

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 8.7.2021.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in 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

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

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

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

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

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of 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 Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations and comments in respect of the draft Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/23 (the draft OZP). It would be conducted with video conferencing arrangement.

4. The Meeting noted that the presentation to brief Members on the representations and comments including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and Planning Department (PlanD)'s views on the representations and comments was made by the government representative in the morning session on 7.7.2021. The PowerPoint and the presentation given by PlanD's representative had been uploaded to the Town Planning Board (the Board)'s website for viewing by the representers and commenters. Members' declaration of interests had been made in the same session of the meeting and was recorded in the minutes of the respective meeting accordingly.

5. Members noted that Messrs Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu, L.T. Kwok, Y.S. Wong and Gavin C.T. Tse, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, who had declared interests on the item, had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. For those Members had no direct interests or involvement in the submissions of the representations and comments and the public housing development, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The Chairperson said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or

made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

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

Government representatives

PlanD

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Ms Jessica H.F. Chu | - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin,
Tai Po and North (DPO/STN) |
| Miss Hannah H.N. Yick | - Senior Town Planner/Shu Tin |
| Mr Adrian H.C. Lee | - Town Planner/Shu 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 |
| Mr Dicky K.Y. Mak | - Engineer |

Housing Department (HD)

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

Transport Department (TD)

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

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Eric Y.H. Wong | - Senior Nature Conservation
Officer/Central |
| Ms C.Y. Ho | - Senior Nature Conservation
Officer/South |

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R89–Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee

R3174/C341–Ko Kok Hung (高國洪)

R3175/C304–Ko Pik Ha (高碧霞)

R3189/C306–Leung Hung (梁雄)

R3791–Ko Poo Ching (高甫青)

R3796/C98–Ko Kwok Keung Ivan

R3803–Wong Cheuk Hung Philip (黃灼雄)

Mr Wong Cheuk Hung Philip - Representer and Representers' and
Ms Chan Yee Ting Commenters' Representatives
Mr Fan Man Tao

R92/C16–Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R1339–Leung Chin Wai Kenny

Mr Leung Chin Wai Kenny - Representer

R2448–Chau Dickson Ka Faat (周嘉發)

Mr Chau Dickson Ka Faat - Representer

R2673–Lui Huo Zheng

Ms Lui Huo Heng Jochebed - Representer's Representative

R2794–Sha Man Fong

Ms Sha Man Fong - Representer

R2820–Lee Wood Hung

Mr Lee Wood Hung - Representer

R2878–Lau Kai Hung

R2879–Yung Yiu Kit (翁耀傑)

R2880–Priyani

R2881–Yung Wan Yu

Mr Yung Yiu Kit - Representor and Representors' Representative

R2925–Koo Sin Wah Sarah

Mr Koo Siu Pong - Representor's Representative

R2926–Law Wai Lan

Ms Law Wai Lan - Representor

R2932–Cheung Wai Man

R2933–Fung Mei Lin

Ms Fung Mei Lin - Representor and Representor's Representative

R2944–Cheung Suk Fong

Ms Cheung Suk Fong - Representor

R3013–Sin Tsun Chau

Mr Sin Tsun Chau - Representor

R3115–Ho Ding Kwok Clement

Mr Ho Ding Kwok Clement - Representor

R3762–Wong Man Ching (黃敏貞)

R3150/C817–Lam Kim Por (林建波)

Mr Lam Kim Por - Representor and Commentor and Representor's Representative

R3258–Lam Chun Fung

R3264–Man Sui Wan Maxim (文瑞環)

Mr Lam Chun Fung - Representer and Representer's
Representative

R3622–Wong Cheuk Chiu

R3624–Lam Kwai Heung

R3625–Wong Chak Kan

R3788–Sze Kai Mui Daphne (施基妹)

R3801–Wong Mei Ching Kent

R3830–Wong Tsz Fung (黃梓烽)

Ms Sze Kai Mui Daphne - Representer and Representers'
Representative

R3833–Leung Kai Lam

Mr Leung Kai Lam - Representer

R5697–Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd.

Ms Sin Man Yee - Representer's Representative

C544–Wong Ping Fat (王平發)

Mr Wong Ping Fat - Commenter

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. To ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, 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 after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers, commenters or their

representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence, and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairperson invited the representers, commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R1339–Leung Chin Wai Kenny

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Chin Wai Kenny made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Planning Area 77 of Ma On Shan (MOS). The capacities of the roads in MOS connecting to Kowloon were insufficient and there was serious traffic congestion. With reference to an image of Google Map, he showed that the traffic conditions of the roads leading to the Tate's Cairn Tunnel near Shek Mun Interchange and the roads connecting to the Lion Rock Tunnel at 8:00 a.m. on 7.7.2021 were heavily congested. The proposed road improvement works only at the local roads would not help improve the congestion on key routes connecting to Kowloon;
- (b) the planned Trunk Road T4 was an important transport infrastructure to help divert traffic to Tsing Sha Highway and improve the traffic flow on the roads connecting to the urban area. It should be constructed prior to implementation of any new developments, including the proposed private residential development with about 9,000 units in Shap Sze Heung;
- (c) since the introduction of the new 9-carriage trains on the MTR East Rail Line (MTR ERL), passengers had to wait for a few trains before getting on. Railway alone would not solve the traffic problems and road infrastructures had to be improved; and

- (d) he had no objection to new developments in MOS but strategic roads such as Trunk Road T4 needed to be completed first before population in-take.

R2448–Chau Dickson Ka Faat

11. Mr Chau Dickson Ka Faat made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the amendments which were a collusion between the Government and the developer of a private residential development nearby, resulting in the destruction of the country park. The mountain views and animals in the country park were precious assets which could enhance the living environment of the city. Country park should be conserved;
- (b) it was only a five-minute drive from MOS Station to the public carpark of the Ma On Shan Country Park (MOSCP), which was a tranquil and relaxing place for the enjoyment of metropolitans. The proposed developments in close proximity to the country park would adversely affect the habitats of animals including Red Muntjac (赤麂) and Eurasian Wild Pig (野豬);
- (c) the amendments would set undesirable precedents to develop the periphery of country parks. This would impose great development pressure on the enclaves or the peripheries of other country parks such as at Wong Chuk Yeung, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun;
- (d) there were other lands available for development including about 2,000 hectare (ha) of brownfield sites;
- (e) while the environmental impacts of the proposed developments had been assessed, there could be environmental impacts during the construction stage which could not be mitigated and relevant government departments were slow to take enforcement actions. He

gave an example of a site rezoned from “Green Belt” (“GB”) for a high-density residential development named The Regent at Lai Chi Shan, Tai Po. The plastic packing materials for the free-standing integrated modules were not properly handled and were blown into the river and forest in the surroundings causing water and waste pollution; and

- (f) to conserve the habitats of the country park, the Board should not agree to the amendments.

