

**Minutes of 1249th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 7.7.2021, 8.7.2021 and 12.7.2021**

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 Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East),

Transport Department

Mr Ken K.K. Yip

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Gavin C.T. Tse

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Terence S.W. Tsang

Assistant Director (Regional 3)

Lands Department

Mr Alan K.L. Lo

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Y. S. Wong

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang (7.7.2021 a.m., 8.7.2021 p.m. and 12.7.2021 a.m.)

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (7.7.2021 p.m., 8.7.2021 a.m. and 12.7.2021 p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu (7.7.2021 a.m.)

Ms Christine C.M. Cheung (7.7.2021 p.m.)

Ms Annie H.Y. Wong (8.7.2021 a.m.)

Mr Alex C.Y. Kiu (8.7.2021 p.m.)

Mr W.C. Lui (12.7.2021 a.m.)

Ms Kitty S.T. Lam (12.7.2021 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 7.7.2021:

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

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr C.H. Hau

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 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

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East),
Transport Department
Mr Ken K.K. Yip

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

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

Assistant Director (Regional 3)
Lands Department
Mr Alan K.L. Lo

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Opening Remarks

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

Sha Tin, Tai Po and North District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23

(TPB Paper No. 10746)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

3. The Secretary reported that Amendment Items A, B1 and D involved public housing developments to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. An Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) for the above-mentioned amendment items was conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with Black & Veatch Hong Kong Limited (B&V), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) and Urbis Limited (Urbis) as the study consultants. Representations and comments had been submitted by Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG) (R44), World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong (WWFHK) (R46), Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R47/C3), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R49/C5), Greeners Action (GA) (R1640), Centre for Community and Place Governance (CCPG), Institute of Future Cities (IOFC) of Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK) (R52), Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas) (R5697), which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD), and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R92/C16). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Mr Gavin C.T. Tse
<i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong | - having current business dealings with HKHA and CUHK; |

- Mr K.K. Cheung
- his firm having current business dealings with HKHA, B&V, KFBG, GA, Towngas and HLD, past business dealings with CA, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;
- Mr Alex H.T. Lai
- his former firm having business dealings with HKHA, B&V, KFBG, GA, Towngas and HLD, past business dealings with CA, and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time;
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho
- having current business dealings with HKHA, MVA and Urbis;
- Dr C.H. Hau
- conducting contract research projects with CEDD, being a member of HKBWS and a life member of CA and his spouse being the Vice-chairman of the Board of Directors of CA, being a former member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWFHK, being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before, and having current business dealings with HLD;
- Mr Franklin Yu
- being a member of the Building Committee of HKHA and his firm having current business dealings with CUHK;

- Mr Y.S. Wong
- being a member of Funds Management Sub-Committee of the HKHA;
- Mr L.T. Kwok
- his serving organisation operated a social service team which was supported by HKHA and openly bid funding from HKHA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau
- being a member and an ex-employee of Hong Kong Housing Society which had discussed with HD on housing development issues;
- Dr Lawrence K.C Li
- being the Deputy Chairman of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University (PolyU) which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu
- being a member of the Council of PolyU which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen
- being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had received a donation from an Executive Director of HLD before;
- Mr K.W. Leung
- being a member of the Executive Committee of HKBWS and the Chairman of the Crested Bulbul Club Committee of HKBWS;
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon
- renting one and owning one residential unit in Ma On Shan (MOS); and his spouse being an

employee of HD but not involved in planning work; and

Professor John C.Y. Ng - being a Fellow of IOFC, CUHK.

[Mr Gavin C.T. Tse and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

4. Members noted that as the interests of Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu and Y.S. Wong were direct, they had not been invited to join the meeting. Members also noted that Dr Lawrence W.C. Pon and Mr Gavin C.T. Tse had already left the meeting. Members agreed that as the interests of Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu, Peter K.T. Yuen, L.T. Kwok and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li were indirect, Messrs K.K. Cheung, Alex T.H. Lai, K.W. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau and Professor John C.Y. Ng had no involvement in the submission of representations and comments, and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no involvement in the public housing development, they could stay in the meeting.

5. The Secretary drew Members' attention that a motion was passed in the Development and Housing Committee meeting of the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) held on 18.2.2021 requesting that Members of the Town Planning Board (the Board) who had to declare interests with Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) to withdraw from consideration of the representations and comments on the MOS Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to avoid any potential conflict of interests, as a site owned by SHK was located to the southeast of Site G further up Ma On Shan Tsuen (MOST) Road and construction of access road for the proposed housing development under Item G might indirectly benefit SHK. The Secretariat of the Board had already provided written responses to STDC in June 2021, advising that the Board would follow the established practices in handling any potential conflict of interests to ensure that the Board would act fairly and impartially in making its decisions, and the arrangement on declaration of interests of Members was detailed in the Procedures and Practices available at the Board's website. The meeting noted that the potential conflict of interest in relation to SHK was remote and agreed that no such declaration from Members was required.

6. The Secretary reported that a joint petition letter was received just before the hearing from eight environmental groups who would make their oral submissions at the hearing. Members noted that as the letter was submitted after the statutory publication period of the draft

OZP, it should not be treated as submission made under section 6(3)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance).

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. 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.

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shia Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)

Miss Hannah H.N. Yick - Senior Town Planner/Shia Tin

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo - Project Team Leader/Housing (PTL/H)

Mr Patrick K.P. Cheng - Senior Engineer

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R43 – Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

Ms Cindy Choi - Representer's Representative

R44 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG)

R2245 – Yung King Leung

R2249 – Ades Gary William John

R2257 – Yip Tsz Lam

R2439 – Shum Wing Shan

Mr Nip Hin Ming - Representers'
Representative

R45 – Hong Kong Wild Bird Conservation Concern Group

Ms Wong Hok Sze - Representers'
Representative

R46 – World Wild Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWFHK)

Mr Chan Chung Ming - Representers'
Representative

R47/C3 – Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS)

Ms Wong Suet Mei - Representers' and
Commenter's
Representative

R48/C4 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

Mr Paul Zimmerman] Representers' and
Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel] Commenter's
Representatives

R49/C5 – The Conservancy Association (CA)

R76 – Chan Ka Lam

R1628 – Hureau Samuel Marie Valery Raymond

R1640 – Greeners Action

R1747 – Hui Shuk Kwan

R2126 – Lau Sin Pang

Mr Ng Hei Man - Representers' and
Commenter's
Representative

R50 – The Green Earth

Mr Yeung Yat Fai - Representers' Representative

R51/C6 – Green Sense

R1653 – Lau Ka Yeung

R3194 – Chao Suet Ying

C102 – Ip Sze Yu

Mr Lau Ka Yeung - Representer and Representers' and Commenters' Representative

R52 – Centre of Community and Place Governance, Institute of Future Cities of Chinese University of Hong Kong (CCPG, IOFC, CUHK)

Professor Ng Mee Kam - Representer's Representative

R54 – 民主黨沙田黨團

Mr Chow Hiu-laam Felix - Representer's Representative

R58/C9 – Yung Ming Chau

Mr Yung Ming Chau - Representer and Commenter

R64/C8 – Chan Pui Ming

R3541 – Mah Hok Yin

Mr Chan Pui Ming - Representer and Commenter and Representer's Representative

R67 – Sin Cheuk Nam

R2596 – Kong Lok Lam Lochlann

R2690 – Lam Shuk Man

Mr Sin Cheuk Nam	-	Representer and Representers' Representative
------------------	---	--

R72/C10 – Ng Kam Hung

Mr Ng Kam Hung	-	Representer and Commenter
----------------	---	------------------------------

R73 – Tam Yi Pui

R2663 – Siu Chi Hang Domingo

Mr Tam Yi Pui	-	Representer and Representer's Representative
---------------	---	--

R2465 – Greenpeace

Ms Chan Hall Sion	-	Representer's Representative
-------------------	---	---------------------------------

9. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments at this session of the meeting held on 7.7.2021. For better time management and smooth running of the meeting, no further briefing would be given by PlanD at the subsequent sessions. Instead, the PowerPoint and the presentation given by PlanD's representative would be uploaded to the Board's website for viewing by the representers and commenters. After PlanD's presentation, the representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation and comment number. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives 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 on each of the hearing day after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives,

representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in a closed meeting after hearing all the oral submissions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, 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 L.T. Kwok joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

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

R45 – Hong Kong Wild Bird Conservation Concern Group

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Hok Sze made the following main points:

- (a) the EFS conducted by CEDD was only one of the many steps to demonstrate that the development was technically feasible. It did not necessarily mean that the "Green Belt" ("GB") should be rezoned for residential development. The representation sites fell within the "GB" zone that had ecological value and primarily defined a limit for urban sprawl and acted as a buffer between urban development and the country park. If the function of the "GB" zone was eroded, it might adversely affect the ecology of the neighbouring country park. Once there was a major development in the "GB" zone, other developments would follow and encroach upon the "GB" zone;

- (b) given the economic challenges brought by COVID-19, the unemployment rate in Hong Kong had reached 7% which was a 17-year high as announced recently by the Census and Statistics Department. Furthermore, a net decrease in population was observed as many people in Hong Kong had emigrated recently. Due to these factors, the demand for private housing might drop and the need for rezoning “GB” for residential development might not be that imminent. Pushing ahead for the private housing development under such circumstances would unlikely help resolve the housing shortage in the short-term, as developers would slow down the development process to wait for economic revival in order to sell the units at a higher price. The Government should comprehensively review the overall housing policy in particular the public-private housing split;
- (c) while according to response E2 provided by PlanD at Annex Va of the Paper, the ecological impact of the proposed housing developments would be limited, the potential risk of birds killed by collision with windows of high-rise buildings should not be overlooked. Many modern residential buildings had incorporated designs with large glass windows. Migratory birds might be confused by the reflections of the windows and accidentally collide with the buildings;
- (d) according to responses SJ1 to SJ3 at Annex Va of the Paper on visual impact, the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, PlanD considered that the visual impact of the proposed developments was acceptable. However, the general public’s perception of the issue of potential visual impact was quite different. Despite that various design measures, such as building height (BH) restriction and providing air ventilation/visual corridor, might be adopted, the proposed development of Item G with buildings up to 250mPD in height would inevitably cause significant visual impact. The only way to reduce the visual impact was to reduce the development intensity and BH. The overall environmental quality of MOS would definitely be affected by the proposed development;
- (e) according to the Paper, there was a surplus of kindergarten, primary and

secondary school classrooms in MOS. With an anticipated drop in the number of students in MOS and Sha Tin Districts, the proposed primary school under Item E might no longer be required; and

- (f) the proposed housing developments were very close to Ma On Shan Country Park (MOSCP). If there was a hill fire in the country park, it would pose a substantial risk to the future residents of the proposed housing developments.

R50 – The Green Earth

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yeung Yat Fai made the following main points:

- (a) the majority of public views received objected to the proposed housing developments. The rezoning of “GB” for housing developments would set an undesirable precedent and send a wrong message that the public’s objection to development project could be brushed aside as long as the project was technically feasible;
- (b) Site G was adjacent to Ma On Shan Tsuen (MOST) Road and only 15m away from the boundary of MOSCP. The proposed private housing development at the site would not only defeat the buffer function of the “GB” zone, but also pave the way for other similar developments in close proximity to country parks; and
- (c) according to a paper of the former Country Parks Board, developments on the periphery of country parks might affect the environment of the country parks. Such development projects should duly consider its environmental impact both inside and up to 1km outside the boundary of country parks. If there was a major road, the potential impact on the area up to 2km from the boundary of country parks should also be taken into account. According to the Paper, the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) conducted only covered a study area of 500m from the works limit of the

proposed housing developments. An explanation should be provided by the relevant government departments to justify why a larger study area was not selected.

