

**Minutes of 1239<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 19.2.2021**

**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

Dr C.H. Hau

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

Dr Jeanne 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

Chief Traffic Engineer (Traffic Survey and Support)  
Transport Department  
Mr C.S. Lee

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)  
Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Director of Lands  
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr Y. S. Wong

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Alex C.Y. Kiu

## **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 1238<sup>th</sup> Meetings held on 29.1.2021

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The draft minutes of the 1238<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29.1.2021 were sent to Members before the meeting. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 22.2.2021, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 22.2.2021 without amendments.]

## **Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

## **Matters Arising**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

## **Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans**

3. The Secretary reported that on 2.2.2021, the Chief Executive in Council referred the Approved Tseng Lan Shue Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/SK-TLS/8 and the Approved Tsing Yi OZP No. S/TY/30 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the said OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 11.2.2021.

**Sai Kung & Islands District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tseung Kwan O  
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/27

(TPB Paper No. 10719)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

4. The Secretary reported that the amendment items were to allow a proposed residential development on a Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) site (the Site) in Tseung Kwan O (TKO), and Dennis Lau and Ng Chun Man Architects and Engineers (Hong Kong) Limited (DLN) was MTRCL's consultant. Representations had been submitted by Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (HKCG) (R130), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD), and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R94/C6), and a comment had been submitted by MTRCL (C1). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr K.K. Cheung    | - his firm having current business dealings with MTRCL, DLN, HLD and HKCG, 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 MTRCL, DLN, HLD and HKCG, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time; |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - having past business dealings with MTRCL;   |

- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen
- being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaborated with MTRCL on a number of arts projects and received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu
- being a member of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Dr C.H Hau
- being an employee of the University of Hong Kong which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before;
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li
- being the deputy chairman of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Professor T.S. Liu
- owning and co-owning properties with his spouse, and his spouse owning properties in TKO; and
- Mr L.T. Kwok
- his employing organisation having social service units located in TKO.

5. As the interests of Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Peter K.T. Yuen and L.T. Kwok, Dr C.H Hau and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li were indirect, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, K.K. Cheung and Alex T.H. Lai had no involvement in the proposed development project and/or the presenter's/commenter's submissions, and the properties of Professor T.S. Liu and his spouse had no direct view of the representation sites, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

## Presentation and Question Sessions

6. 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.

7. The following government representatives, representers, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

### **Government Representatives**

#### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

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

Ms Kitty S.T. Lam - Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O (STP/TKO)

Mr Anthony M.K. Cheung - Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O

#### *Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Stephen C.W. Ko - Senior Engineer/Housing & Planning (SE/H&P)

### **Representers, Commenter and Representers'/commenter's Representatives**

#### R1 – Yu Tsun Ning

Mr Yu Tsun Ning - Representer

#### R2 – Brandon Kenneth Yip

Mr Brandon Kenneth Yip - Representer

R3 – Chau Yin Ming (周賢明)

R13 – The Owners' Committee of Nan Fung Plaza (南豐廣場業主委員會)

Mr Chau Yin Ming - Representer and Representer's Representative

R4 – Lui Man Kwong (呂文光)

Mr Lui Man Kwong - Representer

R5 – Wong Cheuk Nga (王卓雅)

Ms Wong Cheuk Nga - Representer

R6 – Chan Yiu Chor Andrew (陳耀初)

Mr Chan Yiu Chor Andrew - Representer

R7 – Cheng Chung Man (鄭仲文)

Mr Cheng Chung Man - Representer

R8 – Lai Wai Tong (黎煒棠)

Mr Lai Wai Tong - Representer

R9 – Leung Hin Yan (梁衍忻)

Mr Leung Hin Yan - Representer

R10 – Lee Yin Ho Ryan

Mr Lee Yin Ho Ryan - Representer

Mr Yeung Chi On Anderson - Representer's Representative

R11 – Lai Ming Chak (黎銘澤)

Mr Lai Ming Chak - Representer

R94/C6 – Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

Ms Mary Mulvihill



R111 – Pichia Sister

Mr Ho Ho Sum - Representer's Representative

R130 – HKCG

Mr Tsang Chung Man - Representer's Representative

C1 – MTRCL

*LLA Consultancy Limited* ] Representer's Representatives

Mr Ng Siu Lung ]

Ms Lau Wai Chi Gigi ]

8. 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, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his/her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submissions. There was a timer device to alert the representer, commenter or his/her representative 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, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers, commenter, representers'/commenter's representatives and government's representatives 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.

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

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Kitty S.T. Lam, STP/TKO, 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. 10719 (the Paper).

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join, and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

11. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives to elaborate on their representations/comment.

R3 – Chau Yin Ming

R13 – The Owners' Committee of Nan Fung Plaza

12. Mr Chau Yin Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of the Sai Kung District Council (SKDC);
- (b) SKDC had objected to the previous round of amendments to the TKO Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). This time, the objection views to the OZP amendments remained unchanged when SKDC under the current term was consulted in 2020;
- (c) given that the residents' views from private developments were not assessed, PlanD should not conclude that there was no adverse visual impact from the proposed high-rise development by just quoting the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 on "Submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board" (TPB PG-No. 41) that it was not practical to protect private view. Similar to those visual impact assessments conducted for planning applications, the effects of visual changes should be appraised and the visual impact of the proposed development should be evaluated in accordance with the TPB PG-No. 41;

- (d) the area, where the Site was situated, was divided by Chiu Shun Road, with mainly residential developments including Yuk Ming Court and East Point City to the north, and villages including Tin Ha Wan Village and Fat Tau Chau Village as well as a planned public housing development and the subject Site to the east. There was a burial ground of indigenous villagers covering an area of about three to four hectares (ha) near the Site. It was stated in the Paper that wind could penetrate through the area and TKO Hospital via Chiu Shun Road but there was no information about the air ventilation impact of the proposed development on the surrounding residential developments. Since the area to the east of Chiu Shun Road was like an urban fringe park with mainly low-rise village settlements, there was concern in the visual and air ventilation impacts of the proposed development. Stepped height concept had been incorporated since the early planning stage of TKO New Town. The proposed building height (BH) of 130mPD did not comply with such urban design principle;
- (e) the proposed development was located at the main road network connecting the Clear Water Bay area and Kowloon. While the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LTT) would be built for traffic improvement, the proposed high-rise development as an infill development would impose adverse traffic impact on the locality including the junction of Ngan O Road and Chiu Shun Road;
- (f) with the concerns on visual, air ventilation and traffic aspects, a comprehensive planning of the TKO New Town taking into account the future findings of the Planning and Engineering Study for Re-planning of TKO Area 137 – Feasibility Study had been demanded for a few years; and
- (g) he also spoke on behalf of the Owners' Committee of Nam Fung Plaza (R13). The proposed development would impose traffic burden on the area. The capacity of recreational, medical and community facilities had already saturated, which could not cater for the needs of the increased population.

R1 – Yu Tsun Ning

13. Mr Yu Tsun Ning made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC;
- (b) 45 car parking spaces and 10 motorcycle parking spaces would be provided in the proposed development. Given the serious illegal parking at Ngan O Road, the proposed parking provisions would not be sufficient to meet the demand though such provisions were in accordance with the requirements of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG); and
- (c) as a resident of TKO for more than 20 years, he frequently encountered traffic problems including traffic congestion and insufficient carrying capacity of the railway network. A comprehensive traffic impact assessment (TIA) on the whole TKO was hence required to cover not only the immediate road junctions of the proposed development but also the TKO Tunnel and the TKO-LTT. While it was stated in the Paper that the Commissioner for Transport had no comment on the TIA, there was no data provided to support such a view.