R2794–Sha Man Fong

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Sha Man Fong made the following main points:

- (a) as a resident of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody, she and her family members always travelled or cycled along Nin Fung Road to Wu Kai Sha Station and the bus stops nearby, and would also walk her dog along the road. Nin Fung Road was a local road connecting to Sai Sha Road at the east end and being a cul de sac at the west end, and was currently mainly used by residents of Symphony Bay and Cheung Muk Tau Village;
- (b) the proposed developments at Sites A and B1, accommodating a population of about 10,000 people, would induce a large amount of traffic at Nin Fung Road and increase the risk of traffic accidents. If there was a traffic accident, Nin Fung Road which was the only road connecting with the external road network would be blocked. The design of Nin Fung Road could not cater for substantial additional traffic flow and hence it should not be used as the access road of the proposed developments at Sites A and B1; and
- (c) she had worked hard to save money for buying her own property in a low-density residential development for a pleasant living environment. This would no longer be possible with the new developments at Sites A

and B1 and she urged the Board to understand her grave concerns.

R3013–Sin Tsun Chau

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Sin Tsun Chau made the following main points:

- (a) he had been a resident of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody for 23 years. According to the description and plan of the sales brochure, Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody was a development of 16 blocks of low-density luxury property with a backdrop of the country park;
- (b) while he generally supported for increasing housing land supply, he objected to the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 due to their incompatibility with the existing surrounding developments;
- (c) the proposed public housing developments which comprised four residential blocks of 38 to 45 storeys atop podiums and a non-domestic block with parking facilities were infill developments. Their bulk, building height (BH) and appearance were incompatible with the surrounding low-density developments and the mountain backdrop of MOS. The proposed developments would impose significant visual impacts on the residences at Symphony Bay;
- (d) Sites A and B1, with a total site area of about 2.74 ha, would provide about 3,480 units for a population of about 9,750 which were about nine times that of the existing number of flats and population of Symphony Bay. The influx of new population to the area would cause traffic congestion and there would be insufficient community facilities and infrastructure to support them;
- (e) Cheung Muk Tau Village was sandwiched between Sites A and B1 and Symphony Bay was located to the north of the two sites. Double Cove in Lok Wo Sha was located on the other side of Sai Sha Road opposite

to Sites A and B1, the BH of which should not be a relevant reference. Instead, the low-rise and low-density developments at Cheung Muk Tau Village and Symphony Bay should be a reference for the two sites;

- (f) the proposed high-rise residential developments at Sites A and B1 would not be compatible with the surrounding low-density developments. There would be significant visual intrusion and the open view currently enjoyed by residents of Symphony Bay would be compromised;
- (g) the other sites under the zoning amendments were located in areas either undeveloped or near the existing high-density public housing developments, and they were more suitable for building the proposed housing developments and there would be more design flexibility; and
- (h) the “GB” area could be used for providing community facilities and low-rise residential developments instead of high-rise public housing estates. Making reference to the private residential development in Shap Sze Heung, which proposed a 20m wide ecological buffer zone on each side of Tai Tung Wo Liu, an alternative option at Sites A and B1 for other types of development should be formulated and the Board’s decision on the proposed amendments should be deferred.

R2878–Lau Kai Hung

R2879–Yung Yiu Kit

R2880–Priyani

R2881–Yung Wan Yu

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yung Yiu Kit made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Symphony Bay. He had been living in Sha Tin for 41 years since 1980 as he found the town planning of Sha Tin and MOS the best in Hong Kong. However, the proposed developments at Sites

A and B1 deviated from the town planning principles;

- (b) the layout of MOS New Town was elongated with the reclaimed land in the middle being developed as the town centre connecting to two narrow ends at Tai Shui Hang and Cheung Muk Tau. Trunk Road T7 delineated the boundary of the town centre and separated it from the mountains;
- (c) according to the planning of MOS in 1995, Tai Shui Hang, Mui Tsz Lam and Wu Kai Sha Village were rural areas. Being located at the northern tip of MOS New Town and a bottle-neck before entering into Shap Sze Heung, the area of Cheung Muk Tau, Sai O and Nai Chung was designated for village type and low-rise developments and its surroundings of greeneries were zoned “GB”;
- (d) being located adjacent to the valley, the area was prone to flooding and a comprehensive drainage system was required for the construction of Symphony Bay to mitigate the risk of flooding in the area. The proposed high-density developments with podium design at Sites A and B1 at the hillside would cause drainage impacts and increase the risk of flooding. Moreover, with the mountain backdrop to the southeast of Cheung Muk Tau Village, the humidity there was relatively high, and this would further worsen as the proposed high-rise and bulky developments would adversely impact on air permeability. Sites A and B1 were not suitable for high-rise, high-density developments; and
- (e) to meet the severe housing demand, large scale reclamation was an effective way for production of housing land rather than rezoning “GB” sites for infill developments. Otherwise, it was inconsistent with the good practice of town planning adopted by the Board over the years.

R2932–Cheung Wai Man

R2933–Fung Mei Lin

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Fung Mei Lin made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident and property owner of Symphony Bay. She objected to Items A and B1 in relation to the rezoning of the “GB” sites to the south of Cheung Muk Tau Village and Symphony Bay for building four public housing blocks and proposed that those Sites should be reverted to “GB” zoning;
- (b) while she supported the efforts in increasing land supply for public housing developments, she objected to blindly developing unsuitable land for housing including the proposed amendments at Sites A and B1;
- (c) she showed a photo of the existing condition of the concerned “GB” sites and quoted a poem written a hundred years ago which appreciated the abundance of trees in the area of Cheung Muk Tau. The development of the proposed public housing estates would destroy the habitats of wildlife and would require felling of more than 1,000 trees which had been sustained for over a hundred years. It would not only be a disaster for the ecosystem in the area but also would reduce the green space being enjoyed by the residents of Symphony Bay;
- (d) she presented a photo taken from Wu Kai Sha Station which showed the existing condition of Sai Sha Road, with low- to medium-rise/density developments at Cheung Muk Tau Village and Symphony Bay that were surrounded by green areas zoned “GB”;
- (e) she showed a photomontage viewing from the west towards the area of Cheung Muk Tau of the proposed public housing developments atop podiums and the non-domestic block at Sites A and B1. The podium structure at Site A would be 45m high, which was similar to the total BH of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody. Thus, Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody would be surrounded by walls and the existing view towards the green area and mountains would be permanently blocked. Such a

dramatic change in visual context was unacceptable and the physical and psychological well-being of the residents would be adversely affected;