R46 – WWFHK

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Chun Ming made the following main points:

- (a) WWFHK objected to Items A to G which involved rezoning of “GB” for development as it would diminish the role of “GB” as a buffer to protect country parks. As observed from the aerial photos, all sites under Items A to E were well-vegetated and formed an integral part of the “GB” surrounding MOSCP. Those sites should be kept as “GB” to retain its buffer function to reduce the impact of the nearby urban development on the country park; and
- (b) some of the rezoned sites were situated very close to MOSCP, in particular the one under Item G with a distance of just about 15m. Noise and light pollution from construction works and the future housing development would adversely affect the ecology of MOSCP. It would also set an undesirable precedent for similar developments near other country parks.

R47/C3 – HKBWS

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Suet Mei made the following main points:

- (a) the planning intention of the “GB” zone was 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;
- (b) the Government had carried out several rounds of “GB” review. As announced in the 2011 Policy Address, only “GB” sites that were

devegetated, deserted or formed and thus no longer performing their original functions would be converted into housing sites. The Government then announced in 2013 that “GB” sites in the fringe of built-up areas that were close to existing urban areas and new towns would also be reviewed, with a focus to identify sites that though vegetated, had insignificant buffering effect and relatively low conservation, for urban expansion;

- (c) in July 2014, the Development Bureau (DEVB) announced that “GB” sites with relatively lower conservation value would also be reviewed for suitability for development;
- (d) it was clear that throughout the different stages of “GB” review, there was an intention to avoid using “GB” sites that were well-vegetated for development;
- (e) Site A was mainly woodland habitat with streams and an orchard therein. The large patch of woodland within the site, which had a ‘moderate’ ecological value according to the EcoIA report, was ecologically connected to the surrounding environment. The existing orchard within the site was linked to the nearby woodland, and had potential for developing into a foraging ground for wildlife including insects and fruit-eating birds. The watercourse ran through the vicinity of Site A had a moderate ecological value and was the breeding ground for a globally ‘vulnerable’ frog species, Lesser Spiny Frog (小棘蛙);
- (f) similarly, Site B1 was mainly a woodland habitat with marsh and a plantation. The woodland had a moderate ecological value and was ecologically connected to the surrounding marsh, streams and MOSCP. Protected bird species could be found in the vicinity. Various native plant species could also be found within the plantation. She doubted whether the ecological value and buffer function of this site was low as presented in the EcoIA report;
- (g) as observed from the aerial photos, it was very difficult, if not impossible,

to separate Sites C to G from their surrounding areas as those sites, like their surrounding areas, were covered by dense vegetation and formed an integral part of the “GB” that was connected to the vegetation in MOSCP. According to the EcoIA report, woodland with “moderate to high” and “moderate” ecological value and six streams/watercourses with ‘moderate’ and ‘low to moderate’ ecological value could be found within those sites. Some of the streams were also breeding grounds for Lesser Spiny Frog (小棘蛙);

- (h) during a visit to the amendment sites conducted in December 2020, various types of woodland birds, including Scarlet Minivet (赤紅山椒鳥), Japanese Thrush (烏灰鶉), Mountain Tailorbird (金頭縫葉鶯) and Crested Serpent Eagle (蛇鵂) (an vulnerable species), were found. It should be noted that December was not considered as the most suitable month for bird watching/survey and the actual number of bird species inhabiting in the area could be more; and
- (i) in short, Sites A, B1, C to G, which were rezoned from “GB” for residential developments and supporting facilities, were inconsistent with the criteria set out in Stages 1 and 2 of the “GB” review, i.e. those sites were not “devegetated, deserted or formed” and had “insignificant buffering effect” or “relatively low conservation value”. HKBWS did not support those items as they would result in direct loss in valuable woodland habitat, weaken the buffer function of the larger “GB” zone, and reduce the ecological integrity of the woodland as well as space available for passive recreational activities for public enjoyment.

R49/C5 – CA

R76 – Chan Ka Lam

R1628 – Hureau Samuel Marie Valery Raymond

R1640 – Greeners Action

R1747 – Hui Shuk Kwan

R2126 – Lau Sin Pang

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Hei Man made the following main points:

Ecology

- (a) while many of the green groups presenting at the hearing had different focuses, they unanimously objected to the rezoning of “GB” for housing developments and supporting facilities under Items A, B1, C to G;
- (b) CA was particularly concerned about the two pieces of woodland in Cheung Muk Tau being rezoned under Items A and B1;
- (c) the northern part of Site B1 was occupied by a plantation, dominated by Slash Pine (愛氏松) and the southern part was mostly woodland. Despite the general perception that plantation usually had a lower ecological value, based on the site visit conducted by CA, many native self-seeded species, such as Aporosa (銀柴) and Prickly Ash (權權) could be found near the edge of this plantation adjoining the woodland in the southern part. Although many of the plant species found were common native species, it did not mean that the plantation had less ecological value. According to the tree survey report as part of the EFS, trees with a height of 8 to 10m were found within Site B1. CA considered that species diversity and structural complexity of this plantation was quite different from a typical plantation;
- (d) the species diversity at the woodland at/near Sites A and B1 was considered high. Many native plant species, including Hance’s Syzygium (韓氏蒲桃), Lance-leaved Sterculia (假蘋婆) and Mountain Tallow Tree (山烏柏), were among the tree groups connecting Sites A and B1;

Historic Value of Ma On Shan Iron Mine

- (e) the proposed public housing and school sites under Items D and E

respectively were situated close to Shun Yee San Tsuen. Part of Site D was located above the former Ma On Shan Iron Mine (the Mine). The works limit of the proposed development, as marked blue in Plan H-5 of the Paper, extended further out and was even closer to Shun Yee San Tsuen and the various graded historic structures there. At the moment, there was no information on the exact distance between the works limits and Shun Yee San Tsuen. There were doubts on whether mitigation measures, such as provision of a buffer around the Office Block, Engine Room and exterior wall of 110ML Portal to the Mine, could effectively protect those historic structures during site formation and construction stages. The responses provided by the government departments had not satisfactorily addressed those concerns. Noting that the Office Block, Engine Room and exterior wall of 110ML Portal to the Mine were still in relatively good conditions, more effort should be given to their protection;

- (f) some other structures related to the former mine, such as rail tracks to the mineral preparation plant and the platform of the tram repairing area, were spotted within the area of the proposed works limit. Other remnants within the Mine might be directly/indirectly affected by the proposed development and associated road works. The proposed elevated road above the graded pier to the mineral preparation plant was unsatisfactory;
- (g) some historic structures/features, such as a section of catchwater and a water tank, would fall within the works area of proposed access roads. Based on an aerial photo taken in 1963, the catchwater connected the water tank to the area near Site G. It was possible that they were important components in the operation of the Mine. While some of the structures of the former iron mine at the site had not been graded, they formed part of the Mine and should be preserved together with the graded historic structures;
- (h) a more detailed survey of historical structures should be conducted right away. Suitable studies and assessments should be conducted in the early planning stage to ensure better conservation with a “point-line-place” approach, rather than leaving the heritage impact assessment (HIA) to be

conducted at the subsequent detailed design stage;

- (i) the Mine had significant historic and cultural value and the entire area of the Mine should be protected. The uphill and downhill areas along MOST Road should also be designated as a heritage conservation area;

Setting Undesirable Precedent

- (j) in recent years, the Board had considered many proposals to rezone “GB” for housing development. A few of them were eventually considered not suitable by the Board. One of those examples was the proposed rezoning of a “GB” site in the north of Tseung Kwan O (TKO) for public housing development and associated access road. The main reasons for the Board to revert the zoning of that site to “GB” were that the site was relatively distant from TKO Town Centre and not abutting any existing road (compared with other four sites which were relatively closer to the town centre and connected with existing access roads), the construction of a new access road would lead to extensive site formation works and affect the natural slope, and the proposed high-rise housing development was not compatible with the surrounding low-rise developments. The sites in MOS now proposed for housing developments and supporting facilities shared similar planning circumstances. Sites A and B1 were not connected to any gateway nodes. A major access road would need to be constructed to connect these two sites to Nin Fung Road, causing significant impact on the surrounding environment and slopes. Development of these two sites was not in line with the criteria set out under various stages of the review of the “GB” sites;
- (k) a plot ratio of 6.8 for Sites A and B1 was considered excessive and incompatible with the surrounding environment. The nearby “Village Type Development” zone in Cheung Muk Tau was predominantly occupied by 3-storey village houses. The nearby residential developments at Symphony Bay and the “Residential (Group B) 5” zone had a much lower plot ratio (not more than 5). High-density residential developments only

concentrated in the area near Wu Kai Sha Station which was a major transport node; and

- (l) Site G was located on a hillslope far away from the existing developed area in MOS. The surrounding area mainly comprised woodland, plantation and shrub-land. Site G was also less than 15m away from the boundary of MOSCP. Despite that its description as an “area near the periphery” of a country park, if viewed from a wider context and as observed from the aerial photo, Site G was indeed located in the centre of a large patch of dense woodland. The proposed “medium-density” private housing development with nine towers of 18 to 27 storeys was excessive in scale and incompatible with the surrounding environment. It would become a sore-thumb development and adopting a stepped BH concept would not be sufficient to mitigate the visual impact. Extensive vegetation clearance was also required to make way for the associated infrastructure such as access road and service reservoirs. The planning permission for a private residential development at a site in the vicinity (granted by the Board back in 2005) was not an appropriate reference when assessing the landscape impact of the proposed development at Site G. Based on the photomontages in the feasibility study report prepared by CEDD, development at Site G would result in moderate to significant visual impact at some of the viewing points, such as MOST Road. The proposed development would also permanently alter the rural landscape along MOST Road, which was a narrow local road often utilised by nearby residents and hikers. The proposed development at Site G would definitely create an undesirable precedent for similar developments close to country parks.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R51/C6 – Green Sense

R1653 – Lau Ka Yeung

R3194 – Chao Suet Ying

C102 – Ip Sze Yu

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lau Ka Yeung made the following main points:

Ecology

- (a) while noting that there was an acute shortage in housing land and it was the Government's priority to address this issue, they objected to Items A, B1, C to G for public and private housing developments and the related supporting facilities as those sites were in close proximity to MOSCP (as close as 15m away only). Large-scale development in close proximity to country parks would result in irreversible impact on the buffering function of the "GB" zone;
- (b) the proposed housing developments would burden the existing transportation network and create noise problems. There were also insufficient community facilities to support the housing developments;
- (c) there were flaws in the ecological baseline survey and tree survey under the EFS. Six different types of ecological surveys were conducted at these seven amendment sites on the same days. It was likely that different surveys conducted at each of the sites on the same day had interfered with each other and as a result, the findings of the surveys might be skewed. Furthermore, some of the days that the surveys were conducted were immediately after consecutive days of heavy rainstorm or just before a typhoon. Weather situation might have influenced the result of the surveys, i.e. the water flow in the streams/watercourses on those days might be different from normal days, which would in turn affect the number of animal species surveyed. The unfavourable weather conditions might also prevent the survey officers from properly surveying areas deep inside the woodland that were less accessible. According to the guidelines provided by the Environmental Protection Department, ecological baseline survey should be conducted at the time of the year when the target group was more active, conspicuous or easy to be identified;