R11 – Lai Ming Chak

14. Mr Lai Ming Chak made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC;
- (b) he attended the hearing two years ago in respect of the OZP amendments for rezoning five “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites for housing developments in TKO. It had been committed since then that the signalling systems of TKO Line would be upgraded and the carrying capacity of the railway network would be increased. Meanwhile, he noticed that the signalling systems would only be upgraded in 2027. Noting the issues associated with the

signalling upgrading work of the East Rail, he queried whether the target completion date of the upgrading for the TKO Line could be achieved;

- (c) in the previous consultation on the proposed at-grade pedestrian crossing across Chiu Shun Road to Ngan O Road to be constructed by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), the proposed development at the Site had not yet been taken into account in the design of the crossing. With an addition of about 400 flats proposed in the area, the design of the crossing including the traffic signal time and its impact on Wan Po Road and Po Yap Road leading to the TKO Tunnel should be reviewed. Given the proposed elderly centre at the planned public housing development adjacent to the proposed development, the scope to make adjustment to the traffic signal time would be limited;
- (d) while there were sites in TKO Areas 15 and 72 in Po Lam and Tiu Keng Leng respectively reserved for social welfare facilities, those sites which were located outside Hang Hau had not yet been used for the planned uses over the years. The site in Area 15 was currently occupied by a community plant nursery and that in Area 72 was used as a temporary car park providing more than 400 parking spaces. Since those sites were actively in use, he doubted whether they would be used for provision of social welfare facilities in the foreseeable future;
- (e) the property owners of La Cite Noble and TKO Plaza, after moving to their flats, had been concerned about the view from their homes to the graves nearby. The future residents of the proposed development might have the same concern;
- (f) the Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park was a contemporary Chinese style garden with a pavilion in traditional style. Such Chinese style park blended in with the knoll to the east of Chiu Shun Road as a backdrop. With the proposed development sandwiched between the knoll and the park, the park would be surrounded by walled developments and its design characteristic would be compromised; and

- (g) recently, there had been environmental problems and noise nuisance generated from the site formation works of the planned housing development at Chiu Shun Road which was one of the sites rezoned from “GB” during the last round of amendments. It was anticipated that similar problems would be generated from the Site during the construction stage. Given the constraint of retaining the Pak Shing Kok Ventilation Building (PSKVB) in-situ, it was believed that it would be more difficult to implement mitigation measures to address such environmental problems.

R4 – Lui Man Kwong

15. Mr Lui Man Kwong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC;
- (b) part of the Site was previously zoned “GB” which was intended primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. The area within the “GB” zone should not be suitable for development. He wondered why there was a sudden change in planning intention and the area was identified suitable for development;
- (c) TKO was densely developed. The “GB” zone served as a buffer and should not be used for development;
- (d) the similar precedent case of the rezoning of the Yau Tong Ventilation Building and its adjoining land to facilitate residential developments atop as mentioned in the Paper was not yet implemented. The Site should be rezoned after the implementation and evaluation of the development at the Yau Tong site;

- (e) the proposed development would impose adverse impacts on road traffic and MTR lines which had reached saturation and running at about 108% carrying capacity. According to the responses to traffic issues as stated in the Paper, the estimated number of MTR passengers generated from the proposed development was insignificant. However, there were a number of on-going or planned developments including the four sites rezoned from “GB” which would impose cumulative traffic impacts on TKO as a whole. The frequency of MTR trains would not increase until the completion of the upgrade of the signalling system in 2026/27. The Site should not be developed before such upgrading works;
- (f) Chiu Shun Road was already congested. The problem would be worsened with the implementation of the planned public housing development and the proposed development. Meeting the target of housing supply should not be the only consideration for rezoning the Site without taking into account the adverse impacts on the existing and future residents in the area. The Site should only be rezoned when there were adequate community facilities provided.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting during Mr Lui’s presentation.]

R5 – Wong Cheuk Nga

16. Ms Wong Cheuk Nga made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of SKDC. SKDC objected to the amendments to the OZP;
- (b) in response to the representations on traffic impacts, it was stated in the Paper that the traffic congestion of the TKO Tunnel would be alleviated upon completion of the TKO-LTT. However, it was doubtful whether the traffic would really be improved. The congestion problem was not just confined to the TKO district but the whole East Kowloon;

- (c) the bus routes in TKO were poorly planned and the situation had not yet been improved even though the TKO Tunnel Bus-Bus Interchange was commissioned. It was only mentioned in the Paper that the overall carrying capacity of the railway lines concerned could be increased by around 10% but there was no information about the planning of bus and minibus routes for the proposed development; and
- (d) there was a lack of parking spaces in Hang Hau but the relevant authority indicated that no land was available for providing more parking facilities. Given that the parking spaces to be provided in the proposed development could not cater for the demand, the problem would worsen.

R6 – Chan Yiu Chor Andrew

17. Mr Chan Yiu Chor Andrew made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC. Residence Oasis which fell within his constituency area was at the centre of Hang Hau. Without the proposed development, wind from the southeast direction could penetrate via the wind corridor to the estate. While there were no adverse comments from the relevant government departments on the air ventilation impact of the proposed development, there was no information to assess such impact on Residence Oasis. The Board should request the future developer to conduct a detailed air ventilation assessment;
- (b) he attended the hearing two years ago in respect of the draft TKO OZP No. S/TKO/25 for rezoning the five “GB” sites. After considering the representations, the Board decided not to rezone one of the five sites for residential development due to site specific environmental concern. While the Site only involved an area of 0.13 ha zoned as “GB” and no special species were found, the PSKVB which was a low-rise structure served as a buffer to limit the extension of urban area and define the boundary of a community. The Board should therefore consider carefully whether to rezone the Site for residential development; and



- (c) the objection grounds submitted in the representations for the five “GB” sites included adverse traffic impacts, insufficient community and parking facilities, etc., which had not yet been addressed. Although the overall carrying capacity of the railway lines concerned could be increased by around 10% by 2026/27, such increase might only be able to cater for the new population of the residential developments at the four “GB” sites rezoned in the last OZP amendments. The said issues remained unresolved under the current round of OZP amendments.

#### R7 – Cheng Chung Man

18. Mr Cheng Chung Man made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC;
- (b) the density of Hang Hau was higher than that in other areas of TKO. There was great concern on the air ventilation impacts of proposed developments along Chiu Shun Road on the existing residential developments in Hang Hau. The planned public housing development and the proposed development would largely block the wind from the southeast direction. It would affect Ngan O Road and Kwan Ming House which was located at the south-eastern corner of Yuk Ming Court;
- (c) residents across Chiu Shun Road were suffering from the noise nuisance generated from the construction of the planned public housing development. Whilst the Housing Department and its contractor had implemented mitigation measures such as delaying the starting time of construction in the morning, the problem could not be duly addressed. The suffering of the residents would prolong if the proposed development would be implemented after the completion of the planned public housing development; and

- (d) he had been living in TKO since 1988. The traffic congestion became more serious over the years although the frequency of bus and railway services had increased. Moreover, there was not much improvement in the traffic even though new infrastructures had been built. The problem would not be solved unless the Government could suppress the housing demand instead of increasing the housing supply.