- (f) the Secretary for Development said in August 2018 that the rezoning of “GB” sites would not generate unacceptable impacts on the residents nearby. However, the amendments at Sites A and B1 were totally unacceptable to the residents of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody;
- (g) according to the development parameters proposed by the Government, the BH of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody was only one-third that of the proposed public housing developments. The Urban Design Guidelines (UDG) for Hong Kong stated that developments should be compatible with their context and out of context ‘sore thumbs’ developments should be avoided. The proposed high-rise public housing developments at Sites A and B1 were incompatible with the local setting of low-rise developments and thus did not comply with the UDG;
- (h) she did not agree with the claim that the periphery of country park was not actively in use by the public and was a waste of land resource. Making reference to the main purposes of “GB” zone stated in the Board’s Guidelines (TPB PG-No. 10) on ‘Application for Development within Green Belt Zone under Section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance’, the concerned “GB” zones had fulfilled the main purposes to conserve MOSCP, to define the outer limits of MOS New Town and to serve as a buffer between MOS New Town and Sai Kung, and to provide outlets for passive recreational uses. There were many hikers using the trails in the area especially under the pandemic and after the opening of MTR Tuen Ma Line (MTR TML);
- (i) paragraph 2b of the TPB PG-No. 10 also stated that the scale and intensity of the proposed development including BH should be compatible with the character of surrounding areas. The developments in the vicinity of Sites A and B1 including Cheung Muk Tau Village,

Symphony Bay, Li Po Chun United World College, Cheung Muk Tau Holiday Centre for the Elderly and Hong Kong Baptist Theological Seminary were all low-density developments. The proposed high-rise public housing developments were incompatible with the surroundings;

- (j) it was also not in line with the National policy to protect nature and ecology and enhance harmony between people and nature; and
- (k) the proposed developments would also bring adverse traffic and noise impacts that would be further elaborated by other representers.

R2926–Law Wai Lan

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Law Wai Lan made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody. She objected to the rezoning of Sites A and B1 from “GB” for public housing developments;
- (b) while she supported the efforts in increasing land supply for public housing developments to meet social needs, she objected to blindly developing unsuitable land for housing developments that would bring long-term adverse impacts;
- (c) Symphony Bay and Cheung Muk Tau Village were low-density developments located in the periphery of MOS New Town. The concerned “GB” sites with abundance of wildlife and trees functioned as an effective buffer from urban developments;
- (d) the proposed public housing developments at Sites A and B1 comprised four residential blocks with a BH of over 40 storeys, which was about three times that of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody. The proposed high-rise public housing developments were incompatible with the

low-rise developments in the area and would result in wall effect and a congested living environment;

- (e) a photo taken from the property atop Wu Kai Sha Station was presented which showed that Symphony Bay and Cheung Muk Tau Village were low-rise developments amidst a green setting;
- (f) with the aid of some photomontages from various perspectives, she said that the BH of the proposed public housing developments atop podiums at Sites A and B1 would be in marked contrast with the low-rise developments in the surroundings. The visual assessments conducted by the Government also concluded that the overall visual impact of the proposed developments would be ‘moderately adverse’;
- (g) the photomontage of public viewing point 2 (VP2) prepared by the Government in Annex IXa of the Paper from an elevated viewpoint at the hiking trail failed to demonstrate the highly incompatible BH of the proposed developments in the immediate local context with low-rise developments;
- (h) two photomontages of VP3 and VP4 prepared by the Government in Annex IXa of the Paper showed that the proposed developments would bring adverse visual impacts on sitting out areas and road users and would breach the views of MOS Ridgeline; and
- (i) she had worked hard in order to purchase a flat. A photo of a view towards the mountains taken from her home showed that after the proposed developments were in place, she would permanently lose the existing open and pleasant green view and would be viewing concrete walls in future. Members of the Board were urged to pay a visit to Sites A and B1 before making a decision.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong joined this session of the meeting during Ms Law’s presentation.]

R2925–Koo Sin Wah Sarah

17. Mr Koo Siu Pong made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody;
- (b) instead of rezoning the “GB” sites at Sites A and B1, the Government should search for alternative sites for the proposed housing developments;
- (c) the concerned “GB” zone belonged to the general public of Hong Kong and should be conserved;
- (d) the Board should not agree to the amendments, otherwise it would set an undesirable precedent to encourage developers to destroy other “GB” zones in Hong Kong; and
- (e) he requested that Members should pay a visit to Sites A and B1 before making a decision.

R2944–Cheung Suk Fong

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Cheung Suk Fong made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident and property owner of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody. She objected to Items A and B1 and suggested that the original “GB” zones should be retained;
- (b) the proposed developments would generate adverse traffic, air, noise and visual impacts. For traffic issues, some photos of the traffic conditions at Nin Fung Road and Sai Sha Road were presented. Traffic congestion at Sai Sha Road to the direction of Sha Tin during the

peak hours was common. The traffic was also congested during the non-peak hours when there was traffic accident or under poor weather conditions;

- (c) she showed photos of the vehicular access of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody at Nin Fung Road, which was a single 2-lane carriageway. Vehicles at Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody needed to give way to vehicles on Nin Fung Road. With the influx of new population of the proposed developments, the traffic flows via Nin Fung Road would increase substantially and the access of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody would be seriously affected;
- (d) as shown in another photo, traffic congestion at the roundabout of Sai Sha Road and Nin Fung Road was also serious due to the increase in heavy vehicles generated by the construction sites of the residential development in Nai Chung and Shap Sze Heung;
- (e) according to the Preliminary Traffic and Transportation Impact Assessment (PTTIA) conducted by the Government, the traffic flows at Nin Fung Road would increase ten times after the implementation of the proposed developments. The roundabout would become a bottle-neck and the traffic congestion issue would worsen. Furthermore, as revealed in the road link capacity assessments for the design year 2035 (Table 3.9 of the Final Report in Appendix VI of RNTPC Paper No. 4/20), with the proposed developments, the volume/capacity (V/C) ratios of some road links would operate over their capacities;
- (f) the technical assessment report conducted by the Government stated that the proposed developments would be subject to noise impacts and mitigation measures including the installation of acoustic windows at the new developments would be needed. However, the noise disturbance and air pollution during the construction stage on the existing residents were not addressed;

- (g) the construction of the proposed developments would require felling of thousands of trees. The air pollution problem would worsen; and
- (h) she had been living in Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody for four years. She chose her residence there due to the green and pleasant living environment. She was previously seriously ill and now still needed medical treatment. She wished that the current living environment which could help improve her health condition could be maintained. While the technical assessment report concluded that the proposed developments would not result in insurmountable problems, the adverse impacts on the physical, mental and psychological well-being of the existing residents had not been considered.

[Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng joined this session of the meeting during Ms Cheung's presentation.]