- (d) it was unrealistic to conduct concurrent extensive tree surveys at seven sites on the same day. While there was no Old and Valuable Tree (OVT) identified in the tree survey, the survey had not covered private lots. Many other plant species had been found in the area in previously conducted ecological surveys. However, only Lamb of Tartary (金毛狗), Small Persimmon (小果柿), Luofushan Joint-fir (羅浮買麻藤) and Red Azalea (映山紅) were found in the current tree survey. It was believed that the number of tree species and the ecological value of these woodland had been underestimated. Based on a site visit conducted by Green Sense, Ixonanthes (黏木), a rare and precious plants of Hong Kong, and other less-common plant species such as Hainan Anneslea (海南茶梨) and Ailanthusi (常綠臭椿) were also found in the vicinity of MOST Road;
- (e) a number of issues were noted in the tree survey report. It had only reported the average height and trunk diameter of trees. Such presentation might cause individual large and tall trees to 'blend in' with the rest of the trees and underestimate the impact. Furthermore, the health condition of the trees reported in the tree survey did not reflect the actual situation observed at the sites by Green Sense;

Traffic

- (f) for the proposed public/private housing developments (Items D and G) and school development (Item E) along MOST Road, the population would be about 8,300 and 3,100 persons respectively while the primary school would have about 900 students. The proposed bus and mini-bus services would unlikely be able to cope with the actual transportation requirements of the future residents and students. Taking Tsui Chuk Garden, also a subsidised housing development in Wong Tai Sin, as an example, the bus service serving that area operated at a two-minute interval during peak hours. At the moment, it was proposed that the bus service serving the proposed public housing development at Site D would run at a frequency of 18 buses per hour. If the current estimate was inaccurate and additional buses were required to meet the

needs of the future residents, it would pose significant additional traffic burden on the nearby road network. There were also doubts on whether the findings of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) were accurate and reliable. For example, the TIA had anticipated a significant increase in traffic at both the morning and afternoon peaks at the MOS Road/Hang Hong Street roundabout in 2035 with the proposed development at Site D. However, the anticipated traffic for one of the directions at this roundabout would decrease compared to that in 2019 and no explanation had been provided to support this projection. If the TIA findings were unreliable, the proposed development could result in unacceptable impact on the transportation system in the MOS and Sha Tin areas. At the moment, improvement works to Tai Po Road - Sha Tin were being carried out by the Government. With the proposed housing developments at MOS, the traffic situation at Tai Po Road - Sha Tin might soon start to deteriorate again; and

Noise

- (g) one of the residential blocks and one non-domestic block in the proposed public housing development under Item D were susceptible to traffic noise from MOS Bypass. The proposed school under Item E was also susceptible to the same noise problem. The effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures, such as the use of low-noise road surfacing materials and installing acoustic windows, was questionable. Many examples in other housing estates showed that those measures could not practically resolve the traffic noise issue.

R48/C4 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) MOST Road was narrow but actively used by members of the public, including villagers, hikers and paragliders, as the major access to MOSCP. Ngong Ping was also a popular destination for hikers, paragliders as well as

radio-controlled model sailplane hobbyists. The proposed development under Item G would adversely affect their use of MOST Road;

- (b) it was difficult to understand why a residential development with only about 1,000 units to accommodate some 3,100 residents was proposed at a remote site only accessible via MOST Road. Extensive road works would be required, which would cause significant damage to the environment. The only apparent reason was that the site was an old squatter area where land control action had been taken by the Lands Department in the past; and
- (c) Site G was situated on a slope. The natural terrain hazard study only covered the area within the proposed works area. However, mitigation works for natural terrain hazard often had to be carried out outside the immediate works area and they had not been assessed so far. Information on the associated cost, which was likely to be substantial, and impact had not been provided. For example, at a land sale site at Tai Wo Ping in Shek Kip Mei which was also situated close to a country park, the land sale document had marked an area for conducting a natural terrain hazard study that was significantly larger than the sale site. The extensiveness of the potential mitigation works required should not be overlooked simply because a site was located outside the boundary of the country park. He hoped that the Board could review the proposal from a cost-effectiveness perspective.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R43 – Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Cindy Choi made the following main points:

- (a) MOS was an invaluable natural geological heritage in that it had high geodiversity. Three types of rocks from different geological eras could be found in MOS. It was also the only iron mine in Hong Kong. The structures of the former iron mine had historical value worthy of preservation;

- (b) the upland valley of MOS had rare and unique geological features. The MOS area should be used as an outdoor geological and cultural classroom of the community; and
- (c) developments under Items A to G were not compatible with the tranquil environment of MOS. In particular, Item G, which would provide housing to accommodate only about 3,000 persons, would cause disproportional adverse impact on the area surrounding the site. Furthermore, the view of MOS from Sha Tin would also be affected by the proposed high-density housing developments.

R2465 – Greenpeace

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Hall Sion made the following main points:

- (a) for many years, it was the consensus of the public that country parks and their peripheral areas should be protected from development. Based on a phone poll commissioned by Greenpeace in 2018, 50% of the interviewees did not support development in environmentally sensitive areas near country parks and were most concerned about the irreversible impact on the environment that might be caused and the setting of undesirable precedents. There were many alternatives to make land available to meet various development needs. More than 80% of the public views collected agreed that brownfield sites should be developed first before considering options such as reclamation or developing green sites;
- (b) it appeared that the Government had not formulated a comprehensive plan for using brownfield sites for development and had been quite slow in dealing with issues associated with brownfield sites. The data on area of brownfield sites in Hong Kong announced by PlanD was outdated and incomplete and more than 380ha of brownfield sites in Hong Kong were not counted. Assuming that half of these 380ha of ‘missing’ brownfield sites were used for low-density, 4 to 6-storey village type public housing

development, more than 95,000 units could be provided. With better strategy and planning to utilise available land resources, controversial development projects at environmentally sensitive “GB” sites could be avoided; and

- (c) at the same time, due to insufficient planning and regulation, there was a proliferation of brownfield sites. More than 400ha of new brownfields had appeared in Hong Kong in recent years. It was unconvincing that there was any imminent need to develop the “GB” sites. The Government should first gather accurate information on area of brownfield sites in Hong Kong and formulate suitable strategy to convert them for development of public housing. The Board should not allow the current rezoning exercise of the “GB” sites to proceed further.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R44 – KFBG

R2245 – Yung King Leung

R2249 – Ades Gary William John

R2257 – Yip Tsz Lam

R2439 – Shum Wing Shan

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation with video clips, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following main points:

- (a) abundant underutilised land, e.g. the flea market and open-air bus terminus outside Kam Sheung Road Station, could be used for development. There were also many brownfield sites in Kam Tin area along Kam Sheung Road, Kam Tin Road and Fan Kam Road. The areas occupied by those brownfield operations in Kam Tin were very large and many of those operations could be relocated into multi-storey buildings (MSBs). It could present a much more straight-forward option for housing development. While the area close to Shek Kong Airport was subject to airport height restrictions, there were still plenty of brownfield sites in Kam Tin that were

substantial in size and located more than 500m from Shek Kong Airport and could accommodate large scale comprehensive residential developments. Based on his observation, the brownfield sites and vacant land in Wang Toi Shan Hung Mo Tam had an area comparable to Mei Foo Sun Chuen. Furthermore, brownfield sites were usually accessible by vehicles, unlike those remote “GB” sites in MOS being proposed for housing development in the current rezoning exercise;

- (b) in order to accommodate affected brownfield operators, consideration should be given to utilising sites that had been left vacant for a long period, such as the site of the defunct desalination plant in Tuen Mun, for MSB development;
- (c) Site B1 was well-vegetated and the green vegetation coverage extended all the way to MOSCP. The Board had previously rejected rezoning proposal for residential use in “GB” sites for reasons of connection of vegetation coverage in rezoning sites to the surrounding environment. The access road for Site B1 would sever the connection between MOSCP and the marshland near Cheung Muk Tau. The photomontages also showed that the high-density development at Site B1 would result in quite substantial visual impact. The proposed tree planting around the site was ineffective in mitigating the visual impact;
- (d) one of the important factors to be considered in rezoning “GB” for development was whether the sites were well-vegetated. Based on the observation during the site visits by some green groups, the vegetation coverage in Site B1, despite being a plantation area, was comparable to that of a country park in terms of its density and biodiversity. Site A also shared some of these properties with vegetation coverage connected to MOSCP. If these two sites were the subject of planning applications, they would most likely be rejected by the Board;
- (e) there was a seasonal stream just outside the western boundary of Site A. A protected frog species, Lesser Spiny Frog (小棘蛙), could be found in the

vicinity of the stream. The boundary of Site A was abutting the said stream and there were concerns that runoff from the construction works might adversely affect the water quality of the stream and the nearby environment; and

- (f) Sites E and G were both along MOST Road, well-vegetated and in close proximity to MOSCP. There was a presumption against development for “GB”. In particular, Site G was located in the centre of a green space and not suitable for development. While scattered squatters could be found within Site G, those squatters were located in an inconspicuous area within the site and generally existed in harmony with the surrounding environment. Furthermore, the proposed housing and school developments would bring significant visual impact to the users of MOST Road and substantially change the ambience of the surrounding areas. The Board should critically consider whether the visual impact could be properly mitigated by the proposed measures such as tree planting on the periphery.

R52 – CCPG, IOFC, CUHK

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation with video clips on history of the Mine and interview with family members of the miners, Professor Ng Mee Kam made the following main points:

- (a) her team at IOFC of CUHK had conducted a study titled “A multi-dimensional “point-line-plane” approach for industrial heritage conservation in Hong Kong: A case study of Ma On Shan Iron Mine” (the case study) funded by the Built Heritage Conservation Fund;
- (b) the Mine had rich historic and cultural value. For the purpose of the case study, the mine was divided into a number of districts, namely “Peak District”, “Mid-level District” and “Pier District”. A total of 18 sites of historic values were identified in the case study and it was proposed to preserve those sites using a multi-dimensional “point-line-plane” approach to better capture the full cultural values of the heritage site. Most of the Pier

District, where the mineral preparation plant was once located, had been demolished in 1970s and developed into the MOS New Town;

- (c) the boundary of Site E was extremely close to the Grade 2 110ML Portal and the related structures nearby, as well as the Grade 3 mineral preparation plant. According to RNTPC Paper No. 4/20, the proposed school development would avoid the majority of the heritage resources and a buffer zone would be drawn;
- (d) the Government should consider integrating the graded structures with the proposed developments under Items D and E so that the heritage sites could become a learning ground for the community and students. The Mine was a piece of industrial heritage that could offer unique opportunities for STEAM (science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics) education. It was suggested that Site E and its surrounding heritage structures including the 110ML Portal and its associated structures and the mineral preparation plant and related relics be rezoned to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “School cum Conservation Areas” so that the heritage structures could be integrated into the design of the school to tell the story of the Mine to the students. To better achieve the conservation goal, all land uses in the zone should be Column 2 uses requiring planning permission from the Board. The Government should also explore adopting innovative measures and collaborate with non-government organisations to run the proposed school;
- (e) development of Site G would also affect the integrity of the cultural landscape of the area. Site G overlapped with the Mid-level District of the Mine and the first settlers were from the Chiu Chow community. Subsequently, some miners became farmers and had continued to practise farming in the area. Their current settlement within Site G was humble and tied in well with the landscape and formed an integral part of the Mine. Rezoning of the site for private housing development would mean destroying the history and value of the Mine;
- (f) MOSCP was a popular destination for hikers and an important breathing

space for the public. The proposed development at Site G in a continuous “GB” was incompatible with the surrounding natural landscape. Also, the high cost of providing infrastructure and access road to support the development at Site G was not justified; and

- (g) on top of the environmental impact, there was also the issue of socio-spatial justice i.e. a few thousand residents who were wealthy enough to afford the property at Site G could enjoy the environment while their privilege would mean a degraded experience for many other users of the MOSCP. The rezoning of Site G was not acceptable and should not be approved.

24. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:10 p.m.

25. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m.
26. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr. C.H. Tse

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

Assistant Director (Regional 3)
Lands Department
Mr Alan K. L. Lo

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Ken K. K. Yip

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Government Representatives

PlanD

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu	-	DPO/STN
Ms Hannah H.N. Yick	-	Senior Town Planner/Shan Tin
Mr Adrian H.C. Lee	-	Town Planner/Shan Tin

CEDD

Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo	-	PTL/H
Mr Patrick K.P. Cheng	-	Senior Engineer
Mr Dicky K.Y. Mak	-	Engineer

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Elim Wong	-	Planning Officer
Mr Horace K.L. Lai	-	Architect

Transport Department (TD)

Mr K.L. Yiu	-	Engineer/Bicycle Parking
Mr. H. K. Ngai	-	Engineer/Ma On Shan

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Ms C.Y. Ho	-	Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South (SNC/S)
Mr Eric Y.H. Wong	-	Senior Nature Conservation Officer/Central (SNC/C)

Consultants

Mr Ernest Tip	-	Senior Associate, WSP (Asia) Ltd
Mr Joe Kwok	-	Senior Engineer, WSP (Asia) Ltd
Ms Anny Li	-	Tree Specialist, WSP (Asia) Ltd
Mr Vincent Lai	-	Director, Ecosystems Ltd
Mr. Ryan Ho	-	Ecologist, Ecosystems Ltd

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R43 – Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

Ms Cindy Choi	-	Representer's Representative
---------------	---	------------------------------

R44 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

R2245 – Yung King Leung

R2249 – Ades Gary William John

R2257 – Yip Tsz Lam

R2439 – Shum Wing Shan

Mr Nip Hin Ming	-	Representers' Representative
-----------------	---	------------------------------

R45 – Hong Kong Wild Bird Conservation Concern Group

Ms Wong Hok Sze	-	Representer's Representative
-----------------	---	------------------------------

R46 – WWFHK

Mr Chan Chung Ming	-	Representer's Representative
--------------------	---	------------------------------

R47 – HKBWS

Ms Wong Suet Mei	-	Representer's Representative
------------------	---	------------------------------

R48/C4 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

Mr Paul Zimmerman]	Representer's and Commenter's
Wong Wan Kei Samuel]	Representatives

R49/C5 – The Conservancy Association

R76 – Chan Ka Lam

R1628 – Hureau Samuel Marie Valery Raymond

R1640 Greeners Action

R1747 Hui Shuk Kwan

R2126 – Lau Sin Pang

Mr Ng Hei Man - Representers' Representative

R51/C6 – Green Sense

R1653 – Lau Ka Yeung

R3194 – Chao Suet Ying

C102 – Ip Sze Yu

Mr Lau Ka Yeung - Representer and Representers' and
Commenters' Representative

R57 – Li Wing Shing - Representer

R58/C9 - Yung Ming Chau - Representer and Commenter

R64/C8 – Chan Pui Ming

R3541– Mah Hok Yin

Mr Chan Pui Ming - Representer and Commenter and
Representer's Representative

R71/C7 – Chung Lai Him - Representer and Commenter

R72/C10 – Ng Kam Hung - Representer and Commenter

R73 – Tam Yi Pui

R2663 – Siu Chi Hang Domingo

Mr Tam Yi Pui - Representor and Representor's
Representative

R79 – Owners' Corporation of Symphony Bay

Dr Wong Cheuk Ki - Representor's Representative

R80 – 帝琴灣凱琴居民綠化關注組

R2806 – Wan Kang Sun

Wan Kang Sun - Representor and Representor's
Representative

Wong Ying Kit] Representor's Representatives

Ho Yin Faat]

R81 – Hau Lap Fai - Representor

R83 – Cheung Muk Tau Village Affairs Committee

Mr Liu Ghung Ming - Representor's Representative

R85 – 守護馬鞍山智庫

C1544 – Chang Man Hei Jeffrey

Mr Chang Man Hei Jeffrey - Commentor and Representor's
Representative

R87 – Ma On Shan Transportation Group

Mr Wong Ho Lim - Representor's Representative

R88/C13 – 基督教香港信義會恩青營(鞍山探索館) (Evangelical Lutheran
Christian Hong Kong (ELCHK) Grace Youth Camp)

Mr Fan Man Tao] Representor's Representatives

Ms Chan Yee Ting]

R93/C15 – Roger Anthony Nissim

R1557 – Ronald Duxbury Taylor

R1559 – Lam Yin Ling Priscilla

Mr Roger Anthony Nissim - Representor, Commenter and
Representers' Representative

28. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives and the consultants, representors, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representors, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R57 – Li Wing Shing

29. Mr Li Wing Shing made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of STDC and his constituency was Wu Kai Sha. He had received a substantial number of objections from local residents opposing the proposed large-scale housing developments in the area without addressing the problems of traffic congestion and the lack of supporting transport infrastructures. They did not object to building more housing but they objected to the selected sites as they were not suitable for housing developments;
- (b) the recent increase in population in the newly completed housing developments in Wu Kai Sha and the rising number of visitors arising from opening of the MTR Tuen Ma Line (TML) had caused adverse impacts on traffic, environment and supporting facilities in the area. Currently, they needed one to two hours to commute to the urban area as Tolo Highway was always highly congested. The traffic congestion problem would further aggravate in view of the future comprehensive development in Shap Sze Heung and the proposed housing developments on the amendment sites (the Sites) which would have an expected total population of about 20,000;
- (c) he had submitted a petition letter to the Director of Planning and a motion

objecting to Items C to G had been passed by the Development and Housing Committee (DHC) of STDC;

- (d) Shatin was becoming less liveable in view of the recent infill housing developments in the area. The proposed rezoning of “GB” area near Yiu On Estate and Kam Ying Court would involve clearing of wooded area. There was a concern that more and more “GB” areas at the periphery of country parks would be rezoned for housing developments, which would lead to large-scale tree felling and adversely affect the ecological resources;
- (e) some 3,500 trees of more than 100 species would be affected; and
- (f) the MOST was very close to the country park and the villagers there objected to the amendment items (the Items) with the concern that the proposed housing development would wipe out the mining settlements and the heritage of the Mine. Some villagers had lived there since the 1950s and many of their later generations were still living in MOST.

R58/C9 – Yung Ming Chau

30. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yung Ming Chau made the following main points:

- (a) he did not object to building more public housing, but Sites C, D, E, F and G, which fell within his District Council constituency of Tai Shui Hang, were not suitable for rezoning for housing developments and their supporting facilities as they were too close to the country park;

Traffic Issues

- (b) although MOST Road would be upgraded to support the proposed public housing and private housing developments, the traffic flow to be generated by those new developments would further aggravate the traffic problem in the area. Currently, traffic congestion was particularly severe during peak hours

along MOS Bypass heading for Kowloon (via Tate's Cairn Highway and A Kung Kok). The traffic capacity of Shek Mun Roundabout was nearly saturated during the morning peak hours causing a tailback to Yan On Estate. The traffic flow caused by the newly completed housing developments at Pak Shek Kok had also worsened the traffic at Chak Cheung Street Roundabout. The proposed school development at Site E which was not accessible by rail would also increase the traffic flow at Hang Hong Street Roundabout. There were a lot of inaccuracies in the TIA;

Site Selection

- (c) as the proposed housing development at Site D on MOST Road was located at a high site level, Sites C and F were required to be rezoned for providing a fresh water and salt water pumping station as well as fresh water and salt water respectively to support the developments. The construction of other supporting gas or electricity infrastructures might cause nuisance to the villagers and the surrounding environment;
- (d) there was a lack of healthcare and community facilities in MOS area. The condition would worsen in view of the completion of Kam Chun Court, Phase II of Yan On Estate and the comprehensive development at Shap Sze Heung;
- (e) many landslides had happened in the Sites, including five landslides at Sites A and B1, 70 landslides at Sites C, D and E, as well as 27 landslides at Sites F and G. Slope stability works would be required for the proposed housing developments at these sites and future slope maintenance costs would be borne by the future owners;
- (f) the MOS Bypass currently functioned as a barrier preventing the sprawl of urban development to the "GB" area adjacent to the country park. The proposed developments and associated infrastructure would result in spreading the development footprint over the MOS Bypass into the "GB" areas;

Conservation and Environmental Issues

- (g) the Sites were so close to and might be considered as infringing into the country park. Flora species of conservation interest had been identified within the works limit of the proposed developments. According to the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA), part of the works limit of Sites A and B1 and the associated infrastructure and upgrading works of MOST Road (i.e. to the north of Site G) were woodlands of 'moderate' ecological value, while part of the works limit of Sites D and F were woodland of 'moderate to high' ecological value. However, the impact of the proposed developments on the flora species of conservation interest and the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measures were unknown at the current stage as detailed vegetation survey would only be conducted at the detailed design stage;
- (h) the proposed housing developments would have adverse visual impacts on the country park and were incompatible with the surrounding environment. The proposed housing developments at Site D (with a proposed BH of 225mPD) and Site G (with a proposed BH of 250mPD) were only 35m and not more than 10m from the country park respectively and would block the 240 ML Portal;
- (i) no detailed geotechnical investigations had been conducted for the Sites, and reference was only made to the findings of previous studies in ascertaining the geotechnical feasibility aspect;
- (j) a number of graded historic buildings/structures associated with the former Mine were found along MOST Road. The existing village community at Site G possessed unique culture and character of a mining settlement in Hong Kong. The proposed developments would destroy the existing mining settlement and the associated heritage; and

Alternative Site

- (k) the site zoned "GB" adjacent to Kam Chun Court with a site area of about

7.9ha (as shown on Plan H-7 of the Paper) was a better alternative site for public housing development. While CEDD considered that the site might be constrained by steep topography, there were successful cases on building on sloping site such as Shui Chuen O Estate. The said site was further away from the country park and would be served by the existing road. The temporary works site of Sha Tin Cavern Sewage Treatment Works (STCSTW) in Area 73 was considered a suitable site for the proposed primary school and the potential noise impact could be mitigated by proper building design.

