m away from NLH, and mitigation measures were also proposed in the conceptual scheme such as careful design on building block disposition and internal layout to ameliorate the traffic noise. The relevant government departments had no adverse comment on the proposed development from environmental perspective.

#### *Transport, Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity*

87. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the future residents of the proposed development would use the planned TCE Station or the existing Tung Chung Station for access to TCL, and information on the design of TCE Station including any planned station entrance/exit close to Caribbean Coast and the pedestrian connectivity to the nearby developments; and
- (b) the traffic impact generated from the proposed development on the road and railway networks in Tung Chung, and information on the transportation services, capacity of road and rail in Tung Chung in respect of the TIA for the proposed development.

88. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD and Ms Fanny S.Y. Hui, E/Is, TD made the following main points:

- (a) the distance from the proposed development to Tung Chung Station and TCE Station was about 1.4 km and 700m respectively. Given the shorter distance from the future TCE Station, it was more likely that the future residents of the proposed development would use this station rather than Tung Chung Station to access TCL. It was anticipated that more pedestrian flows towards the direction of TCE Station would be generated from the proposed development as well as other nearby residential developments such as Caribbean Coast. As TCE Station was still at the design stage, there was no detailed information on the access arrangement of the station and the related pedestrian connections at the current stage. Regarding the suggestions of providing a station entrance/exit close to Caribbean Coast and a better pedestrian network connecting to the nearby developments in future, PlanD would convey the suggestion to MTRCL for consideration with a view to enhancing the pedestrian connectivity in the area; and
- (b) according to the TIA conducted by MTRCL in support of the proposal, it was anticipated that the proposed development would not generate significant traffic impact on the junctions and road network in the vicinity, and would not overload the railway network. The traffic impact of the



committed/planned developments in Tung Chung including the TCNT Extension had already been assessed under the TCNT Extension Study undertaken by the Government. On road network, it was revealed that by the design year of 2031, most of the road junctions could achieve a reserve capacity higher than the requirement of 15% as set by TD.

89. In response to a Member's enquiry on the provision of bus services in Tung Chung, Ms Fanny S.Y. Hui, E/Is, TD said that in view of the population growth in relation to some new developments, TD would examine the bus routes, bus stops and service level of the bus services in the area under the annual Bus Route Planning Programme and implement appropriate measures timely including introduction of new franchised bus routes and service enhancement of the existing franchised bus services, etc. to cater for the demand for bus services in Tung Chung

90. In response to a Member's question on the provision of parking facilities within the proposed development, Ms Fanny S.Y. Hui, E/Is, TD said that the car parking provision of the proposed development would follow the upper end of the requirements stipulated in the HKPSG and further details would be subject to the detailed design to the satisfaction of TD.

#### *GIC Facilities*

91. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the planned provision of GIC facilities in TCNT and its extension was adequate to meet the community needs;
- (b) the difference in GIC provision presented in the RNTPC Paper No. 1/20 and the Paper as mentioned by R53/C7;
- (c) whether there was an existing football pitch to the southwest of the site, and whether there was any existing or planned sports ground in Tung Chung;
- (d) provision of wet markets in Tung Chung;

- (e) the existing uses of the two “G/IC” sites under amendment item A2;
- (f) when consulting IsDC, whether the provision of five social welfare facilities had already been included in the development proposal;
- (g) noting an acute demand for GIC facilities, whether there was any scope to provide additional GIC facilities within the proposed development; and
- (h) information on the “G/IC” site reserved for religious use to the immediate southwest of the site, its vehicular access arrangement, and whether more GIC facilities could be provided at that “G/IC” site.

92. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) the provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung was planned in a holistic manner to serve the population of the existing TCNT and its extension in accordance with the HKPSG and based on the advice of relevant government departments. While mathematically there would be deficits in hospital beds and specific educational facilities, child care centres and elderly facilities, the planned provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung was generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population. The provision of GIC facilities would be under close and continuous monitoring and the actual provision would be subject to the consideration of the relevant government bureaux and departments during the planning and development process;
- (b) as regards the difference in GIC provision presented in RNTPC Paper No. 1/20 and the Paper, it should be noted that after the consideration of the RNTPC Paper by the Committee on 29.5.2020, the Government had further reviewed the provision of GIC facilities in Tung Chung. With the concerted efforts of relevant government bureaux and departments, additional GIC facilities, such as child care centre, day care centre for the elderly and residential care home for the elderly had subsequently been planned to serve the population of TCNT and its extension. The

information on the provision of some social welfare facilities had been updated accordingly in the Paper;

- (c) there was an existing football pitch located to the southwest of the site within Tung Chung North Park. While there was currently no sports ground in Tung Chung, a site for a standard sports grounds had been reserved in TCNT Extension;
- (d) there were existing wet markets in the public housing estates such as Fu Tung Estate and Yat Tung Estate, which were being managed by Link REIT. Wet markets were also provided in some new public housing estates such as Ying Tung and Mun Tung Estates. In addition, two new public markets had been planned in Tung Chung, one in Tung Chung Town Centre near Tung Chung Station currently under study while another one would be in Area 133A in TCE;
- (e) at the time of consultation with IsDC, the five social welfare facilities within the proposed development had already been included in the development proposal, yet IsDC members still considered that such provision was inadequate;
- (f) the two strips of government land to the north and south of the Tung Chung traction substation, which were previously zoned “G/IC”, were proposed to be consolidated with the traction substation site to form a larger site for constructing the proposed residential development with GIC facilities. The northern strip of government land was previously an undesignated “G/IC” site currently occupied by part of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)’s Public Works Regional Laboratory (North Lantau) while the southern strip designated as an amenity area was currently vacant and partly fell within a drainage reserve. By incorporating the two strips of government land into the traction substation site for development, the development potential of the site could be optimised;

- (g) the five social welfare facilities within the proposed development was required by the Social Welfare Department (SWD). There might not be scope to provide additional GIC facilities within the proposed development as part of the site was occupied by the existing traction substation and the podium floors on UG1/F to UG4/F would mainly be used for lobby, car park, residents' clubhouse and electrical and mechanical facilities; and
- (h) the "G/IC" site to the immediate southwest of the site had been reserved for religious use to meet the local needs. It would be served by a separate ingress/egress at Man Tung Road. The land grant of a planned church development within part of the "G/IC" site was under processing. For better site utilisation and to serve the local needs, some social welfare facilities would also be provided at that "G/IC" site.

93. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break.]

#### Deliberation Session

94. The Chairperson briefly recapitulated the background and key issues raised in the presentation and Q&A sessions to facilitate Members' consideration of the amendments. Members noted that the proposed development was in line with the Government's initiative to optimise the development potential atop railway facilities with the objective to increase housing supply. Alongside public housing developments, there was also strong public need for private housing. The site comprised the existing traction substation and two adjoining strips of government land. The strips of government land would not be put to gainful community uses on their own. The proposed development would help optimise the potential of the site and provide about 1,300 flats together with five social welfare facilities to serve the wider community.

Relevant technical assessments on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects had been conducted by MTRCL and concluded that the proposed development would not result in insurmountable problem with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures. As regards the general transport issue concerning Tung Chung as a whole, the overall transportation networks and public transport provision had been assessed and would be implemented under the TCNT Extension project.