R2820–Lee Wood Hung

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lee Wood Hung made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to Items A and B1. The original “GB” zones should be retained;
- (b) he showed a photo of the existing condition of the Cheung Muk Tau area and a photomontage of the proposed developments. The proposed high-rise developments which intruded into the new town periphery deviated from the town planning principles. They would create adverse environmental, traffic and visual impacts;
- (c) while he supported the efforts in increasing land supply for public housing developments to meet social needs, he objected to blindly developing unsuitable land for housing developments. The proposed amendments would bring long-term adverse impacts and set an

undesirable precedent. Should the Government decide to rezone the “GB” zones in the new town periphery and remove the buffer areas, public consultation on such a major change in policy would be required;

- (d) the recent social unrest was fuelled by social conflict and the housing problem. As Hong Kong had entered into a new era, the housing problem had to be addressed but the Board was requested to discharge its functions following the preamble of the Town Planning Ordinance to enhance the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community. In finding new land for housing, good planning principles should still be followed. Given the incompatibility of the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 with the surroundings, the unacceptable adverse impacts that would be created and the setting of undesirable precedent, the amendments could not be agreed to; and
- (e) from a background research of previous planning applications for residential developments rejected by the Board, one of the rejection reasons was that the proposed developments were incompatible with the surrounding environment. Harbourfront Landmark in Hung Hom and Highcliff at Stubbs Road, which were notorious ‘sore thumbs’ and examples of bad planning in Hong Kong, should be avoided. Taking the criteria of TPB PG-No. 10 and the principles of the UDG into consideration, the Board should not agree to the proposed amendments.

R89–Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee

R3174/C341–Ko Kok Hung

R3175/C304–Ko Pik Ha

R3189/C306–Leung Hung

R3791–Ko Poo Ching

R3796/C98–Ko Kwok Keung Ivan

R3803–Wong Cheuk Hung Philip

20. Mr Wong Cheuk Hung Philip made the following main points:

- (a) to express objections to Items F and G, representations in the form of a letter with about 2,000 signatures of Ma On Shan Tsuen (MOST) villagers were submitted to the Board;
- (b) he was the second generation of a miner of the Ma On Shan Iron Mine (the Mine) and lived in MOST. The Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee had been established for over 30 years to provide assistance to the residents of MOST;
- (c) it took an hour for him to travel from his home in MOST to the Tate's Cairn Tunnel that morning, which was evident of the serious traffic congestion problem of MOS. With completion of new developments in Ma Kwu Lam, Nai Chung and Shap Sze Heung, the additional traffic flows could not be addressed by minor improvements to the existing road junctions or roundabouts. The road section in the area of Tai Shui Hang and Shatin Hospital, which was the bottle-neck for the traffic from Tai Po via Tolo Highway and from MOS New Town, had been saturated;
- (d) he then gave an account of the history and culture of the Mine and MOST. The Mine commenced operation in 1940s. The labour force from Chiu Chow mainly settled in the middle levels of the Mine hence that settlement was called 'Chiu Chow Village' which was within Site G. He objected to Items F and G as they would destroy the origin of the miners and the history of the Mine, which should be preserved. They wanted to continue to live in the Chiu Chow Village as it was their 'root';
- (e) the Mine was isolated and inaccessible in the past. Externally, they relied on sea transport between the former pier near the Mine and the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Internally, without any support or assistance from the Government, MOST Road and their settlements were built by the miners themselves;

- (f) with the aids from the missionaries of the Franciscan Order and the Evangelical Lutheran Church, facilities including a school, a football field and a church were later built;
- (g) there was an indigenous village called 'the Wan Village' in the upper end of MOST Road but the villagers had sold their land to a developer for a private development. To avoid the impact of the private development on the Mine and MOST, a consensus was previously reached through the liaisons among the developer, MOST villagers and the Government and a scheme with the widening of MOST Road to facilitate that private development was formulated in 2009 but yet to be implemented. He showed a plan of the road scheme numbered 'STM7230';
- (h) the development proposals under Items F and G and a new proposal to widen MOST Road, which was different from the agreed road scheme, were proposed by the Government. The current proposal for improvement of MOST Road by the Government would destroy the mining settlements. It seemed to be a collusion for the Government to build the road to facilitate the private development at the Wan Village;
- (i) he had grave concern on the geotechnical safety of the Sites for developing the proposed developments. The open cut mine at 280ML had collapsed. The 240ML and 110ML were extensively drilled and vertically connected inside. Sites D and E were located near the 110ML Portal and the lavatories used by the miners. Without detailed ground investigation, the feasibility and structural safety of constructing the proposed public housing development at Site D were doubted;
- (j) from ecological perspective, Sites F and G were located in the immediate outskirts of MOSCP, which was just within a 10m distance. The habitats of wildlife would be adversely affected by the proposed developments; and

- (k) the Mine and MOST had historical importance and was an intangible cultural heritage. It was more worthwhile to preserve the heritage which was built with the efforts of the miners and their families than developing Site G for private luxury housing. The Mine and the settlements of MOST should be preserved as an integral heritage so that the public could visit the Mine and learn about the history and contributions of the Mine.

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

21. In response to Members' questions in the hearing on 7.7.2021 regarding the structures with historical and cultural values in the Chiu Chow Village, the following representer's representatives of Evangelical Lutheran Church of Hong Kong operating the Grace Youth Camp (R88/C13) provided some supplementary information.

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Chan Yee Ting made the following main points:

- (a) she presented an aerial photo of the Mine in 1949 which showed that 110ML and the Mineral Preparation Plant had not yet been built and MOST was not yet established. From another aerial photo in 1963, 110ML and the Mineral Preparation Plant were built and the Mine was developed to a considerable scale. The miners built their own settlements at Site G and subsequently the Chiu Chow Village was formed;
- (b) while the information provided by the Government revealed that there was no Old and Valuable Trees or species of conservation interest identified within Site G, over half of the Site was covered by vegetated land, farmland and fish ponds. The farmland and fish ponds adjacent to the settlements, which formed an integral part of the village, also reflected the history of the village; and
- (c) as shown in the site photo on Plan H-4d of the Paper, over 80% of Site

G was vegetated and the existing structures of the Chiu Chow Village were well blended into the green environment. Site G as a “GB” area had served as a buffer for MOSCP and such function was not affected by the existing village settlements. In contrast, the proposed housing development with a BH of 250mPD would not be compatible with the surroundings.

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

- (a) the existing villagers of the Chiu Chow Village were the second and third generations of the miners who had a strong bonding with the Mine;
- (b) there were structures with historical or cultural values within Site G and in its immediate vicinity. Those within Site G included a leisure pool where kids could swim and was the only recreational facility in the village; and a pig shed for rearing pigs as a source of food supply to the villagers and other residents in MOS. The construction style of the settlements and the practice of farming were replications of the Chiu Chow culture from their home town. Also, some cookware which had been used by the miners for preparing big feasts was still used by the villagers nowadays;
- (c) those in the immediate vicinity of Site G included a Tin Hau Temple and remnants of a farm (嘉華農場), which was identified by the Government for a pilot eco-farm in 1960s; and
- (d) while 110ML was a Grade 2 building, there were clusters of ungraded mining structures with historical value within the works limit of Sites D and E that would be affected by the proposed developments. As submitted in their representation, those structures included lavatories used by the miners, a tram repairing area, a retaining wall, a pier, a water tank, structure for electricity supply and catchwater (part). A multi-dimensional ‘point-line-plane’ approach should hence be adopted

to conserve all the inter-related heritage resources of the Mine for the completeness of the mining history of Hong Kong.