#### R8 – Lai Wai Tong

19. Mr Lai Wai Tong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC and had also been a resident of TKO since 1999;
- (b) the rezoning of the “GB” sites in the last round of OZP amendments deviated from the stepped height urban design principle of TKO. The rezoning of the Site for the proposed development would further deviate from such principle. Moreover, the proposed development would pose visual impacts on Savannah Place at Chi Shin Street;
- (c) the medical facilities were insufficient in TKO and it was difficult to make appointment at the public clinics. The completion of a government complex with offices and clinic in TKO Area 67 by 2025 would help address the deficit of such facilities in Tiu Keng Leng but would not be able to cater for the addition of 22,000 population due to the rezoning of the “GB” sites;
- (d) there would be more developments in the Clear Water Bay area. Upon completion of the TKO-LTT, the Cross Bay Link and Route 6 in 2021, 2022 and 2025/26 respectively, the traffic from Sai Kung to Kowloon would be diverted to the TKO-LTT via Hang Hau as the journey time would be reduced to about 15 minutes only. This would also bring traffic to the local roads of Hang Hau leading to the TKO-LTT including Po Yap Road and Chiu Shun Road. There would be cumulative traffic impacts on Chiu Shun Road;

- (e) while the findings of the study for TKO Area 137 were pending, the area could accommodate about 100,000 population. The development of Area 137 should be prioritised over all other infill developments in TKO; and
- (f) citing the construction waste and nuisances of the recently completed Yung Ming Court on Savannah Place as an example, similar impacts of the proposed development on La Cite Noble could be foreseen.

[Mr Andrew C.W. Lai left the meeting during Mr Lai's presentation.]

#### R9 – Leung Hin Yan

20. Ms Leung Hin Yan made the following main points:

- (a) while she was a member of SKDC, her oral submission was made in the capacity of a resident in Hang Hau. She objected to the OZP amendments;
- (b) the percentage of placements of job seekers in the vicinity of their residence in the Sai Kung district was 9.7% which was the lowest in Hong Kong. The job placements within the district was about 6,500 but the population was over 400,000. This mismatch resulted in a large number of daily commuters to other districts for work and hence, caused traffic congestion. The MTR Lines were operating above their carrying capacities and the TKO Tunnel was always congested. The saturated transport system could not accommodate more population in TKO;
- (c) it was estimated that the property price of the proposed development would be similar to that at the site of Yau Tong Ventilation Building (about \$20,000/ft<sup>2</sup>). For a couple living in a flat of 400ft<sup>2</sup>, the price would be about \$8 million. The monthly household income should be at least \$64,000 for mortgage and the average salary of each person would be \$32,000. She questioned the number of job placements in Sai Kung that could offer such salary. In other words, residents of the proposed

development would commute externally for work and traffic congestion would be aggravated;

- (d) in addition to the four rezoned “GB” sites, there would be various new residential developments in TKO including LOHAS Park, Tiu Keng Leng Disciplined Services Quarter, etc. which would generate several thousand population and thus cumulative traffic impacts. Moreover, there was a potential infrastructure development, namely Tai Sheung Tok Transfer Station near Clear Water Bay Road and Anderson Road which was being studied. Such an infrastructure development would result in refuse collection vehicles passing through either Hang Hau to TKO Area 137 or TKO Road to LOHAS Park via the TKO-LTT. The traffic of Chiu Shun Road would further get worse;
- (e) “GB” zone should be designated to define the boundary of a new town. Given the Government’s initiative to explore more sites for housing supply, the remaining rural characters of TKO had been bit by bit taken away. The Site which was located at the urban fringe of TKO should be preserved;
- (f) in response to the representations on the noise impact, it was stated in the Paper that mitigation measures such as building setback from Chiu Shun Road were proposed. The setback would result in taking up more land zoned as “GB”;
- (g) Hang Hau was densely populated and the proposed development would further increase its density. She questioned how building a high-rise development instead of retaining the knoll undisturbed could introduce visual amenity to the area. According to Photomontage 2 (Figure 3.3) appended in SKDC(M) Paper No. 86/20 submitted for the SKDC meeting on 5.5.2020 regarding the OZP amendments, the residential towers would be seen clearly from the view northeast from Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park. She disagreed with PlanD’s assessment that the proposed development would not cause significant adverse visual impact on the surroundings; and

- (h) with the congested transport system and insufficient community facilities, she urged the Board not to further degrade the living quality of TKO by supporting the amendments.

R10 – Lee Yin Ho Ryan

21. Mr Lee Yin Ho Ryan made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of SKDC; and
- (b) the Site fell within his constituency area which was rich in rural character. Tin Ha Wan Village and Fat Tau Chau Village were located in its surroundings. The area was a reclaimed land. The villages were relocated to the area to give way for the development of TKO New Town, which was a compromise for urbanisation. The proposed development intruding into the immediate neighbourhood of the villages would further compromise their living environment and the burial ground of the indigenous villagers was not respected. The proposed development as an infill development at the urban fringe should not be supported.

R111 – Pichia Sister

22. Mr Ho Ho Sum made the following main points:

- (a) with the aid of his mobile device, he demonstrated the difficulty of making medical appointment in TKO (Po Ning Road) General Out-patient Clinic;
- (b) the traffic congestion of the TKO Tunnel was not very serious twenty years ago and the vehicle queue ended near the Telephone Exchange at Wan Lung Road. However, the vehicle queue nowadays extended to near the junction of Wan Po Road and Chiu Shun Road (J3 of the TIA). He considered that the traffic would not be improved upon completion of the TKO-LTT given that the whole road network in TKO and Kwun Tong was congested;

- (c) as shown in Figure 2 of the TIA, inward bound traffic to the proposed development via the TKO Tunnel would travel through Wan Po Road and three junctions along Chiu Shun Road (J1 to J3 of the TIA). Traffic at the junctions along Chiu Shun Road would be adversely impacted and the illegal parking at Ngan O Road would be aggravated. If parking facilities of Hang Hau would be used by the residents of the proposed development due to insufficient parking provision at the Site, traffic on the roads of the town centre would be adversely affected;
- (d) given that the track system of TKO Line had to accommodate the trains of TKO Line and interchange for Island Line, Kwun Tong Line and the future North Island Line, the upgrade of the signalling system was complicated. It was doubtful whether the upgrade would be completed by 2026/27;
- (e) with the planned public housing development and the proposed development, it was uncertain whether the capacity of the Chiu Shun Road/Ngan O Road junction, upon addition of the proposed pedestrian crossing across Chiu Shun Road, could cater for the demand; and
- (f) as shown in the photomontage on Plan H-6e, the two proposed residential blocks were like walled structures which would impose visual impact on the view from Chiu Shun Road.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting during Mr Ho's presentation.]

R130 – HKCG

23. Mr Tsang Chung Man made the following main points:

- (a) he was a representative of HKCG; and

- (b) as the proposed development was in close proximity to a high pressure pipeline along Chiu Shun Road, the future developer should conduct a Quantitative Risk Assessment and consult HKCG during the detailed design and construction stage from gas safety perspective.