95. Members, in general, supported the rezoning of the site to allow the proposed residential development with GIC facilities, and had the following views:

- (a) the proposed residential development could optimise the use of scarce land resources by increasing not only the private housing supply but also the provision of GIC facilities which could benefit the wider community;
- (b) the proposed development with a PR of 6 and a BH of 184mPD was considered compatible with the surrounding residential developments with PRs ranging from 5 to 6 and BHs ranging from 140mPD to 184mPD;
- (c) according to the technical assessments conducted, the proposed development would not generate adverse impacts on various aspects including visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, etc., which was considered acceptable by relevant government departments. In particular, a minimum separation distance of 55m from the nearest residential development, Caribbean Coast, had been allowed, which was generally much wider than that found in the built-up urban area;
- (d) given the site constraints including the presence of the existing railway lines and facilities, the conceptual scheme had demonstrated that careful consideration had been given to the layout and disposition of blocks to minimise their visual and air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas. The mitigation measures included the provision of two 15m-wide building separations between towers to serve as wind corridors as well as visual corridors towards the mountain backdrop which would improve visual permeability of the proposed development; and

- (e) it was appreciated that the five social welfare facilities including integrated home care service team sub-base, social and recreational centre for the disabled, on-site pre-school rehabilitation services, parents/relatives resource centre and home care service for persons with severe disabilities as required by SWD would be provided within the proposed development. Some of them were indeed not stipulated in the HKPSG. Moreover, additional GIC facilities would be provided in Tung Chung under the implementation of the TCNT Extension. The planned provision of GIC facilities at the site was generally considered reasonable and adequate.

96. Some Members also had the following suggestions to the project proponent for consideration in taking forward the proposed development:

- (a) the pedestrian connectivity from the future TCE Station exit to the nearby developments including the proposed development and Caribbean Coast, and the walkability to the waterfront and within the area should be better planned to facilitate the residents' access to various facilities and services as well as pedestrian circulation in the area;
- (b) an integrated residential and GIC development scheme should be formulated at the site so as to facilitate the public's access to the GIC facilities without causing disturbance to the future residents living therein; and
- (c) further consultation with the local residents should be conducted as appropriate when proceeding to the detailed design of the proposed development.

97. The Chairperson proposed and Members agreed that the Secretariat would, on behalf of the Board, convey the suggestions stated in paragraph 96 above to MTRCL for their consideration. Amongst which, the Secretariat would also convey the Board's concerns on improving the pedestrian connectivity in the area to PlanD and CEDD for appropriate follow-up action.

98. As for amendment item B, Members noted that it was technical in nature, which was to reflect the existing roadside amenity area.

99. Members generally considered that other grounds and proposals of the representations and comments in respect of the OZP had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

100. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R1 to R70 and considered that the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Amendment Items A1 to A3

- (a) the Government has been increasing land supply through a multi-pronged approach and addressing the supply-demand imbalance by formulating short, medium and long-term measures. The rezoning of the Tung Chung Traction Substation site for residential use is in line with the Government’s initiative to explore the development potential of railway stations and their related sites along existing and future rail lines, with the objective to increase housing supply (**R1 to R3, R6 to R8, R16, R24, R27 to R39, R45, R51, R52, R57, R59, R61, R64, R65 and R70**);
- (b) the proposed building height (BH) restriction of 185mPD and plot ratio (PR) restriction of 6 are considered compatible with the surrounding high-rise high-density residential developments with BHs ranging from 140mPD to 184mPD and PRs ranging from about 5 to 6 (**R12, R13, R17, R19, R20, R23, R24, R27 to R40, R46, R47, R55, R57, R58, R67 and R68**);
- (c) technical assessments have been conducted on visual, air ventilation, traffic, environmental, landscape and other aspects and no insurmountable technical problem is envisaged by relevant government bureaux/departments (**R1 to R18, R22 to R62, R65, R66, R69 and R70**);

- (d) in accordance with the standards stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the requirements of relevant government bureaux/departments, sites have been reserved for government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, including educational, medical and health, social welfare, public market and recreational facilities as well as open space, to serve Tung Chung New Town and its extension. Social welfare facilities will be provided within the future development at the representation site. The planned provision of GIC facilities and open space in Tung Chung is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population (**R1 to R4, R11, R17 to R21, R30, R45 to R48, R53, R62 and R63**); and

Amendment Item B

- (e) the amendment is to reflect the existing roadside amenity area (**R1 to R26**).”

101. The Board also agreed that the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

102. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 6:05 p.m.