R3115–Ho Ding Kwok Clement

24. With the aid of slides on the visualiser, Mr Ho Ding Kwok Clement made the following main points:

- (a) his representation was related to Sites A and B1. He had provided data and details concerning the adverse traffic impacts of the proposed developments at those two sites in his written submission;
- (b) the findings of the PTTIA indicated that in the design year 2035, under the scenario without road improvement, all V/C ratios of some road links were greater than 1, which meant traffic congestion would happen;
- (c) according to the data of the traffic conditions from Google Map, the journey time during the peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 8:30 a.m.) from Wu Kai Sha to the Tate's Cairn Tunnel ranged from 30 to 70 minutes while the travelling time at 6:00 a.m. was only 18 minutes. However, there was no alternative road from MOS to the urban area;
- (d) the railway services were insufficient after the introduction of the 9-carriage trains on the MTR ERL, and they had to wait for multiple trains before they could be on board. To avoid that, he had to advance his journey to work for an hour by leaving home at 7:00 a.m.;
- (e) the new residential developments in Wu Kai Sha and Shap Sze Heung would have more than 10,000 units. Assuming a household size of 2.4 persons, the additional population would be about 27,900. The road network could not cater for the further increase in traffic flows from the proposed developments at Sites A and B1;
- (f) the capacity of Tate's Cairn Highway in 2035 under the scenarios

without and with road improvements would be 1.19 and 0.88 respectively, and that of Sai Sha Road would be 1.1 and 0.82. He would not object to new developments if sufficient transport infrastructure could be timely provided. He further enquired about the implementation programme of the relevant transport infrastructures such as Trunk Roads T4 and T6; and

- (g) given insufficient road capacities, he was also concerned whether population in the area would be able to timely access health facilities, such as the Prince Wales Hospital in Sha Tin or the Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital in Tai Po, when there were accidents and emergencies.

R3762–Wong Man Ching

R3150/C817–Lam Kim Por

25. Mr Lam Kim Por made the following main points:

- (a) he was born in Hong Kong as the second generation of a miner of the Mine. Given his childhood experience of a poor living environment, he understood the housing need of grassroots families. While he supported the efforts in increasing land supply for housing developments, he objected to Site G as it was unacceptable to destroy the history and character of MOST at Site G and the Mine and the ecosystem of MOSCP for the proposed housing developments;
- (b) he provided an account of their past living in the area. His father migrated to Hong Kong and worked in the Mine in the 1940s, and after he built his own house in an area within Site G, his mother and elder brother also came to Hong Kong in the 1950s for reunion. While working in the mine was tough and there was a lack of transport facilities, electricity and water supply, they enjoyed living a simple life in a caring community. The income of miners was generally low and they cultivated on the farmland and reared livestock to supply food for

themselves and their neighbours;

- (c) the Chiu Chow Village at Site G was generally formed between 1940 and 1950. He recalled that there were more than 40 households with about 300 people in the Chiu Chow Village. The social network was strong and they shared resources and provided assistance for those in need. They cooked traditional food together for festivals and sacrificial offerings. In special occasions such as wedding and birthdays, they would arrange special Chiu Chow style banquets for celebrations. There were two temples and the villagers and other Chiu Chow people from the urban area would come back for festivals and ceremonial celebrations;
- (d) when the school in MOST was open, the children and grandchildren of the miners could receive education and improve their standard of living. The work of miners was tough and dangerous. All the miners had passed away but a few of their wives now aged over 90 were still living there;
- (e) the Chiu Chow Village was a record of the history of mining industry in Hong Kong and a testimony of the miners contributing and their descendants' efforts to maintaining the unique culture. People in the Chiu Chow Village spoke the same dialect and had the same culture, life-style and religion. That was an intangible cultural heritage which was worth preserving;
- (f) by showing photos of a landslide that previously occurred near 240ML, he expressed grave concerns on the geological safety of the proposed developments at Sites D to G, which were quite close to the mine heritage;
- (g) the maximum BH of the proposed developments at Sites D and G were 225mPD and 250mPD respectively. The absolute BH of the developments at both sites would be about 100m. The proposed

developments would have adverse visual impact on the ridgeline of MOS especially as viewed from the waterfront promenade at Tolo Harbour;

- (h) the proposed developments would bring adverse impacts on the ecosystem at Site G and its surroundings. He had not seen wild animals such as Eurasian Wild Pig at Site G when he was young. However, it was not uncommon to see such wild animals in the Chiu Chow Village nowadays as the wild animals were being driven out after the former pier in the west had been developed as Heng On Estate and the site at upper MOST Road for private development had been fenced off; and
- (i) he also noted the adverse representations made by the residents of Symphony Rhapsody. He considered that the proposed developments at Sites A and B1 near Symphony Rhapsody and those at Sites D to G near the Mine were infill developments and hence objected to all amendments to the draft plan.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left this session of the meeting during Mr Lam's presentation.]

R3622–Wong Cheuk Chiu

R3624–Lam Kwai Heung

R3625–Wong Chak Kan

R3788–Sze Kai Mui Daphne

R3801–Wong Mei Ching Kent

R3830–Wong Tsz Fung

26. Ms Sze Kai Mui Daphne made the following main points:

- (a) she was the secretary of Ma On Shan Mutual Aid Committee. Mr Wong Cheuk Hung Philip (R3803) was her husband. She was familiar with the conditions inside the Mine because her parents-in-law worked

there. The internal tunnels/passageways were complex but no detailed geotechnical assessment had been conducted for the proposed developments. As mentioned by some representers, given that one of the mines had previously collapsed and landslide had occurred, the geotechnical safety of the sites proposed for developments was of great concern;

- (b) the Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) bought the land in the Wan Village in 1991 for a luxury housing development. The enhancement of MOST Road proposed by the Government, which would affect the Chiu Chow Village, seemed to be a collusion between the Government and the private developer to spend public funds to build the road to facilitate the luxury housing development;
- (c) she showed a plan indicating a road scheme proposed by SHK in 2009 which involved widening the existing MOST Road without affecting the Chiu Chow Village. She questioned why the Government did not adopt that road scheme but proposed a new and more extensive scheme that would destroy the Chiu Chow Village;
- (d) MOST, including the Chiu Chow Village, was the only village related to the mining industry in Hong Kong, which should be preserved with Government's support. Destruction of the cultural heritage of the village was irreversible; and
- (e) there was a need for more public housing in Hong Kong, instead of luxury private housing, such as that proposed at Site G. It was not reasonable to destroy the village of historical importance for the development of luxury housing.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left this session of the meeting during Ms Sze's presentation.]