R94/C6 – Mary Mulvihill

24. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the housing issue was about affordability but not supply;
- (b) according to the statistics published by the Census and Statistics Department on 18.2.2021, there was a decrease of 46,500 persons in the provisional estimate of the Hong Kong population due to the net outflow of Hong Kong residents. Taking into account the better quality of life and employment prospects in the Greater Bay Area, the inflow population through One-way Permits would be reduced. The new official figures predicted that the city's population would peak at 8.11 million in 2041, before dropping to 7.35 million by 2069. By that time, nearly two in five residents would be above retirement age;
- (c) given the ageing population, the former Director of Planning, Mr K.K. Ling, advised a few years ago that the urgent need in the community was not for private housing but for community services to handle the "Grey Tsunami";
- (d) there were an estimated 200,000 empty private flats in the city. The proposed vacancy tax to encourage the release of some of this stock into the market was postponed due to the pandemic. Record numbers of families were preparing to emigrate and this would free up some flats in the market;
- (e) compared with the HKPSG requirements, there was a deficit in community facilities in TKO including Community Care Services Facilities (56%) and Residential Care Homes for the Elderly (52%). The lack of Child Care

Centre (49%) would be a particular problem in TKO given that most of the working population had to commute outside the district for work;

- (f) the Site could be used alternatively for relocating government, institution and community (GIC) facilities to free up better locations for elderly care and child care facilities. While the Site was not suitable to accommodate certain facilities that should not be situated at a height of more than 24m above ground level, other community facilities without such locational requirement could be provided at the proposed development;
- (g) instead of the proposed development, the PSKVB could be decked over for a community garden. It was noted that there were only two community gardens in TKO (Sai Kung - Sheung Ning Playground Community Garden and Sai Kung - Yuk Nga Lane Community Garden) providing a total of 104 planting plots to serve a population of over 400,000;
- (h) transitional housing at the Site was another alternative use. The building height of a transitional housing development would be lower and no parking provision was required. Hence, the visual, air ventilation and traffic impacts would be reduced as compared with that generated by the proposed development;
- (i) from the health perspective, acoustic windows resulting in poor ventilation should not be used. Moreover, there was no information about the possible health risks of living above a large ventilation building. There was concern about the noxious air coming out from the underground tunnels and planting a few trees around would not resolve the issues. While there was strong opposition in the community against the location of the ventilation shafts at Hill Road of the Western District, the local residents were advised that there was no alternative site for the facility built under a flyover in a dense urban district. Since TKO was not as crowded as the Western District, a more suitable site should be identified for residential development;



- (j) the “GB” site should not be rezoned for development and its importance was not recognised. Also, the glare impact of the proposed development on the animals and insects in the adjacent knoll was not assessed;
- (k) there was a transfer of interests between the Government and MTRCL. It appeared that there was a conflict of interest as the Government had appointed the MTRCL as the project development consultant and the MTRCL provided relevant data and feasibility studies without going through an open tender procedure;
- (l) when the development of TKO commenced, it was promised that this would be a verdant district and the green panorama would help mitigate the odour and negative environmental impact of the adjoining landfill. However, it had become more crowded like Mongkok but without the vibrant street life. The promised green surroundings were being gradually whittled away and replaced with high towers; and
- (m) the Board had a duty to listen to the community. Supporting the current amendments would set an undesirable precedent that more developments encroaching upon “GB” zones would be encouraged. The planned public housing development had already been allowed in the previous round of OZP amendments. If the proposed development was allowed, the remaining “GB” zones on the OZP would soon be taken away. There was originally a comprehensive planning for the TKO New Town designating areas for community facilities, open spaces and green belts, which should be respected.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break.]

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting during the break.]

25. As the presentations of PlanD's representatives, representers, commenter and representers'/commenter's representatives 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 representers, commenter, representers'/commenter's representatives 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

*The MTR PSKVB*

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

- (a) ownership of the PSKVB and its surrounding cut-slope;
- (b) whether any other operation was being carried out in the PSKVB, whether the MTR tracks ran underneath the PSKVB, and whether the PSKVB was compatible with residential use;
- (c) whether there was any reported incident of release of toxic/harmful substance from the PSKVB;
- (d) details of the buffer between the PSKVB and the residential development atop;
- (e) direction of air flow in and out of the PSKVB;
- (f) whether there was any other ventilation building(s) in TKO;
- (g) details of the precedent case of residential development atop the Yau Tong Ventilation Building;
- (h) whether the previously zoned "GB" portion of the Site was a natural slope;

- (i) whether the Site was first zoned “GB” before the PSKVB was built, and whether the remaining “GB” zone adjoining the Site would be affected by the proposed development; and
- (j) whether the maintenance responsibility of the PSKVB and its cut-slope would be borne by MTRCL or the future owners of the proposed development or shared by both.

27. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the PSKVB belonged to MTRCL, while its surrounding cut-slope was on government land entrusted to MTRCL for maintenance;
- (b) the PSKVB was a facility for air ventilation of the MTR TKO Line. There was no other operation in the PSKVB, and the MTR tracks did not run underneath the PSKVB. Since MTR was operated by electricity, no toxic/harmful substance would be released through the ventilation shafts of the PSKVB. Hence, there was no compatibility issue between the PSKVB and residential use;
- (c) she was not aware of any reported incident of release of toxic/harmful substance from the PSKVB;
- (d) according to the conceptual scheme submitted by MTRCL, the PSKVB would be decked over for residential development atop with a minimum buffer distance of 5m above which was a transfer plate. MTRCL would also carry out some modification works to the two existing ventilation shafts of the PSKVB, and the PSKVB would not cause adverse impacts on residential developments nearby and atop;
- (e) the two modified ventilation shafts, with one facing Chiu Shun Road and the other facing the cut-slope behind the PSKVB, would take in and discharge air along the northwest-southeast direction;

- (f) there was no other ventilation building in TKO. That said, there were ventilation shafts for underground MTR stations;
- (g) the rezoning of the Yau Tong Ventilation Building site for residential development above the ventilation building had already been completed, and the development was under construction. It was the first precedent case of residential development above ventilation building;
- (h) the Site was zoned “GB” on the first TKO OZP. Back then, the TKO Line was only an indicative line on the OZP. In 1999, the alignment of the MTR and the PSKVB were gazetted under the Railways Ordinance, and were later deemed approved under the Town Planning Ordinance. Part of the Site was then shown as ‘MTR Pak Shing Kok Ventilation Building’;
- (i) the previously zoned “GB” portion of the Site was not a natural slope. It was a cut-slope formed for the construction of the PSKVB. It was included into the Site to facilitate the construction of a deck for the proposed residential towers, and would remain largely as a landscaped cut-slope in future. The “GB” zone adjoining the Site would not be affected by the proposed development; and
- (j) while the lease for the proposed development had yet to be drawn up, the maintenance of the PSKVB, which was MTR’s facility, would remain as MTRCL’s responsibility. The maintenance responsibility/costs for the cut-slope would be sorted out at the land administration stage as it would affect both the PSKVB and the proposed development.

28. Mr Ho Ho Shum, R111’s representative, claimed that the information provided by PlanD’s representative had misled the Board in that:

- (a) the proposed development would extend about 15m towards the existing cut-slope, necessitating further cutting of the slope;

- (b) the PSKVB also served as an emergency entrance into the TKO Line; and
- (c) any smoke in the TKO Line in case of fire would be exhausted through the PSKVB, and would affect the future residents of the proposed development at the Site.

29. While reminding R111's representative to exercise due caution when making allegations against another party, the Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to clarify the matters. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide showing the section plan of the proposed development, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) piles would need to be driven into the existing cut-slope to support the podium deck, but the residential blocks themselves would not sit on the slope. According to the conceptual scheme submitted by MTRCL, the cut-slope would remain largely as a landscaped cut-slope after completion of the proposed development;
- (b) the PSKVB did allow firemen's access to the TKO Line in case of emergency; and
- (c) fire accidents might take place anywhere in the territory, and should not be perceived as a regular activity or a regular air pollution source that would preclude residential development.