R3541 – Mah Hok Yin

R64/C8 – Chan Pui Ming

31. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Pui Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of STDC and had been living in MOS for a long time;

Technical Difficulties

- (b) MOS New Town was mainly developed along the waterfront and the hillslopes of MOS had been saved from developments in the past due to its steep terrain and location on the Strategic Cavern Area (SCVA) No. 19. The northern boundary of the SCVA was defined by a geological fault line, the eastern boundary by MOS Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), the western boundary by MOS Road and MOS Bypass, and the southern boundary by private lots and a geological fault line. Sites C, D, E, F and G were situated on the SCVA. Sites C, D and E were very close to the fault lines. Detailed geotechnical investigations had not been conducted for the Sites which might not be suitable for housing development in view of the landslides previously recorded. There was also a high pressure gas pipeline close to Sites B1 and D. However, no risk assessment had been conducted to evaluate the potential risk;

Environmental Impacts

- (c) the Sites were currently densely vegetated and in the core of the “GB” areas. The woodland in the “GB” areas was an integral part of the country park environment. Large-scale developments would have adverse impact on the ecology and animal habitats. However, the ecological baseline survey conducted was not comprehensive as it had only covered the summer and winter seasons, instead of a four-season survey, and might have underestimated the ecological value in the area. Some important fauna and flora species were identified on the Sites such as Crested Serpent Eagle (蛇鵟), Lesser Spiny Frog (小棘蛙), Hong Kong Azalea (香港杜鵑) and Incense Tree (土沉香). Mitigation measures such as creating wildlife crossings were proposed to help conserve the habitats, but no details were provided and the effectiveness of the measures was questionable;
- (d) some of the residential units of the proposed housing development at Site D would be subject to excessive traffic noise even after the implementation of noise mitigation measures such as the installation of acoustic windows. It was also doubtful how the future traffic and construction impacts on the existing housing developments such as Kam Ying Court could be mitigated;
- (e) by showing a photomontage viewing from CUHK, it was noted that the proposed developments at Sites D and G with a maximum BH restrictions (BHRs) of 225mPD and 250mPD respectively would result in sore-thumb developments and were not in line with the stepped BH profile of MOS with a maximum BH of about 150mPD for the existing developments such as Kam Ying Court in the vicinity;
- (f) there was a wind corridor along the drainage reserve area (traversing Sites F and G) which facilitated the penetration of wind from the uphill of MOS towards Tolo Harbour. The wind environment of the area had already been affected by the newly completed public housing development of Kam Fai Court located along this wind corridor. Sites G and F located along this wind

corridor were not suitable for development. The proposed development at Site G with a BH of 250mPD would affect the air ventilation on Heng On Estate and Yan On Estate;

Conservation of Historic Heritage

- (g) some of the historic structures, such as the piers of the Mineral Preparation Plant, were not graded by the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB), as they were not included in the assessment of Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO). The conservation of heritage should not solely rely on the AMO's grading system. Without a proper assessment on the historic structures at Mine, it would be imprudent to rezone the Sites for development. There were many overseas examples of revitalised mining areas, such as Sovereign Hill in Australia. The Mine was even more unique as people relating to the mining heritage were still living in MOST. The villagers should be allowed to continue to live there and preserve it;

Lack of Community Facilities

- (h) the population of MOS was about 270,000. While there was a shortage of the provision of GIC facilities (such as health centre/ clinic) according to the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) in MOS and Sha Tin areas, some planned GIC facilities had not been built even though sites had been reserved for many years. The situation would worsen in view of the increasing population in proposed housing developments;

Traffic and Transportation

- (i) the external traffic connections to MOS were mainly via A Kung Kok Street and MOS Road. The findings of the TIA of the EFS were questionable. The study on Relocation of Sha Tin Sewage Treatment Works to Caverns indicated that the volume/capacity (v/c) ratio of A Kung Kok Street southbound was 1.18 while the TIA of the EFS indicated that the v/c ratio of

A Kung Kok Street (southbound/northbound) was 0.88 only as it had averaged the southbound (1.18) and northbound (0.58) v/c ratios. The implementation of planned infrastructure projects such as the construction of Trunk Road T4 lagged behind the proposed housing developments in the area. Despite the opening of the MTR TML, railway service could not fully replace road transport nor alleviate the traffic congestion situation, as many of the residential estates in MOS were far from the railway stations. The Government had built elevated walkways and lift towers for housing developments at uphill locations such as Choi Tak Estate and Shui Chuen O Estate to connect the residents to the downhill areas. However, no such facilities were proposed for the future housing developments at the Sites in the uphill area and the transport connection with only one access road would be problematic.

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined the meeting at this point.]

R71/C7 – Chung Lai Him

32. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chung Lai Him made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of STDC and his constituency was MOS Town Centre;
- (b) he played the audio recordings of a number of MOS residents expressing their concerns that the proposed housing developments would adversely affect the traffic conditions and environment in the area and expressing the views that the existing sewage treatment works site would be more suitable for residential development after the relocation of the sewage treatment works;
- (c) the population of MOS was about 210,000. The proposed rezoning of the Sites together with the completion of Kam Chun Court and the Shap Sze Heung comprehensive development would increase the population by about 40,000. There was an existing shortage of GIC facilities in the area such as general out-patient clinic. It would also be difficult for the future residents of

the proposed housing developments at the uphill area to access to the retail facilities in the town centre, with the nearest one at Heng On Estate; and

- (d) the Sites were too close to the country park and he queried why the Country and Marine Parks Board was not consulted on the proposed amendments to the OZP.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R72/C10 – Ng Kam Hung

33. Mr Ng Kam Hung made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of STDC and he was a Geopark guide for AFCD;
- (b) about 30% of the population of Sha Tin resided in MOS. Most of the new developments in Sha Tin District were located in MOS area, which would further aggravate the traffic congestion in the area and the existing road network could not support more housing;
- (c) MOST possessed the unique culture and character of a mining settlement and had intangible historic value. Many villagers were descendants of miners who came from different provinces of the Mainland. The clearance of the old mining settlements would lead to destruction of the community and would be a great loss in human history;
- (d) the “GB” areas and the country park formed an important ecosystem supporting a variety of precious fauna species such as Red Muntjac (赤麂). The proposed housing developments would destroy the ecosystem and habitats of the animals;
- (e) a grave in the downhill with a history of 134 years was found which showed that there were people living in MOS for more than 100 years;

- (f) the proposed developments would ruin the efforts of ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) in revitalising the industrial, mining village and religious heritage as well as the natural values of the Mine and MOST;
- (g) the proposed developments would have adverse impact on the setting of the 110ML and 240ML Portals, which had become popular local attractions to both local and foreign visitors;
- (h) MOST had demonstrated an integral mining history in Hong Kong and some of the historic structures within the area had not been assessed by AMO for their historical value. The proposed improvement works for MOST Road would have a direct impact on a pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant. In fact, part of the history of the Mine had already been lost due to the development of Heng On Estate and Yiu On Estate;
- (i) MOS was an important part of Hong Kong UNESCO Global Geopark due to the magnetite mine in the area, which could be an important attraction for green tourism; and
- (j) for the above reasons, he objected to the amendments on the OZP.

R73 – Tam Yi Pui

R2663 – Siu Chi Hang Domingo

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tam Yi Pui made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of Tai Po District Council and his constituency was Sai Kung North. Sites A, B1 and B2 fell within his constituency;
- (b) the planning intention of “GB” zone was 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 existing developments were mainly confined to the west of MOS Bypass;

- (c) Cheung Muk Tau Village would be enclosed by and severely affected by the four towers of the proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1;
- (d) Sites A, B1 and B2, which were densely vegetated and linked to the country park and had conservation value, were not suitable for developments;
- (e) there was a lack of recreational facilities in the area. The proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1 had affected the proposal of providing a sitting-out area near Cheung Muk Tau Village;
- (f) it was expected that the population in MOS would be increased by about 60,000 taking into account the Shap Sze Heung comprehensive development. The increased population would lead to a surge of traffic flow to the Sai O Roundabout and result in traffic congestion during peak hours;
- (g) despite the increase in traffic flow, there were no improvement measures to the existing roads such as pedestrian crossing facilities at Nin Fung Road; and
- (h) other reasons of objection included worsening traffic congestion in New Territories East, destroying nearby landscape, affecting the nearby permitted Burial Ground of indigenous villagers and inadequate healthcare services support within the region. Due to environmental, traffic and cultural reasons, he also opposed Items C, D, E, F and G.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R79 – Owners' Corporation of Symphony Bay

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr Wong Cheuk Ki, the representer's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) 243 responses from the residents of Symphony Bay were received in a survey conducted in June 2020 and the results showed that the vast majority (236 or 97%) strongly opposed Items A and B1. In December 2020, the owners'

corporation collected another 785 signatures from residents of Symphony Bay strongly opposing to the Items. As a responsible government, the relevant departments and the Board needed to listen carefully to and properly handle the objection of the local residents;

- (b) the Government should not ignore the established guidelines and criteria when identifying new sites for public housing developments. According to the Town Planning Board Guidelines for Application for Development within “Green Belt” Zone (TPB PG-No. 10), two of the main planning criteria were that the scale and intensity of the proposed development including the plot ratio (PR), site coverage and BH should be compatible with the character of surrounding areas and the design and layout of any proposed development should be compatible with the surrounding area without involving extensive clearance of existing natural vegetation, affecting the existing natural landscape, or causing any adverse visual impact on the surrounding environment;
- (c) it was stated in the Urban Design Guidelines that the general principle for development in urban fringe area was to respect the natural environment and to provide visual and physical linkages between urban and rural areas, which should promote the psychological well-being of the residents. It was also stated that BH should be harmonised with the rural setting and existing developments in rural areas;
- (d) the Secretary for Development also mentioned in a written reply to Legislative Council (LegCo) in 2018 that in proposing rezoning of “GB” sites, the government would, according to the established mechanism and criteria, assess a host of factors, including transport and infrastructure capacities, provision of community facilities, development constraints, potential impacts on the local environment, visual and air ventilation impacts, etc. to ensure that there would not be insurmountable impact on the local community;
- (e) contrary to the above, it was obvious that the proposed developments would lead to substantial tree felling and were not compatible with the surroundings.

The visual assessments also indicated that the overall visual impacts of the proposed developments were considered as “moderately adverse”;

- (f) the Sites were located in “GB” areas and felling of a large number of trees would cause irreversible damage and disaster to the ecological environment. The construction of four 45-storey public housing developments at Sites A and B1 in the densely vegetated area was incompatible with the surrounding environment and would become another bad example of sore thumb developments;
- (g) there would be serious traffic congestion and more traffic accidents in view of the proposed housing developments and the future developments along Sai Sha Road. According to the PTTIA, it was estimated that the traffic flow in 2035 would be increased by tenfold as compared with the scenario of without the proposed housing developments; and
- (h) the rezoning of the Sites was not acceptable, and it would seriously affect both the existing and future residents. The Government needed to resolve the above issues before implementing the proposed housing developments.