27. Mr Leung Kai Lam made the following main points:

- (a) he was the third generation of a miner of the Mine. His grandmother prepared and sold food for the miners. While he lived in the upper MOST which would not be affected by the proposed developments at Sites F and G, he objected to the zoning amendments as other villagers would be affected;
- (b) developers in Hong Kong had acquired and reserved lands for years but some of the lands were vacant and not yet developed. It was a waste of land resources. The Government should consider levying a vacancy tax on the lands owned by the developers;
- (c) the construction of developments on hillslope would involve greater difficulty and higher capital cost. The proposed developments would bring adverse ecological impacts that had been mentioned by some of the representers; and
- (d) apart from housing developments, he suggested alternative uses for the sites such that a special place of tourism attraction could be created by building a museum of the mining industry and settlements, a demonstration of renovated village houses, and parking caravans for stargazing.

R5697–Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd.

28. Ms Sin Man Yee said that since the proposed residential developments at Sites B1 and D were in close vicinity to high pressure gas pipelines underneath MOS Bypass and along MOST Road respectively, quantitative risk assessments should be conducted by the project proponents prior to commencement of the developments.

C544–Wong Ping Fat

29. Mr Wong Ping Fat made the following main points:

- (a) he was born and grew up in MOST and lived in the lower part of the village. He objected to Items D to G;
- (b) the Mine had made contributions to Hong Kong and its history was related to the Country. During the Japanese occupation period, the Japanese military extracted iron ores from the mine to manufacture weapons for the World War II (WWII);
- (c) the newspaper article of Wenweipao dated 30.3.2015 reported that the Mine had historical significance related to the history of the mining industry and immigrants of Hong Kong, and the recovery and revitalisation of the economies after WWII;
- (d) MOST comprised clusters of settlements scattering on the hillslope that were built by miners who immigrated from different provinces of the Mainland. For instance, Chiu Chow miners formed the Chiu Chow Village at Site G. The settlements of each cluster agglomerated near a mining activity area for the convenience of work; and
- (e) MOST was unique because it was a chapter of the human history in Hong Kong. It was different from other walled villages in the New Territories as it was formed by miners with different background and from different origins who congregated to contribute to the mining industry. As a unique cultural heritage, it should not be destroyed just for a luxury housing development accommodating only about 3,000 people.

[Mr K.K. Cheung left this session of the meeting during Mr Wong's presentation.]

R92/C16–Mary Mulvihill

30. Before making oral submission, Ms Mary Mulvihill observed that the faces of Members who were attending the meeting by video conferencing were not shown on the

screen. She asked for the reasons of such arrangement, which was different from the previous meetings she had attended. She said that it was important for attendees to monitor which Members were attending the meeting by video conferencing. In response, the Chairperson said that Members' attendance would be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

31. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the rezoning of the "GB" sites could not be justified under the existing policy. The sites to the south of MOS Bypass served as a buffer zone of MOSCP, which helped define the boundary between the MOS New Town and the country park. The amendments would take away at least 10 ha of "GB" areas including some parts with waterways;
- (b) the proposed private residential development at Site G was very close to the country park and would require widening of the existing access road. That would certainly encourage more rampant developments on the southern side of the country park;
- (c) the provision of transport links would incur extensive slope works and stabilisation, which would adversely affect the ecosystem and wildlife. The costs and impacts involved were unacceptable;
- (d) private housing would be subject to traffic noise at a level similar to the urban area but ways to mitigate such impact had not been addressed;
- (e) regarding the environmental, ecological and landscape aspects, while the Paper stated that "GB" was a zoning intended for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas, it failed to mention the general presumption against development within that zone;
- (f) the Government claimed that suitable "GB" sites identified for development were with relative lower buffer or conservation value but the data provided by the green groups refuted that claim;

- (g) the Paper also stated that the Sites were suitable for development as there were no insurmountable technical problems and unacceptable environmental and ecological impacts. However, the criterion stated in the Policy Address for identifying suitable “GB” sites for development was ‘degraded green belts’ and not just with ‘no insurmountable technical problem’. That matter could be subject to judicial review;
- (h) according to the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) conducted by the Government, there would only be short term lighting and human disturbances affecting the foraging behaviour of avifauna and mammal adjacent to the Sites as those animal species were highly mobile and would adjust their foraging area. The sites with avifauna and mammal identified did not meet the criteria set out in the Policy Address that “GB” sites to be rezoned for residential developments should be devegetated, deserted or formed;
- (i) the EcoIA revealed that part of the works limit of Site D consisted of woodland of ‘moderate to high’ ecological value. Again, this proved that the “GB” zones under the amendments were not sites suitable for development according to the Policy Address;
- (j) she questioned the proposal to provide compensatory woodlands when the existing woodlands could have been preserved instead. While it was claimed that native species compatible with the surrounding landscape would be used for tree compensation to enhance the vegetation diversity of the local environment, she considered that the trees planted around developments would mostly be chosen for their ornamental value rather than enhancing biodiversity. The compensatory woodlands would not help enhance the ecosystem;
- (k) there were other animal species of conservation interest recorded by the green groups but were not identified in the field survey conducted by the government’s consultants. The Board should study both sets of data. The proposed developments would result in the loss of a wide range of

habitats and the wild animals such as the Eurasian Wild Pig that would be driven into the built-up areas. The risk of spreading new infectious diseases could be resulted from human encroachment into animal habitats. Sites C to G were located in close proximity to the MOS Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), and the proposed developments would reduce the buffer for the SSSI;

- (l) regarding the marshland with moderate ecological value near Site B1, the transplantation of individual Horsetail Spikesedge (木賊狀葶薺) would bring adverse impact on the ecosystem;
- (m) there were representations pointing out that the scenic landscape of “GB” sites was integrated with the adjacent MOSCP. The proposed developments in “GB” areas would have widespread implications on the view and experience of visitors in the surrounding country park. She disagreed with PlanD’s view that the proposed developments would have no significant impact on the country park;
- (n) in view of global warming and reports of landslides, heavy rainfall and severe flooding in many parts of the world, the geotechnical and construction issues of the proposed development at Site G were of great concern;
- (o) the ridgeline of MOS would be breached by the proposed developments. The green panoramic background enjoyed by the public on both sides of Tolo Harbour would be irreparably destroyed;
- (p) the visual impacts of the proposed developments demonstrated by the photomontages prepared by the Cheung Muk Tau villagers should not be ignored. The findings of the Visual Impact Assessments (VIA) conducted by the Government acknowledged that the proposed developments would result in different levels of visual impacts. While mitigation measures through architectural design and arrangement including building separation and landscaping measures were proposed

to achieve better visual permeability, she questioned the effectiveness of the compensatory planting and greening to alleviate the inevitable vegetation loss. As pointed out by some representers, the proposed developments did not comply with the UDG;