#### *Provision of GIC Facilities*

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

- (a) whether there would be any new cultural/recreational facility in TKO in light of a representer's comment on the lack of cultural/recreational facilities in TKO;
- (b) programme of population growth in TKO versus that of provision of individual GIC facilities;

- (c) development programme of the social welfare complexes in TKO Areas 15 and 72 in light of the significant deficit in community care services facilities, residential care home for the elderly and child care centre in TKO indicated in the Paper, and the current uses of the two sites;
- (d) distribution of existing and planned child care centres in TKO having noted that many TKO residents were working in other districts and there was a great demand for child care centre; and
- (e) whether encouraging local employment should be a planning consideration.

31. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the existing and planned cultural/recreational facilities in TKO would generally be able to meet the needs of TKO residents in accordance with the relevant requirements under the HKPSG. These included a planned civic centre in the town centre, and PlanD would liaise with the relevant government departments on its implementation programme;
- (b) concerned government departments were actively providing various GIC facilities under their ambits to meet the needs of the TKO population according to their resources, priorities and programmes. For example, there would be two new clinics in TKO, one at the new government office building to be completed in 2025, while the other would be provided within a proposed joint-user complex under planning. The Government would strive to align the provision of various GIC facilities with the population growth;
- (c) two sites in TKO Areas 15 and 72 had been reserved for the development of social welfare facilities. As the Social Welfare Department (SWD) was actively involved in the development of social welfare facilities in a few other locations in TKO under the 'single site, multiple use' model, there was no programme to develop the two sites at the moment. They were currently

being used as community plant nursery and temporary car park respectively. PlanD would liaise with SWD for the early development of the two sites to meet TKO residents' needs. Although there were significant deficits in community care services facilities, residential care home for the elderly and child care centre in TKO, it should be noted that the standards for those provisions were newly added to HKPSG in 2018 to 2020 as a long-term target. It might not be possible to meet such targets in a mature New Town like TKO within a short period of time. SWD would incrementally increase the provision of such facilities through a multi-pronged approach;

- (d) the distribution of existing and planned child care centres in TKO was shown on a PowerPoint slide, which were mainly provided in the clusters of residential developments; and
- (e) given its proximity to the urban areas, TKO was originally planned for residential developments with relatively few commercial developments and employment opportunities. With the upcoming completion of the government office building and joint-user complex in TKO south, there would be more employment opportunities for the TKO population.

32. Mr Chau Yin Ming (R3) remarked that the two sites reserved for the development of social welfare complexes at TKO Areas 15 and 72 were too far away to serve the needs of future residents of the proposed development.

33. Mr Lai Wai Tong (R8) advised that there was no planned cultural facility in the Hang Hau area. There was also no programme of development for most of the proposed open space and recreational facilities in TKO. The Site was also about 1km to 2km away from the nearest existing and planned social welfare facilities.

*Transport and Traffic*

34. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was/would be any new/improved public car parking facility in the vicinity of the Site in light of some representers' comments on insufficient parking provision for the proposed development;
- (b) a brief account of traffic impacts arising from the proposed development, particularly impacts on the junction of Po Ning Road, Po Lam North Road and Po Shun Road (J7) and the junction of Ying Yip Road and Po Ning Road (J6), both of which had no reserve capacity;
- (c) whether the upcoming completion of the TKO-LTT would improve the traffic connection between TKO and Kowloon, or worsen the traffic conditions between Sai Kung/Clear Water Bay and TKO as claimed by some representers;
- (d) an indication on how congested the TKO Tunnel was, and how much better it would be upon completion of the TKO-LTT;
- (e) whether there would be any improvement works along Chiu Shun Road and Po Yap Road to address any possible increase in traffic along the two roads arising from the proposed development, the adjacent public housing development and/or the opening of the TKO-LTT;
- (f) noting the present traffic congestion in TKO and the history of Hang Hau to Shau Kei Wan being an important marine traffic route in the old days, whether the options of water transport and cycling had been considered;
- (g) availability of survey data on the current operating conditions of the TKO Line noting some representers' claim that the current loading rate of the line was over 100% of its passenger carrying capacity;



- (h) whether there would be any improvement in the passenger carrying capacity of the TKO Line by 2029 when the proposed development was scheduled to be occupied;
- (i) reserved capacity of the three major infrastructures in TKO, i.e. the TKO Tunnel, the TKO-LTT and the MTR TKO Line, say in 2030;
- (j) whether there was any plan to promote cycling in TKO; and
- (k) whether there was any plan to strengthen the bus services for TKO.

35. In response, Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P, TD and Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) car parking for the proposed development would be provided in accordance with the upper end of the requirements stipulated in the HKPSG. Meanwhile, TD had substantially completed the review of the standards for parking facilities specified in the HKPSG, and would promulgate the revised parking standards as soon as possible after taking into account the views gathered during consultation. The parking provisions of the proposed development might be reviewed upon promulgation of new parking standards of the HKPSG. TD would provide four new public car parks in TKO under the 'single site, multiple use' model, which were at different stages of planning and development. These include 300 parking spaces for private cars and about 70 parking spaces for commercial vehicles within a joint-user complex under construction in Area 67, about 100 parking spaces for private cars within a proposed joint-user complex also under planning in Area 67, over 300 parking spaces for private cars underneath the Town Park in Area 66 which would be submitted to the Board for consideration in 2021, and over 100 parking spaces for private cars in the proposed Chinese Medicine Hospital in PSK;
- (b) MTRCL had conducted a TIA for the proposed development. Completion of major infrastructures and traffic arising from developments approved before the proposed development had already been taken into account in the

TIA. The TIA forecasted 32/19 private cars leaving/returning to the proposed development during the am/pm peaks respectively (the adjacent public housing development had similar peak hour traffic). The resulting traffic increase on Chiu Shun Road would therefore be minimal. The TIA recommended a series of mitigation measures, including conversion of roundabout J6 into a signalised junction to improve its traffic performance, and the addition of a bypass lane to junction J7 to reduce the queueing time at the roundabout. The TIA concluded that with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the proposed development would not generate significant adverse traffic impacts;

- (c) the TKO-LTT had three main functions: (i) providing a connection to the Eastern Harbour Crossing (EHC); (ii) connecting TKO to Kwun Tong's road network; and (iii) connecting TKO to West Kowloon upon completion of Route 6 by 2026. Functions (i) and (ii) would be fully materialised upon completion of the TKO-LTT by 2021. It was expected that the traffic conditions of the TKO Tunnel and the Choi Hung Interchange would be greatly relieved by the TKO-LTT, and hence Kowloon-bound traffic from Sai Kung/Clear Water Bay would also be improved;
- (d) the TKO Tunnel was currently operating above its design capacity as it was the only route from TKO to Kowloon. The volume to capacity (v/c) ratio was approaching 1.2. Upon completion of the TKO-LTT, the v/c ratio of the TKO Tunnel would fall to an acceptable level of about 0.9 as most Hong Kong-bound traffic would be diverted to the TKO-LTT instead;
- (e) as the traffic flow arising from the TKO-LTT had already been taken into account in the design of Po Shun Road and Po Yap Road, the opening of the TKO-LTT would not adversely affect these two roads;
- (f) there was no planning for water transport for TKO which was planned with land transport in mind;