R80 – 帝琴灣凱琴居民綠化關注組

R2806 – Wan Kang Sun

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wan Kang Sun, made the following main points:

- (a) they supported the Government's efforts to find more land to build public housing to meet the needs of the society. However, they objected to the proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1 as they would generate unacceptable impacts and become a bad precedent for urban development;
- (b) the proposed buildings at Sites A and B1 would form a barrier blocking air circulation, natural sunlight, and ridgelines and would have adverse impacts on the mental health of existing residents. There would be a total of 3,480

units with a population of about 9,750 people, which would cause a lot of noise nuisance, visual impact and large amount of carbon emissions in the long-term. That would affect the natural environment of MOS, the habitats of animals in the “GB” area and the health of MOS residents;

- (c) Site A and B1 were densely vegetated and supporting a large number of animals with conservation value. The proposed housing developments would also result in the felling of about 1,450 trees, including some mature trees and precious species. The “GB” areas had been protected by relevant laws and regulations;
- (d) according to the Government’s planning principles, high density developments were planned within the MOS town centre and the fringe area of MOS were mainly low density developments, such as Symphony Bay and Cheung Muk Tau Village. The rezoning of Sites A and B1 for high density developments at PR of more than 6 was highly incompatible in the local context, and it did not follow the basic principles laid down in government’s planning documents, which would set an undesirable precedent. The rezoning was not compatible with the surrounding developments and would affect the buffer function of the “GB” area, which were rejection reasons for previous planning applications in the area. The proposed developments would overtax the existing traffic condition and environment in the area, and seriously harm the interests of the general public; and
- (e) he had conducted a survey with some hikers in his personal capacity and most of the surveyed objected to the amendments, and considered that the “GB” area should be kept as a buffer area to the country park.

R81 – Hau Lap Fai

37. Mr Hau Lap Fai made the following main points:

- (a) he was the village representative of Cheung Muk Tau Village and he and a few generations of his family had been living there;

- (b) the Government had an obligation to conserve the old and big trees near Cheung Muk Tau Village, which provided a habitat for different and precious animal species; and
- (c) they were worried about the impacts of the proposed housing developments at Site A and B1 on the existing graves and the permitted Burial Ground of indigenous villagers.

R83 - Cheung Muk Tau Village Affairs Committee

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Liu Ghung Ming, made the following main points:

- (a) the reasons for objection were that the rezoning would replace the tranquil “GB” area with high-rise housing developments which would further spoil the local green environment and ruin the village heritage;
- (b) their ancestors had been living harmoniously with nature in the foothills of MOS for more than three centuries. Since the 1960s, the tranquil and rural character of the local environment had succumbed to urbanisation. The villagers had accepted the change for the benefit of the wider community but had been suffering from the impacts of adjacent developments. Cheung Muk Tau Village was surrounded by the natural landscape, fauna, and tranquillity to the south, which had preserved the rural character. The sublime mountain vista could still be enjoyed by residents and passers-by with the magnificent backdrop of Ngau Ngak Shan peak and its ridgeline. The dramatic view and the environment had so far been protected by the “GB” zoning under the OZP with the planning intention to contain urban sprawl and to provide a buffer between the developments in MOS and the adjacent MOSCP;
- (c) the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 would destroy the remaining connection between Cheung Muk Tau Village and the natural rural environment and the tranquil character to the south; totally enclose Cheung Muk Tau Village with buildings and destroy the village setting; and impose

further adverse impacts on the village. It would completely go against the long established and effective planning guidelines for “GB” areas and obstruct peoples’ window to nature. The tall tower blocks would have significant adverse visual intrusion/obstruction impacts and would ruin the beautiful mountain views of Ngau Ngak Shan;

- (d) Site A was within an area where indigenous villagers had buried their ancestors and development at Site A would block the access from Cheung Muk Tau Village to the Burial Ground. The ancestral graves were sacred totems which served to unite many generations of descendants who were scattered around the world. The northerly vista of the burial ground facing Tolo Harbour was disrupted by Symphony Bay and Site A would further disrupt the easterly/southerly vistas of Cheung Muk Tau Village;
- (e) Site A and the road extension would take over an orchard of fruit trees cultivated by the villagers. The area was first granted to the villagers in the 1960s, and was previously used for rice cultivation. It was turned into an orchard in the early 1990s;
- (f) three ‘fung shui dei’ (風水地) sites on the knoll overlooking the village belonged to the families of Cheung Muk Tau and Sai O villages. The alignment of Nin Fung Road extension through the knoll would impact these fung shui sites and the villagers’ customs and traditions;
- (g) Site B1 and the new road would encroach into wetland / marshland area west of Cheung Muk Tau, which was the last remnant of former rice cultivation activities. A major portion of the wetland (former paddy fields) would be lost which would further erode their village heritage. Previous planning applications to build medium-rise and town houses on that site were rejected by the TPB in the 1990s in order to protect the “GB” area;
- (h) Site B1 was currently a densely wooded area with a large portion of it occupied by a stand of Pine trees. It was a remnant of much larger Pine tree groups planted in the 1960s around the village to mitigate adverse feng shui and

landscape impacts from major quarry works (for Plover Cove Reservoir and harbour reclamation). It became a popular woodland setting during the 1980s and 1990s for TV and film productions, which was supported by services provided by the villagers;

- (i) the developments at Site A and Site B1 would permanently ruin the local environment and character of the “GB” area. The remaining vestiges of their village heritage would be lost. Using valuable “GB” area for high-density residential developments would have undesirable long term consequences on Hong Kong’s ‘liveability’ and encourage more rezoning of the remaining “GB” area between Sites A and B1 for later expansion of the housing developments. The time frame of 2030/2031 for the completion of Site A and B1 appeared to be no earlier than the latest development programme for the other planned New Development Areas (NDAs) and the Government should focus on the efforts to implement the NDAs.

[Professor John C.Y. Ng and Dr Frankie W.S. Yeung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R85 - 守護馬鞍山智庫

C1544 - Chang Man Hei Jeffrey

39. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chang Man Hei Jeffrey, made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed traffic improvement measures for the proposed developments under the zoning amendments were unable to address the fundamental traffic problems of MOS. Currently, the most congested areas were near Tai Shui Hang and Tate’s Cairn Highway. The planned road improvement works such as the new Trunk Road T4 and widening of Tate’s Cairn Highway, Sha Tin Road and Lion Rock Tunnel were insufficient and could not address the traffic problems timely. There would still be bottlenecks at the tunnel portal areas;

- (b) public transport services were not sufficient to support the proposed developments, as bus services had been cut after the opening of MTR TML and the carrying capacity of MTR East Rail Line (ERL) was reduced due to the use of nine carriage trains;
- (c) the proposed developments would have impact on the micro-climate in the area (including the country park and SSSI). For example, the use of air-conditioners by future residents of the proposed housing developments would result in higher temperature in the local area and hence affect the survival of wild animals and plants. According to PlanD's Urban Climatic Map, Sites C to G fell within Urban Climatic Planning Zone (UPCZ) 2 area which covered mostly urban fringe areas or rural lowland and it was important to maintain the climatic characteristics. While individual new low-density developments could be allowed, high-density developments should be discouraged at such locations;
- (d) the proposed developments would ruin the integrity and history of the Mine. The Government should consider promoting the Mine and revitalising it into a local tourist spot similar to the good example set in revitalising Yim Tin Tsai;
- (e) as landslides had occurred in Sites D and E, there was concern on slope stability during the construction stage, in particular the impact on the village settlements; and
- (f) the proposed school at the uphill area was not convenient to students who might take the existing shuttle buses to MOST, hence affecting the availability and capacity of services to MOST villagers.

R87 - Ma On Shan Transportation Group

40. Mr Wong Ho Lim made the following main points:

- (a) 99% of the representations objected to the proposed amendments;

- (b) the traffic capacity of Shek Mun Roundabout and Tate's Cairn Highway was nearly saturated during the morning peak hours causing a tailback to MOS Bypass and A Kung Kok Street;
- (c) regarding public transport, the problem of over-capacity of MTR ERL and TML had been neglected. It would be aggravated by proposed housing and other developments in New Territories North, as well as the increase in passengers upon future extension of these railway lines and the change from 12 to nine carriages for ERL. Despite the opening of the TML, railway service could not fully replace road transport and alleviate the traffic congestion, as many of the residential estates in MOS were not close to railway stations;
- (d) the proposed traffic improvement measures could not address the traffic problems of MOS. The proposed mitigation measure of converting the existing Chak Cheung Street/Science Park Road roundabout junction to a signalized-controlled junction would lead to traffic congestion at Chak Cheung Street and the nearby road which were frequently used by the MOS residents. The increase in population along MOST Road would also increase the traffic at Heng Hong Street Roundabout. However, major road improvement works planned such as Trunk Road T4 and widening of Tate's Cairn Highway could not address the traffic problems timely;
- (e) it was questionable whether MOST Road could cope with the traffic flow generated by the proposed housing and school developments along the road; and
- (f) the road traffic problems and public transport needs of the existing residents should be properly addressed before considering any new developments.

R88/C13 - 基督教香港信義會恩青營(鞍山探索館) ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp)

41. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Fan Man Tao, made the following main points:

- (a) they objected to Items C to G;
- (b) ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) was previously the Lutheran Yan Kwong Church, which was the first cathedral built in the village by ELCHK in 1950 as a place of worship, together with the provision of education, relief assistance, medical service, daily assistance and community service to the villagers. They revitalised it in 2015 with an aim to promote the industrial/mining village and religious heritage as well as the natural values of MOS;
- (c) the history of the Mine was more than 100 years. In the 1950s and 1960s, it was the only iron ore mine in Southeast Asia. MOST had a historical connection with the Mine and the mining settlement;
- (d) in 2017, they made a submission to AAB proposing that more than 30 structures in the mine should be assessed as Grade 2 and Grade 3 historic buildings. However, due to the large area of the mine, many potential monuments and historic structures were still subject to study and assessment. While the proposed developments under the zoning amendments and their associated infrastructure and facilities would not encroach onto any historic buildings/structures that were already graded, those historic buildings/structures which were yet to be assessed might be affected by the proposed developments, such as the miners' lavatory, water tank used in the mining activities, and catchwaters in the mine;
- (e) the proposed developments would destroy the integrity of Mine, which signified Hong Kong's iron ore industrial heritage. According to the Joint International Council on Monuments and Sites – the International Committee for the Conservation of the Industrial Heritage Principles for the Conservation of Industrial Heritage Sites, Structures, Areas and Landscapes (also called “The Dublin Principles”), industrial heritage reflected the profound connection between the cultural and natural environment and included both material assets and intangible dimensions that shaped the life of communities and brought major organisational changes to entire societies and the world in general;

- (f) the preservation works should cover the whole mining settlement which was identified as four areas, namely Peak District, Ma On Bridge District, Mid-level District and Shun Yee San Tsuen District, and would be affected by Items C, D, E, F and G. The rezoning would damage the integrity of the whole mining settlement and the potential historic buildings/structures. Sites D and E were too close to Shun Yee San Tsuen and some graded historic buildings. Without a comprehensive heritage conservation plan, the proposed developments at Site D and E might affect those graded historic buildings. Site G was the only settlement of Chiu Chow miners in Hong Kong which possessed unique culture and character of a mining settlement and was of intangible cultural heritage value. The proposed housing development at Site G with a BHR of 250mPD was blatantly incompatible with the surroundings;
- (g) there was a large number of tangible and intangible cultural heritage items within the Sites which showed the only iron mining history in Hong Kong. Any damage to these heritage items would cause irreversible harm to the cultural and historical inheritance of Hong Kong. The MOST area, including the Sites, provided the Hong Kong people with unique historical and cultural education. Housing developments should be considered in other sites and the Board should strike a balance between development and conservation; and
- (h) he played a video showing the views of MOST villagers who had been living there for decades.