- (q) regarding the heritage aspect of the Mine, she commented that the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) would frequently give in to facilitate development and would disregard the adverse impacts on heritage and cultural sites. All initiatives to preserve heritage in recent years had been at the initiative of the public such as the State Theatre and Bishop Hill Reservoir. The AMO, which was under the Development Bureau, could not be trusted to safeguard heritage sites;
- (r) some representers alternatively proposed to use the sites for low-rise private residential developments instead of public housing, and the Government should study the feasibility of such option, as it could generate revenue from land sale which might in turn support the development of brownfield sites for housing; and
- (s) there were over 5,000 representations objecting to the draft plan that were submitted by representers from all walks of life with a wide range of background. It was the duty of the Board to carefully consider their views before making a decision. Whilst the need to increase land supply for public housing was supported, the amendments were objected to as they would destroy the beauty of MOSCP.

R3258–Lam Chun Fung

R3264–Man Sui Wan Maxim

32. Mr Lam Chun Fung made the following main points:

- (a) to provide a stable, reliable and predictable environment for investors, it was crucial for the Government to follow the established procedures to formulate policies, and uphold procedural justice. He considered that

the established procedures were not followed in the gazettal of the amendments under Items D to G;

- (b) the proposed developments under Items D to G would destroy the Mine which had historical importance in relation to the history of WWII and should be regarded as a national heritage;
- (c) he quoted various publications published by the Ma On Shan Promotion of Livelihood and Recreation Association, the Joint Publishing (Hong Kong) Company Limited and Wenweipao in relation to the history and contributions of the Mine. In gist, during WWII, the Mine was in the leading position in the mining industry of Asia and the major source of Japan's iron supply. It adopted the most advanced mining technology from Japan. It recorded the history of the mining industry and immigrants of Hong Kong, and the recovery and revitalisation of the economy in the post-war era. It was also important to the cultural heritage of the Country and would provide important resource for national education;
- (d) MOST was an important part of the heritage. It comprised Shun Yee San Tsuen, MOS Upper Mid-level Village, MOS Lower Mid-level Village and MOS Upper Village. Sites D to F were located near Shun Yee San Tsuen, at MOS Upper Mid-level Village and MOS Lower Mid-level Village. Both the Mine and MOST should be preserved;
- (e) according to paragraph 10 of the Explanatory Statement of the approved MOS OZP No. S/MOS/13 exhibited in 2004, MOST was of historical interest and 'worthy of preservation and thus any development or redevelopment affecting them should be avoided as far as possible'. The recognition of the historical interest of MOST should be maintained;
- (f) as stipulated in the Notes of the draft OZP, "SSSI" zone was designated with an intention to deter human activities or developments within the

SSSI, and there was a general presumption against development. No developments were permitted unless they were needed to support the conservation of the features of special scientific interest in the SSSI. Given that the distance between Sites D to F and the MOS SSSI was about 350m to 400m, the proposed developments at Sites D to F would cause permanent and irreversible adverse impacts on the SSSI;

- (g) Sites D to G were just 10m outside the boundary of MOSCP. The proposed developments would unavoidably affect the habitats of the country park. The magnitude of the impacts would be similar to developing housing within the country park. The boundary of the country park was not a definitive physical demarcation and therefore the peripheral area of the country park which served as a buffer should not be developed;
- (h) the Report of the Task Force on Land Supply promulgated in 2018 stated that developing the periphery of country park had not been recommended as an option for increasing housing land supply as it was generally not supported by the public, and it was not a simple option as it would involve a range of considerations including ecological and legal aspects. Such policy direction was further stated in the 2020 Policy Address, and recently reconfirmed by the Secretary for Development in a recent meeting of the Legislative Council; and
- (i) the proposed development at Site G would provide 1,040 luxury flats accommodating a population of 3,120. Taking account of the costs involved for the capital works, the disturbances on the ecosystem, and the destruction of historical and cultural heritage cum national education resources, the amendments at Sites D to G should not be pursued.

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan left this session of the meeting during Mr Lam's presentation.]

33. As the presentation from the representers, commenters and their representatives in the morning session had been completed, and noting that most of the oral submissions in

the morning session were related to Sites A and B1 and the representations to be submitted in the afternoon session would mainly concern Sites D to G, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed to proceed to the Q&A session, which would focus on Sites A and B1.

34. 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. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Sites A and B1

Traffic and Transport Aspect

35. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the proposed traffic and transport arrangement for Sites A and B1 and the future traffic conditions of Nin Fung Road and any impacts on traffic and pedestrian safety;
- (b) the proposed road improvement works at the roundabout junction of Sai Sha Road/Nin Wah Road/Nin Fung Road; and
- (c) whether the existing access roads used by the Cheung Muk Tau Village and Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody would be changed.

36. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD and Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PLT/H, CEDD made the following main points:

- (a) currently, Nin Fung Road was a standard single 2-lane carriageway with a cul-de-sac. The existing traffic flows were relatively low. For implementation of the proposed developments at Sites A and B1, a new access road of a 7.3m wide single 2-lane carriageway with 2.75m wide

footpath on both sides around the south side of Cheung Muk Tau Village would be provided as shown in Annex VIIIa of the Paper. The proposed new access road would be connected with Nin Fung Road. While the future traffic flows including bus services would increase after population in-take of the proposed public housing developments, according to the results of the PTTIA, Nin Fung Road and the access road to Cheung Muk Tau Village would operate within their capacities. There was no information at hand on the existing traffic flow of Nin Fung Road;

- (b) pedestrians in the area would access the MTR Wu Kai Sha Station and the developments on the opposite side of Sai Sha Road via the new footpath and the existing subway underneath Sai Sha Road. Also, on-street bus lay-bys were proposed at the new access road;
- (c) the roundabout junction of Sai Sha Road/Nin Wah Road/Nin Fung Road was connected with Nin Fung Road leading to Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody and also the single track access road leading to Cheung Muk Tau Village passing by the eastern and southern sides of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody. To minimise the traffic flows via the roundabout and to provide a direct exit from Nin Fung Road for vehicles bound for the MOS town centre/urban area, the approaching arm of Nin Fung Road (westbound) would be widened to allow an exclusive left turn lane to Sai Sha Road (westbound) as shown in Annex Xd of the Paper. According to the PTTIA, the V/C ratios of this roundabout in 2019, 2035 (without improvement works) and 2035 (with improvement works) were 0.47, 1.1 and 0.82 respectively. With the proposed road improvement works, no undesirable performance for the existing roads and roundabout/junction would be envisaged; and
- (d) the vehicular access of Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody abutted Nin Fung Road. The existing arrangement of accessing the residence via Nin Fung Road would remain unchanged. Nin Fung Road would be extended to connect the proposed new access road which would be the access for Sites A and B1. For Cheung Muk Tau Village, it was

currently served by the said single track access road and such arrangement would remain unchanged. While a roundabout at the end of the new access road for Sites A and B1 was proposed to connect the single track access road to Cheung Muk Tau Village, it was expected that the routing through the roundabout onto the single track access road to the roundabout junction of Sai Sha Road/Nin Wah Road/Nin Fung Road, would only be for contingency.