- (g) the passenger carrying capacity of a railway line was derived based on a series of assumptions, including the design capacity of train compartments which was 6 standing passengers/m<sup>2</sup>. In view of a decreasing willingness of passengers to board a congested train in recent years, the railway line capacity was also assessed with 4 standing passengers/m<sup>2</sup> and hence the line was considered operating slightly above its passenger carrying capacity along critical sections. MTRCL now aimed to adjust the design capacity of train compartments to tally with this rising aspiration of passengers, while improving the signalling to achieve shorter headways between trains and in turn, about 10% higher passenger carrying capacity territory-wide. Whilst there was no information in hand on the percentage improvement figure for the TKO Line due to signalling improvement, the proposed development, with about 432 flats, would only generate about 140/100 passengers on the TKO Line during the am/pm peaks respectively according to the TIA. No significant impact of the proposed development on the TKO Line was anticipated. The Railway Development Office of the Highways Department was consulted on the TIA and had no adverse comment;
- (h) MTRCL committed to increasing total passenger carrying capacity of the MTR system by around 10% through improvements to the signalling system. The signalling of the TKO Line was scheduled to be upgraded in 2027. Congestion on the TKO Line would be greatly relieved before the scheduled occupation of the proposed development in 2029;
- (i) by 2031, the v/c ratio of both the TKO Tunnel and the TKO-LTT would be around 0.9 to 1.0. The strategic road and rail networks for the territory were currently being examined under the Strategic Studies on Railway and Major Roads beyond 2030. Specifically, the Studies would assess whether new strategic road and rail links would be required in the territory including TKO and Kowloon East;
- (j) with the completion of the Cross Bay Link (CBL) in 2022, the cycle track loop for TKO would be completed, and cyclists could cycle around the eastern, western and southern parts of TKO along the waterfront promenade

and CBL without turning back. Although the Site was not part of or directly connected to the cycle track, bicycle parking spaces would be provided in the proposed development to encourage commuting by cycling; and

- (k) TD would examine whether the headway of existing bus services would need to be adjusted and/or new bus routes would need to be added upon completion of new infrastructures/developments, including the TKO-LTT and the proposed development.

36. Mr Chau Yin Ming (R3) supplemented that TD used to require improvement of the junction of Chiu Shun Road and Ngan O Road for development proposals along Clear Water Bay Road. Such junction improvement was missing in MTRCL's TIA. He queried why it was acceptable to TD. In addition, the proposed development, located right next to Chiu Shun Road, would be subject to traffic noise.

37. Mr Lai Wai Tong (R8) accused TD of misleading the Board in that all four new public car parks in TKO were too far away (over 1km) to be able to serve the future residents of the proposed development at the Site.

38. The Chairperson reminded Mr Lai to exercise due caution when making what appeared to be an unfounded accusation, as TD's representative was merely providing information in response to Members' questions.

39. Mr Ho Ho Shum (R111) supplemented that MTRCL was providing about 23 trains per hour on the TKO Line during the am peak, only 19 of which would serve Hang Hau and Po Lam. That resulted in an hourly passenger carrying capacity of about 58,000 in the am peak for Hang Hau and Po Lam based on the design assumption of 6 standing passengers/m<sup>2</sup>. He also doubted the 2027 timeframe for signalling improvement of the TKO Line in view of the recent delay in signalling improvement for other MTR lines.

#### *BH and Visual Impact*

40. The Chairperson, Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was a stepped BH profile for the TKO New Town as suggested by R3 and R8;
- (b) whether the views of existing developments towards the “GB” zone would be adversely affected by the proposed development;
- (c) an elaboration of the VIA process in the context of the TPB PG-No. 41;
- (d) visual impact when viewed from the Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park;
- (e) whether there was any vantage point(s) farther away from the Site; and
- (f) the height of the mountain to the south of the Site, the proposed development and La Cite Noble.

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

- (a) a BH profile had indeed been proposed for the TKO Town Centre under the Further Development of TKO Feasibility Study commissioned by CEDD about 20 years ago. At that time, most of the Hang Hau area in which the Site was located had already been developed. The BH profile for the TKO Town Centre could not be retro-applied to the developed Hang Hau area;
- (b) the views of La Cite Noble on the opposite side of Chiu Shun Road towards the “GB” zone would be affected by the proposed development. In view of the highly developed context of Hong Kong, the Board would not normally take into consideration visual impacts on private views. That said, MTRCL had proposed to setback the proposed residential towers to reduce the visual impacts on La Cite Noble;

- (c) according to the TPB PG-No. 41, the main aim of VIA was to assess the potential visual impact of a development proposal on its surrounding areas. Valuable visual resources (e.g. ridgelines) in the vicinity of the site in question should first be identified. Potential visual impacts on such visual resources from popular public vantage points should then be assessed, and suitable mitigation measures to address any significant impacts should be recommended accordingly;
- (d) MTRCL had conducted a VIA for the proposed development in accordance with the TPB PG-No. 41. According to the VIA, the skyview towards the Site from the Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park would be moderately affected by the proposed development. MTRCL had proposed a series of mitigation measures, including responsive BH, building mass and disposition and building separation, to reduce the potential visual impacts. Relevant government departments were satisfied with the conclusions and recommendations of the VIA;
- (e) TKO was surrounded by mountains and the visual impacts from popular hiking trails had been assessed. As TKO was a mature New Town with many high-rise developments, the proposed development would not generate much visual impacts when viewed from a distance, say Duckling Hill; and
- (f) the height of the mountain to the south of the Site was around 140mPD, the proposed BH restriction for the Site was 130mPD, and the BH of La Cite Noble was 146mPD.

### *Air Ventilation*

42. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) an elaboration of the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) findings in light of some representers' concerns on air ventilation impacts arising from the proposed development, particularly on the air ventilation of Residence Oasis further inland; and

- (b) whether acoustic windows would affect ventilation as claimed by R94.

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

- (a) according to the AVA submitted by MTRCL, the annual prevailing wind was northeasterly while the summer prevailing wind was southwesterly, and Chiu Shun Road was the major ventilation corridor. Compared against the baseline condition, ventilation at the Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park/Ngan O Road would be slightly worsened but ventilation along Chiu Shun Road would be slightly improved with the proposed development. MTRCL had proposed several wind enhancement features including setback of podium/residential blocks from Chiu Shun Road, permeable elements underneath the podium and above the PSKVB, and building separation between the two residential blocks. With the incorporation of these wind enhancement measures, no significant impact on the surrounding pedestrian wind environment was anticipated. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD considered the AVA acceptable. In view of the direction of the prevailing winds, the proposed development would unlikely affect the air ventilation of Residence Oasis; and
- (b) acoustic windows were commonly installed in residential buildings in Hong Kong. They were openable windows with two glass panels parallel to each other with openings at alternative sides to screen off traffic noise while allowing natural ventilation at the same time.

44. Despite PlanD's explanation, Mr Chau Yin Ming (R3) insisted that the air ventilation of Residence Oasis would be affected by the proposed development. He pointed out that an air ventilation path over the mountain to the south of the Site along the direction which the Hang Hau Tin Hau Temple was facing would be blocked.

45. Mr Lai Wai Tong (R8) advised that the Hang Hau area was relying heavily on southerly wind via the Hong Kong Velodrome Park and Ngan O Road for air ventilation. He was of the view that the proposed development would block the southerly wind, thereby adversely affecting the air ventilation for the Hang Hau area.

*Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA)*

46. A Member asked whether HKGC's gas pipeline along Chiu Shun Road was compatible with residential use, and whether the risk of the pipeline to the Site would be so great that it would render residential development at the Site impossible.