R93/C15 - Roger Anthony Nissim

R1557 - Ronald Duxbury Taylor

R1559 - Lam Yin Ling Priscilla

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Roger Anthony Nissim made the following main points:

- (a) he moved into Wu Kai Sha five years ago. He was a passionate hiker and often hiked up MOS;

- (b) the tallest buildings in MOS should be in the more central area near Lake Silver and BHs should descend towards the outer areas;
- (c) Items A and B1 were mainly to rezone a total of 2.84 ha of “GB” and for 3,480 public housing units. It relied on the 2012 policy of rezoning government land which had proved an ineffective tool for increasing land supply. In 2018, the Task Force on Land Supply (TFLS) did not recommend rezoning of individual sites, but instead recommended implementation of the NDAs by large scale land resumption. Since 2019, the Government had commenced large scale land resumption to ensure timely delivery of planned public housing units;
- (d) the strategy of rezoning individual sites was proved to be ineffective. The Secretary for Development (SDEV) advised LegCo in a written reply on 12.12.2018 that in the five years up to 2018, the Government had rezoned only 37.75 ha of “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”), “GB” and “Open Space” land plus 27 ha of residential land for public housing developments. Such level of land supply was clearly inadequate to meet the growing demand for public housing units, and the proposed rezoning of Sites A and B1 (2.84 ha) would have negligible impact on increasing housing land supply;
- (e) the Government had focused on development of NDAs since 2019. It was stated in the 2019 Policy Address that the Government was committed to implementing all the NDAs. In the 2020 Policy Address, it was stated that 330 ha of land had been identified for producing 316,000 public housing units in the coming 10-year period with 101,300 units in the first five years. The rezoning of Sites A and B1 (involving 3,480 public housing units) could not be made ready within five years;
- (f) in SDEV’s written reply to LegCo on 24.3.2021, it was stated that the Government had resumed about 90 ha of land (including about 80 ha of land for NDAs and public housing development) in 2019-2020 and 2020-2021. Looking ahead, about 700 ha of land (including more than 600 ha of land for

NDAs and public housing development) would be resumed from 2021-22, of which about 500 ha of land (including about 400 ha for NDAs and public housing development) were expected to be resumed in the next five years (i.e. from 2021/22 to 2025/26). The land supply for public housing developments was plentiful. In addition, 160 ha of brownfield sites were also identified for public housing developments. Brownfield sites should be developed rather than damaging “GB” areas;

- (g) in SDEV’s written reply to LegCo on 2.6.2021, it was stated that the TFLS recommended, and the Government accepted, that development on the periphery of country parks should not be included as an option for priority studies in 2018. The TFLS found, after extensive consultation, that this option failed to garner support from the general public. SDEV had reaffirmed such a government policy. However, all the Sites were clearly within the periphery of MOSCP and had also drawn significant public objections. Following the same principle, the rezoning of the Sites that were in the periphery of the MOSCP should not proceed further;
- (h) Items A and B1 amounted to only 2.84 ha of land when compared with the 330 ha of land that the Government was actively implementing in the NDAs for timely and properly planned public housing production. In the light of that and the re-affirmed policy just announced by SDEV of not developing the periphery of country parks, there was clearly no need to destroy any of the local pristine countryside in order to produce such a small area of land for public housing developments; and
- (i) the Board should note that there were also unanimous objections to the amendments which should not be agreed.

43. On behalf of R1557, Mr Nissim made the following main points:

- (a) Mr Taylor was a hiker and was an engineer by profession;
- (b) although the EFS indicated that no insurmountable technical problem and

unacceptable impacts would be caused by the proposed public housing developments, there was no indication of the mitigation measures to address the concerns raised by the representers and it was considered that engineering feasibility of the Sites had not been truly confirmed;

- (c) the widening of MOST Road would involve much more land take as it involved land with big difference in site levels and would require extensive embankments and retaining walls. It was impossible to have MOST Road upgraded with an improved gradient of 7.5% to 10% as the average gradient of the existing slopes was about 11% (rising from 150m over 1.35km). As such, the improved MOST Road would fail to meet the road gradient standard of the Highways Department. However, the details of the road works were not available at the current stage and would be approved under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance and would not be further considered by the Board. The Board should defer making a decision on the zoning amendments and request for more information from the Government; and
- (d) it was questionable how the access to MOST would be maintained during the construction of MOST Road.

44. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representers, commenters and their 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, commenters, their 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.

Heritage Aspect

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

- (a) whether R52's proposal to rezone Site E and its surrounding heritage structures as "OU (School cum Conservation Areas)" would be considered by PlanD;

- (b) how Sites E and G were related to the heritage feature of the Mine; and
- (c) whether the amendments would cause irreversible impacts on the heritage elements as claimed by some representers.

46. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, made the following responses:

- (a) according to the general practice of the Education Bureau (EDB), the school design would be drawn up in consultation with the school sponsoring body in the future design stage to suit the school's operation needs as far as practicable. Whether a heritage concept would be adopted in the school design to take into account the heritage structures in the vicinity was subject to the acceptance of the school sponsoring body and the overall design consideration of the school. If the Board considered that heritage-related features should be factored into the future school design, PlanD could convey such intention to EDB for consideration. Heritage-related features could also be considered by HD in the design of the proposed public housing development at Site D making reference to the case of On Tai Estate at Anderson Road. That said, given the focus of the rezoning amendment on land use, it was not appropriate or necessary to mandate these design aspects by way of further zoning amendment;
- (b) Site E was about 60m from the 110ML Portal. Site G, at the upper part of MOST Road, was on government land and was dotted with about 49 temporary structures/buildings including some licensed squatters. From the 110ML portal, there was a tunnel of about 2.2km long which was connected to the 240ML portal in the uphill area. The uphill area of the Mine originally operated as an open cut mine, until changed to underground mining entirely by 1959. Extract of iron ore at underground levels by excavation took place near the 240ML portal area. The iron ores were transported through a tunnel to the 110ML portal area for further selection at the Mineral Preparation Plant and then transported away by boats. The tunnel would not traverse Site G (about 1200m from the 240ML portal). There was no graded structure within Site G; and

- (c) according to the baseline study on heritage impacts, the majority of the graded heritage resources, which were all on government land, had been excluded from the Sites and would not be affected. A pier (being part of the Mineral Preparation Plant) might be affected by the proposed upgrading of MOST Road but efforts would be made to minimise the adverse impacts as far as possible. In consultation with AMO, CEDD would conduct a comprehensive heritage impact assessment at the subsequent investigation and design stages.

47. In response to a Member's question on the relationship between the Chiu Chow Village and the mine heritage, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that according to the representers, Site G was the Chiu Chow settlement who were also descendants of the miners. Mr Fan Man Tao, the representative of R88/C13, supplemented that in the 1940s/1950s, the early miners congregated in villages in different parts of the Mine, and the Chiu Chow Village was one of those. The Chiu Chow Village at Site G needed to be preserved, otherwise, the iron mine heritage would be incomplete. The houses in Chiu Chow Village were built by villagers themselves in the early years and should not be just regarded as squatter structures.

48. A Member asked the representatives of ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) (R88/C13) to explain which features they considered to have heritage value and how those would be affected by the Sites. Mr Fan Man Tao, the representative of R88/C13, said that the Mine should be preserved as an integrated whole rather than preserving the individual features/structures. Ms Chan Yee Ting, another representative of R88/C13, said that initially it appeared that the MOST Road would affect the pier of Mineral Preparation Plant and Site G would affect some parts of catchwaters that they had recently identified. They would supplement the locations of those heritage features at the meeting in the following day.

49. Noting that some historic buildings/structures had not been assessed for their historic value, a Member asked the representative of ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) (R88/C13) how those buildings/structures could be preserved. Mr Fan responded that in the proposal submitted to AAB for grading the historic buildings/structures in the Mine in 2017, it was proposed that part of the 110ML and 240ML Portals could be used for exhibition of the history of the Mine. The Mine, being the only iron mine in Hong Kong's history, should be preserved by the Government. There were successful heritage preservation cases of similar facilities in

Japan and Taiwan. The Chairperson said that apart from having an established scheme focusing on preservation of graded heritage, the Government had in recent years established a dedicated fund of \$1 billion for encouraging gainful use of vacant government land, including vacant built premises thereon, by NGOs.

50. A Member asked the number of residents living in MOST who were also the descendants of the miners. Mr Fan indicated that more than half of the residents were the descendants of miners.

Environmental and Ecological Aspects

51. Two Members asked how the ecological survey was conducted and specifically asked whether it was acceptable that the ecological survey was completed within one day and only covered areas near the development footprint. Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that two ecological surveys which covered a dry season and a wet season were conducted under the EFS and the EcoIA covered areas within 500m from the works limit. The Chairperson also asked whether the study area needed to extend beyond 500m on the ground that the Sites were close to the country park, as asserted by some of the representers. In response, Ms C.Y. Ho, SNC/S, AFCD, supplemented that the methodology adopted in the ecological survey conducted for the proposed developments had largely followed the requirements of Technical Memorandum (TM) of Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO). To establish the baseline condition, the consultant was required to conduct a literature review covering the study area which was 500m from works limit. The purpose of the field survey was to fill the missing information gap and to identify the direct impacts of the proposed developments and it was generally acceptable for the field survey to focus on the development sites. It was noted that the survey transects had already covered areas that were accessible within the study area. It was not unreasonable to conduct field surveys on different faunal groups at the same time. When reviewing the ecological assessment, AFCD would also conduct on-site verification of the survey results submitted by the consultant.

52. Some Members asked the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed housing developments would lead to adverse glare and

noise impacts and affect any animal species with conservation interests;

- (b) the intent of the MOS SSSI;
- (c) whether there was any designated project requiring environmental permit under EIAO and how the public could be engaged to ensure the environmental performance of proposed developments during their implementation; and
- (d) whether the monitoring period of three years for the compensatory planting in the Preliminary Environmental Study (PES) report was adequate.

53. The government representatives made the following responses:

- (a) Ms C.Y. Ho, SNC/S, AFCD, said that the species of conservation interests mentioned by the representers were protected under the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance (Cap. 170) but they had a wide distribution and were common in Hong Kong. The EcoIA conducted by CEDD had already assessed these impacts;
- (b) Mr Eric Y.H Wong, SNC/C, AFCD said that the SSSI was primarily an administrative measure to designate sites with scientific importance, and that due consideration should be given to its conservation when developments at or close to those sites were proposed. The MOS SSSI, which fell within MOSCP, was recognized for its floristic interest of native Rhododendrons. The proposed housing developments and their associated infrastructure and facilities were at a distance from the SSSI, and hence they would not cause direct impact on the SSSI;
- (c) Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that EPD had advised that the proposed developments would unlikely constitute designated project(s) requiring environmental permit under EIAO. Having said that, technical assessments on environmental and ecological impacts had been conducted and mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure no insurmountable impacts; and

- (d) Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that, for the compensatory planting/transplanting works, a relatively long establishment period and maintenance period of 3 to 5 years would be provided in the works contract to allow time for the compensation trees to grow. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu further said that an independent environmental checking team would also be established by the future project proponents to ensure no insurmountable issue and AFCD would also be consulted on the compensatory planting proposal.

Traffic and Transportation

54. Some Members asked the following questions:

- (a) whether the implementation programme of the proposed traffic improvement measures could be advanced so as to improve the existing traffic problem in MOS area;
- (b) whether there were pedestrian facilities connecting Sites A and B1 to Wu Kai Sha Station; and
- (c) whether the Government would improve the Roundabout at Sai O in view of the increased traffic flow generated by the proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1.

55. The government representatives made the following responses:

- (a) Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that the proposed housing developments at Sites A and B1 and that at Site D were targeted to be completed in 2030/31 and 2032/33 respectively. The proposed traffic improvement measures would be implemented together with the proposed housing developments under the same project funding and would be completed before population intake of the housing projects. Separate funding approval would be required for implementing those traffic improvement measures in advance;

- (b) Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that the residents in Cheung Muk Tau Village and future residents in Sites A and B1 could access Wu Kai Sha Station by an existing subway across MOS Bypass near Cheung Muk Tau/footpath along Sai Sha Road/an existing footbridge across Sai Sha Road near the MTR Station which would take a 15-minute walk; and
- (c) Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that the approaching arm from Nin Fung Road to Sai Sha Road/ Nin Wah Road/ Nin Fung Road Roundabout would be widened to allow an exclusive lane for vehicles to access Sai Sha Road westbound without the need to enter the roundabout to cope with the traffic flow at the morning peak hours. It was considered that the capacity of the roundabout was adequate to cope with the forecasted traffic flow in the afternoon peak.

56. The Chairperson asked about the impact of upgrading MOST Road on the hikers. Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that the existing MOST Road (about 6m wide with substandard pavement) was proposed to be re-aligned and upgraded to a 7.3m to 7.9m wide single 2-lane carriageway with 2m to 2.75m wide footpath on both sides up to Site G to serve the proposed public housing development at Site D and private housing development at Site G. The upgraded road could allow for better, wider and safer access for hikers and visitors to the historic buildings uphill. Temporary pedestrian/vehicular access would be provided during the construction stage. Mr Roger Anthony Nissim, R93/C15, supplemented that cyclists currently also used MOST Road and their need should be taken into consideration.

Visual Impact

57. A Member asked whether there were photomontages showing the visual impact of the proposed housing development at Site G. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, with the aid of a flythrough animation video, indicated that the proposed housing development at Site G was generally in line with the stepped height concept of MOS New Town by keeping taller buildings on the hillside and lower buildings towards the waterfront.

58. A Member asked whether the photomontage of the proposed developments at Sites D and G viewing from Tolo Harbour, as shown by R64/C8, was an accurate presentation and

why the viewing point (VP) from Tolo Harbour was not adopted in assessing the visual impact of the proposed developments. Ms Chan Pui Ming, R64/C8, said the photo he used to prepare the photomontage of Sites D and G was taken from CUHK which was highly accessible to the public.

59. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that she could not ascertain the accuracy of the photomontage shown by R64/C8 and whether the VP taken was in line with the requirements as set out in the TPB PG-No. 41. With the aid of a photomontage from the Pak Shek Kok Promenade (in Annex IXb of TPB Paper No. 10746) towards the further southeast, she said that the proposed development at Site D would be substantially blocked by existing buildings nearer the waterfront. For Sites A and B1, VP2 (hikers from the south) and VP4 (road users of Sai Sha Road) (in Annex IXa of TPB Paper No. 10746) would experience a “slightly or moderately” adverse visual impact. She further supplemented that VPs under the visual assessments were selected taking into account criteria such as visual sensitivity, local significance and accessibility to the public, as well as other local and district planning considerations. CTP/UD&L of PlanD considered that the selection of VPs was generally in line with the requirements as set out in the TPB PG-No. 41 and the findings of the VIA were generally acceptable.

Site Selection

60. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed amendments complied with the criteria of “GB” Review;
- (b) the selection criteria and the site configuration of Site G; and
- (c) whether the amendment sites were on the periphery of the country park as claimed by the representers

61. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, made the following responses.

- (a) in order to build up land reserve to meet housing and other development needs, the Government had carried out the review of “GB” sites since 2012 in two

stages. In the first stage of “GB” review completed in 2012, PlanD mainly identified and reviewed areas zoned “GB” that were devegetated, deserted or formed. With the completion of the first stage of “GB” review, PlanD conducted the second stage of “GB” review which covered mostly those vegetated GB sites with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value and were adjacent to existing transport and infrastructure facilities. Under the second stage of “GB” review, seven sites in MOS New Town, which were close to existing transport node, partly formed/deserted and had lower buffer/conservation value, were identified for development of housing and the associated supporting GIC facilities. Sites A and B1 were adjacent to the existing private developments such as The Entrance with a PR of 3.6 and were within walking distance to Wu Kai Sha Station. Sites C to G could be accessed by MOST Road and were just about 180m to 500m away from the existing residential developments such as Kam Ying Court and Heng On Estate. The EFS with technical assessments on the potential traffic, infrastructural, environmental, ecological, landscape, heritage, geotechnical, drainage, sewerage, visual and air ventilation impacts etc. had been undertaken and had confirmed that no insurmountable problems were envisaged;

- (b) Site G was generally covered with disturbed vegetated areas and dotted with about 49 temporary structures/buildings. No trees with conservation importance were found in the site. The Tin Hau Temple was excluded from Site G. The site configuration had taken into account the constraints of topography. It was situated on relatively flat land along MOST Road and was about 13m away from the country park; and
- (c) sites on the periphery of the country park referred to by TFLS were those within the boundaries of country parks. The Sites were all outside the country park boundary, and Site A was 380m, Site B was 338m, Site C was 2m, Site D was 34m, Site E was 108m, Site F was right next to the country park and Site G was 13m approximately from the MOSCP boundary.

62. In response to the Chairperson’s question on the claim of R93/C15 that rezoning was ineffective in contributing to the overall housing land supply, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu,

DPO/STN, PlanD, said that in SDEV's opening remarks at LegCo's motion on "Increasing land supply on all fronts" on 9.6.2021, it was mentioned that of the 330 hectares of land for providing the planned 316,000 public housing units in the next ten years, 35% came from NDAs and large-scale development projects, and about 40% from rezoning of different sites for housing developments. Sites A and B1 were included in the new public housing units supply in the next ten years and would form an important part of the new public housing units supply in the respective year.

Geotechnical and Construction Aspects

63. Some Members asked the following questions:

- (a) the extent of the cut slopes for the proposed housing developments and road works;
- (b) whether additional "GB" area would be taken up for the road works in support of the proposed housing developments; and
- (c) the difficulty of upgrading MOST Road with a gradient of about 11%.

64. The government representatives made the following responses:

- (a) Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that the extent of slope works required further geological investigation and it would be minimised as far as practicable by suitable design. Retaining walls were required to maximize area available for housing development and the retaining walls would be within the development sites. Mitigation measures such as compensatory tree planting and climber planting on new man-made engineering slopes and retaining walls would be adopted;
- (b) Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that a total area of about 16.48 ha of "GB" zone would be affected by the amendments, amongst which 7.83 ha would be used for the proposed housing developments (Sites A, B1, D and G), 1.84 ha for the proposed GIC developments (Site C, E and F) and 6.8 ha

for road works. The area of the affected “GB” zones only accounted for 4.1% of the “GB” zones within MOS OZP Scheme Area or 0.1% of “GB” zones in the territory; and

- (c) Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that the upgrading works of MOST Road was challenging as it was constrained by the country park and sloping terrain. Generally, a gradient of not exceeding 10% could be achieved and the design of the upgrading works would be further developed in the detailed design stage by exploring the feasibility of different options including the construction of retaining walls. The upgraded MOST Road would largely follow the current road alignment so as to reduce the disturbance to the Mineral Preparation Plant. The road works would be gazetted under the Road (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370).

65. The Chairperson asked PlanD to clarify the reasons for including a large stretch of slope area in the lease plan in the case of Tai Wo Ping site as quoted by a representer (R48/C4). Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that the slope area that was shown as a green hatched black area on the lease plan of Tai Wo Ping site was an investigation area for the natural terrain study required under the lease and was not the works area. In response to the claim of Mr Nip Hin Ming (the representative of R44) that slope works in association with the proposed developments under the zoning amendments would be implemented within the surrounding slope area if terrain hazard was identified, Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, said that any hazard mitigation measures would be implemented within the Sites.

66. Picking up an earlier comment made by a representer querying the geotechnical safety of proceeding with housing developments on Sites D and E, the Chairperson enquired whether Sites D and E were situated on top of a cavern and geotechnically safe for construction. Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD, confirmed that Sites D and E were not on top of a cavern. Appropriate settlement and vibration monitoring would be provided during construction stage to ensure that the 110ML Portal would not be affected. There should also be a tunnel of about 2km long connecting the 110ML and 240ML Portals and the geology of the vicinity of tunnel area would be further investigated in the detailed study for the construction work. Also, according to the Geotechnical Appraisal conducted under the EFS, 97 landslides within the study area of Sites D, E and G were observed from aerial photographic records in the past 80

years, which were all confirmed to be small in scale covering an area of about 140m². Detailed investigation on slope stability would be further carried out and mitigation measures would be implemented where appropriate.

Provision of GIC Facilities

67. A Member asked the types of GIC facilities that would be provided in the proposed housing developments. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that relevant government departments would be consulted on the type of GIC facilities to be provided in the proposed public housing developments. She expected that more elderly facilities would be required as 33% of population in Sha Tin District would be aged over 64 in 2036.

68. A Member enquired about the provision of healthcare facilities in MOS area. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that there were currently four clinics/health centres in the Sha Tin district. The Government had planned to provide three more clinics/health centres in the district under the “single site, multiple use” initiative. There was no shortage in the provision of hospital beds in the Sha Tin district.

Others

69. A Member asked whether land resumption was required for the proposed developments. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that the Government would resume some private land at Site B1 (about 565m²) for the proposed public housing development and road works (about 2,300m²).

70. In response to a Member’s enquiry about the impacts on the permitted burial ground as mentioned by some representers, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that Sites A and B1 would not encroach onto the permitted burial grounds.

71. A Member asked whether Site B1 was subject to a previous planning application as mentioned by some representers. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that a site adjacent to Site B1 was situated on a marshland and was the subject of a rezoning request (application No. Z/MOS/5) which was rejected by the RNTPC in 2008 on the ground that the major part of the site fell within the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Cheung Muk Tau Village. Mr

Liu Ghung Ming, the representative of R83, indicated that given the application was for low-rise houses but was rejected by RNTPC, there was no justification to agree to the high-rise buildings at Sites A and B1. In response to a Member's question, Mr Liu said that the new road serving the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 would encroach onto the marshland area west of Cheung Muk Tau Village near Site B1. A Member further asked whether the proposed road would be within the 'VE', Ms Chu said that both Site B1 and the road would not affect the 'VE' of Cheung Muk Tau Village.

72. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

73. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau and Dr Roger. C.K. Chan left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]