47. Mr Tsang Chung Man, representative of HKCG (R130), advised that the gas pipeline along Chiu Shun Road was a high-pressure pipeline, and hence MTRCL should conduct a QRA to determine the risk level and hence the suitability of the Site for residential development.

48. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD responded that according to the Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD), the gas pipeline along Chiu Shun Road was a medium-pressure pipeline only, and hence QRA was not a mandatory requirement for developments in its vicinity. That said, concerned government departments would be further consulted at the detailed design stage to see whether a QRA would be necessary for the proposed development, and if so, one would be conducted accordingly. To her knowledge, QRA was aimed at assessing the risk of increasing population around certain potentially hazardous installations and proposing suitable mitigation measures to address that risk, rather than precluding particular sites from development. She remarked that there were many similar installations, for example, petrol filling stations, near residential developments in the main urban areas.

*Other Aspects*

49. Noting R10's presentation that Tin Ha Wan and Fat Tau Chau Villages to the northeast of the Site were re-sited villages, a Member enquired whether the Government had made any commitment to reserve the Site or land in its vicinity for Small House (SH) development by indigenous villagers. The Member also requested PlanD's representative to



elaborate on the spatial relationship between the Site and the nearby burial grounds, and whether access to the burial grounds would be affected as claimed by some representers.

50. Another Member enquired whether there was any SH demand from villages in the vicinity of the Site, and whether sufficient land had been reserved for SH development accordingly.

51. With the aid of a site plan and an aerial photo (Plans H-2 and H-3 of the Paper), Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD explained to Members the spatial relationship between the Site and the isolated graves around it, the burial grounds to its south, as well as the re-sited villages in the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones to its northeast. To her understanding, the Government had not made any commitment to reserve the Site or land in its vicinity for SH development by indigenous villagers. SH demand, if any, should be satisfied in the “V” zone. The access to the burial grounds was located to the southwest of the Site near the junction of Chiu Shun Road/Wan Po Road/Po Yap Road and hence would not be affected by the proposed development. While there were trails in the vicinity of the Site leading uphill, the overgrown grasses prevented access to the burial ground from those trails.

52. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Chau Yin Ming (R3), SKDC member, opined that the burial ground was located close to the Site. He maintained that trails in the vicinity of the Site were used by villagers to access the burial ground, and conflicts between indigenous villagers and future residents of MTRCL’s property development at the Site were expected. He also relayed the objection to the amendment items from the villagers of Tin Ha Wan Village and Fat Tau Chau Village, who somehow missed the deadlines for submitting representations/comments.

53. The Chairperson noted some representers’ suggestion to develop TKO Area 137 instead, and enquired about the progress of the Planning and Engineering Study for Re-planning of TKO Area 137 (TKO Area 137 Study) and whether TKO Area 137 could be regarded as a replacement for the proposed housing development at the Site.

54. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD explained that TKO Area 137 was located at the southern end of the TKO New Town and was currently a fill bank. PlanD and CEDD were jointly carrying out the TKO Area 137 Study to

examine the feasibility of using the area for residential, commercial and other development purposes. The study was still in progress, and any development in TKO Area 137 would hinge upon the relocation of the fill bank. In view of its remote location and the current sole access via Wan Po Road, the study was looking into a comprehensive traffic solution to establish the feasibility of development in the area.

55. A Member enquired about the cumulative construction impacts of the proposed development and the public housing development to its northeast, and enquired about their implementation programmes.

56. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD responded that the proposed development and the neighbouring public housing development were scheduled for completion in 2029 and 2024 respectively. The public housing development was under construction already, while the proposed development would still need to go through the land administration procedures upon the completion of the statutory plan-making process. Overlapping of the construction periods of the two developments, if any, would be minimal.

57. Mr Stephen C.W. Ko, SE/H&P, TD supplemented that a TIA would need to be conducted to assess the traffic impacts during the construction period for all development projects. In the unlikely event that there was overlapping of the construction periods of the two developments, TD would restrict the number of construction vehicles and the hours of construction vehicular access to the two sites to minimise the traffic impacts of the two developments.

58. A Member enquired why the Site and the adjacent public housing site were not rezoned for residential development in one go.

59. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD responded that planning was an on-going process, and PlanD would put forward development proposals, once confirmed feasible in all aspects, to the Board for consideration to address the territory's urgent housing need. Technical studies for the public housing site to the northeast of the Site were completed in 2016/17. On the other hand, the proposed development was MTRCL's proposal in 2017 in response to the policy initiative to explore the development potential of railway stations and related facilities along existing and future rail lines with the objective to increase housing supply

announced in the 2015 Policy Address. Technical studies for the proposed development were only completed in 2020.

60. 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, commenter, representers'/commenter's representatives and government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Professor John C.Y. Ng left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

#### Deliberation Session

61. The Chairperson briefly recapitulated the background and key issues raised at the hearing to facilitate Members' consideration of the representations and comments. Members noted that the amendment items arose from the Government's initiative to encourage MTRCL to optimise the potential of topside development at railway stations and related facilities along existing and future rail lines with the objective to increase housing supply. In view of the Government's commitment that 70% of new housing land would be for public housing development while there was also strong public need for private housing, the proposed development was a valuable source of private housing land supply. The cumulative flat supply contributed by small developments like the proposed development would be substantial.

62. The Chairperson continued to sum up the key issues. The Site had already been granted to MTRCL for the PSKVB. Since the facility was essential to the operation of the TKO Line, it would not be possible to resume the Site per se for the development of GIC facilities to address the needs of the community. Nor would it be reasonable and practical to expect that MTRCL would be willing to develop the Site for GIC facilities instead of residential use. Noting that traffic was a major issue in TKO, MTRCL had conducted a TIA to assess the impacts of the proposed development. As the TIA was done to assess the impact of a proposed development project in TKO, one could not possibly expect territory-wide traffic issues to be assessed in that context. That said, TD found the TIA acceptable and confirmed no

insurmountable traffic issues for the proposed development. On safety concern, despite HKCG (R130)'s representation, EMSD confirmed that QRA was not required for the proposed development. Upon further consultation with the relevant government departments, a QRA could be done at a later stage before commencement of the project, if subsequently required. Regarding the quality of air outflow from the PSKVB, MTRCL had conducted an environmental assessment (EA), which concluded that the PSKVB would not have undesirable emissions/pollutants. The EA report was accepted by the Environmental Protection Department. Relevant government departments would also provide comments at the building plan submission stage.

63. Mr Terence S.W. Tsang, Assistant Director of Environmental Protection (Environmental Assessment), supplemented that MTR was operating on electricity, and should not emit any toxic emissions as there was no combustion process. Fires in MTR trains/stations were emergency and accidental events and it was noted that suitable buffer distance between the PSKVB and the residential development atop would be provided in accordance with the Fire Services Department's requirements.

64. The Vice-chairperson and majority of Members supported the zoning amendments and considered that the OZP should not be amended to meet the representations on the following considerations:

- (a) the scale of the proposed development was small, its impacts were insignificant, and MTRCL was able to address the technical issues of its proposal, including traffic, visual, air ventilation and environmental etc. In that regard, the rezoning could help increase housing supply and achieve an optimal use of the Site;
- (b) the wider-district concerns on traffic congestion and under-provision of GIC facilities raised by some representers/commenter could not be addressed even if the zoning amendments were not agreed to; and
- (c) concern over gas safety, if any, would not pre-empt the proposed development at the Site. The PSKVB would not give out undesirable emissions according to MTRCL's EA for the proposed development. It was

unreasonable to amend zoning of the Site due to emergency and accidental events.

65. Two Members considered that no matter how small an increase in population to be generated by the proposed residential development, they had reservation on the zoning amendments and expressed the following views:

- (a) there was continuous traffic congestion problem in TKO over the past few years;
- (b) population of TKO had increased substantially over the years without adequate provision of some of the basic supporting GIC facilities; and
- (c) the subject “GB” zone was an important delineation to define the boundary of the new town. Rezoning the Site, especially for private development, would compromise its buffer function and affect its integrity.

66. The following issues/views/observations were raised by some Members during the deliberation:

*General*

- (a) SKDC’s objection to a rezoning proposal involving even a small increase in number of flats was worrying as it reflected the local community’s entrenched grudges about the New Town’s existing problems, notably traffic congestion and under-provision of some GIC facilities. The sentiment would grow if those long-standing problems were not resolved;
- (b) the Government should improve its communication with the public to enable them to appreciate the long-term improvements brought about by planning proposals;
- (c) the development density in TKO was relatively high, and a comprehensive review of TKO’s planning might be required;

*Traffic*

- (d) further development in TKO would be constrained by its traffic connection with other districts, notably Kowloon East, in view of the lack of reserve capacity of the TKO Tunnel and the TKO-LTT. A district-wide traffic plan was needed;
- (e) the 2027 timeframe for signalling improvement to the TKO Line might be too late to meet the local need. MTRCL should be advised to consider advancing its programme;
- (f) consideration could be given to the provision of water transport to TKO, so as to demonstrate the Government's determination to deal with the traffic congestion problem;
- (g) given the inadequate provision of car parking provision in the territory in general and in the TKO area, as noted in the representations, the Government might consider suitably adjusting the parking standards/policy to address the issue;
- (h) the use of car lifts within the proposed development warranted careful consideration as it might lead to serious queueing within the carpark of the development or onto Chiu Shun Road during the peak hours;

*Provision of GIC Facilities*

- (i) elderly and child care facilities were in particular shortage in TKO, but open space and schools had surpluses. Consideration could be given to using idling facilities to address those facilities in shortfall;
- (j) TKO residents were particularly concerned about the programme of development of GIC facilities;

- (k) some open spaces in TKO were not yet implemented. Some of the open space sites were grassed but fenced, which precluded public enjoyment;
- (l) MTRCL should be encouraged to provide suitable GIC facilities in the proposed development to at least address its own share of any shortfall. This was also in line with the 'single site, multiple use' model currently adopted by the Government;

*Visual and Air Ventilation Impacts*

- (m) MTRCL should be encouraged to provide more mitigation measures to ameliorate the visual impact on the Hang Hau Man Kuk Lane Park;
- (n) it was noted that the building-to-building separation within La Cite Noble was closer than its distance to the Site; and

*Others*

- (o) the indigenous villages of TKO were much affected by the New Town development, and the villagers' sacrifice should be recognised.

67. Regarding the implementation of GIC facilities, the Chairperson remarked that:

- (a) PlanD was mainly responsible for reservation of land for GIC facilities. Implementation of the facilities was largely beyond PlanD's control and rested with the relevant government bureaux/departments;
- (b) that said, a new mechanism had been put in place for PlanD to monitor idle GIC sites without any programme for implementation, and sites earmarked for use by individual bureaux/departments might be de-reserved if the situation persisted;
- (c) the Government Property Agency would be responsible for identifying partners for joint-user developments.

68. Regarding the parking provision standards, the Chairperson highlighted that while TD was reviewing the standards, there was always a dilemma as increasing the car parking provision would encourage car ownership which in turn might add loading to the road network.

69. Some Members had also expressed views on the issue of local employment. While a few Members suggested adding more employment opportunities to the New Town, others considered TKO not a genuine employment-deficit New Town in view of its proximity to the main urban areas as compared to other new towns, e.g. Tin Shui Wai. Rather, it was a temporary problem due to TKO's currently saturated external traffic connections.

70. A Member found the representers' use of the word "misleading", when referring to some of the government representatives' responses at the hearing, unacceptable, noting that the government representatives were merely responding to Members' specific questions. The Member concurred with the Chairperson's gentle reminder to the representers/commenter and their representatives at the hearing.

71. The Chairperson noted that majority of Members were supportive of the zoning amendments, but had general concerns on issues which would not directly affect the decision, specifically on the traffic conditions and provision of GIC facilities in TKO as a whole. To address Members' concerns, the Chairperson suggested that TD be invited to give an overview of the short, medium and long-term traffic infrastructure provisions in TKO, including major roads, tunnels and railway lines, for the Board's reference. The relevant government departments would also be reminded to expedite implementation of the planned GIC facilities in TKO to meet the district's needs. Members agreed.

72. As for amendment item B, Members noted that it was technical in nature, which was to allow the planned provision of footpath along the existing road.

73. 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.



74. After deliberation, the Board noted the views of R130 on Amendment Item A, and decided not to uphold R1 to R129 and considered that the draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Amendment Item A

- (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 Pak Shing Kok Ventilation Building site is in line with the Government’s initiative to explore the development potential of existing railway facilities with the objective to increase housing supply (**R7, R9, R27, R103, R110, R113, R119**);
- (b) the inclusion of the existing cut-slope within the future development would not affect the greenery of the area. The proposed building height (BH) restriction of 130mPD and plot ratio (PR) restriction of 6 are considered compatible with the surrounding high-rise high-density residential developments, including the planned public housing development to the immediate north-east of the site with a BH restriction of 130mPD and a PR restriction of 6.65 (**R7, R91, R92, R98, R103, R106, R107, R110, R112, R113, R118, R120, R121**);
- (c) technical assessments have been conducted on visual, air ventilation, traffic, noise, environmental, landscape and other aspects and no insurmountable technical problem is envisaged by relevant government bureaux/departments (**R1 to R5, R7 to R97, R102 to R126**);
- (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 facilities including educational, medical and health, social welfare, public market and recreational facilities as well as open space to serve Tseung Kwan O (**R3, R4, R7, R11 to R13, R67, R78, R90, R92,**

**R103 to R105, R107, R109, R110, R112 to R116, R121, R122, R126 to R128);**

- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the OZP amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of the OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments also form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (**R3, R5, R10 to R12, R120**); and

Amendment Item B

- (f) the proposed amendment is to allow planned provision of footpath along the existing road (**R1 to R10, R13 to R102**).”

75. The Board also agreed that the draft Tseung Kwan O 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.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang, Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during the deliberation.]

**Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/YL-NTM/399

Proposed Public Utility Installation (Solar Photovoltaic System) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 978 (Part), 979 (Part), 1043 and 1047 in D.D. 102, Siu Hum Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long  
(TPB Paper No. 10721)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

76. The Secretary reported that the applicant requested on 10.2.2021 deferment of consideration of the review application for two months in order to allow time for the applicant to prepare further information as the reply from the China Light and Power Hong Kong Limited

on the Feed-in Tariff Scheme was pending. It was the second time that the applicant requested deferment of the review application. Since the last deferment, the applicant had yet to submit further information.

77. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to defer a decision on the review application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Board agreed that the review application should be submitted for its consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. If the further information submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the review application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board's consideration. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of further information. Since it was the second deferment and a total of four months had been allowed for preparation of the submission of further information, no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting]

#### **Any Other Business**

78. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:10 p.m.