Visual Aspect and Layout and Design of the Proposed Developments

37. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the compatibility of Sites A and B1 with the surroundings;
- (b) the BH profile in a wider context taking into account Nai Chung and Kwun Hang;
- (c) the relevance of the viewpoint at Tolo Harbour as shown by some representers;
- (d) whether views of the ridgeline of MOS could be preserved;
- (e) measures to alleviate the visual impacts; and
- (f) whether the photomontages of Sites A and B1 presented by some representers were prepared by the Government.

38. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides and a visualiser, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) it was not uncommon to build high-density developments adjacent to “Village Type Development” zone in a new town. Tai Wai Village in Sha Tin was one of the examples. Under the recent amendments to the

Tseung Kwan O OZP, a “GB” site near Yau Yue Wan Resite Village was rezoned for a public housing development with a maximum BH of 140mPD;

- (b) on BH profile, there was gradation of BH from the west to east, which ranged from Lake Silver at 185mPD in the west (near Wu Kai Sha Station), Sites A and B1 at 165mPD and the Shap Sze Heung private development under construction (with 9,000 housing units) with maximum BH at 147mPD abutting the eastern fringe of the MOS planning scheme area. There was also gradation of BH towards the hillside from north to south, which ranged from Li Po Chun United World College at 42mPD to The Entrance at 95mPD and Sites A and B1 at 165mPD;
- (c) the selection of VPs for the VIA was in line with the requirements set out in TPB PG-No. 41 on ‘Guidelines on submissions of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board’. According to paragraph 4.5 of TPB PG-No. 41, in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it was far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists. Visual impact assessments should primarily assess the impact on sensitive public viewers from the most affected VPs. Given that Sites A and B1 could not be easily seen from Tolo Harbour at popular public VPs such as the Plover Cove Reservoir, a viewpoint from Tolo Harbour might not be of significance. Sites A and B1 were also barely seen from the promenade in the Tai Po waterfront or from the pier at Ma Liu Shui;
- (d) the general principle to maintain a 20% building free zone below the ridgelines was only applicable to the ridgelines around Victoria Harbour from strategic viewpoints stated in the UDG. The proposed developments at Sites A and B1 of 165mPD would not breach the

mountain backdrop of the Hunch Backs at 677mPD. From the viewpoint at Pak Shek Kok Promenade, the existing buildings and the proposed developments at Sites D and E were far below the ridgeline of MOS and hence the mountain backdrop of MOS as a character in the district was generally preserved; and

- (e) the photomontages of Sites A and B1 presented by some representers were not prepared by the Government.

39. In response, with the aid of PowerPoint slides, Mr Horace K.L. Lai, Architect, HD made the following main points:

- (a) in the conceptual design adopted in the Engineering Feasibility Study for technical assessments, building setback from the boundary of Site A had been incorporated. The distance between the podiums of the proposed public housing and Symphony Bay Villa Rhapsody was approximately 60m to 70m. Mitigation measures including building separation of 15m wide for visual or wind corridor and a greening ratio of not less than 20% would also be adopted. Further consultation with the District Council and stakeholders would be carried out during the detailed design stage. Taking their comments into consideration, the layout and architectural design would be refined as appropriate; and
- (b) with regard to the proposed podium of 45m of the housing development at Site A as mentioned by some representers, he clarified that the podium under the conceptual design was at 45mPD, not 45m. A podium height of 45mPD would translate into 15m (around 3 storeys) for Site A.

Environmental Aspect

40. In response to a Member's question about the noise impact on the existing residential developments adjacent to Sites A and B1, Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD said that according to the Preliminary Environmental Study, the existing sensitive receivers

would not be subject to any noise level exceeding the noise assessment limits specified under the Technical Memorandum of the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance and therefore no mitigation measure would be required.

Landscape Aspect

41. In response to a Member's question, Mr Horace K.L. Lai, Architect, HD said that the integration of landscape proposals for Sites A and B1 with the green surroundings to better reflect the MOS and Cheung Muk Tau setting would be considered during the detailed design stage. There was a flexibility to increase the greening ratio, and some of their projects had adopted greening ratio up to 30% to achieve a better landscape design.

42. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the morning session of the hearing was completed. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the government representatives for attending the hearing.

43. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:30 p.m.

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

44. The meeting was resumed at 2:35 p.m.

45. 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

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr C.H. Tse

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

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

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

Presentation and Question Sessions

46. The following government representatives, representers, commenters and their 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/Shu Tin
Mr Adrian H.C. Lee - Town Planner/Shu Tin

CEDD

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

HD

Mr Forrest K.W. Fong - Senior Architect
Ms Elim Wong - Planning Officer

TD

Mr Caleb K. L. Yiu - Engineer/Bicycle Parking

Mr Wilfred H. K. Ngai - Engineer/Ma On Shan

AFCD

Mr Eric Y.H. Wong - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/Central

Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South

Consultants

Mr Ernest Tip - Senior Associate, WSP (Asia) Ltd

Ms Anny Li - Tree Specialist, WSP (Asia) Ltd

Mr. Ryan Ho - Ecologist, Ecosystems Ltd

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R92/C16–Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R1339–Leung Chin Wai Kenny (梁展璋)

Mr Leung Chi Wai Kenny - Representer

R1536–Au Kwok Kuen (區國權)

Mr Au Kwok Kuen - Representer

R3258–Lam Chun Fung

R3264–Man Sui Wan Maxim (文瑞環)

Mr Lam Chun Fung] Representer and Representer's
] Representative

R84/C12–Ma On Shan Village Concern Group (馬鞍山村關注組)

R103–Chan Kong Yin (陳江然)

- R105–Chan Wai Kiu Terence (陳偉僑)
R106–Liu Yanhong (劉燕洪)
R107–Chan Wai Ping (陳偉平)
R108–Lam Chor Hing (林楚卿)
R113–Kong Suet Yi (江雪兒)
R149–Lam Chun Yi (林振怡)
R189–Chan Shuk Kwan (陳淑君)
R228–Lai Chun (黎臻)
R204–Wong Kwan Heung (王群香)
R244/C29–Wong Hiu Man (黃曉雯)
R249–Ho Wing Yan Ruby (何泳欣)
R263–Yip Hiu Lam (葉曉琳)
R407–Wong Kwok Tung (黃國棟)
R589–Fung Chun Kwong (馮進光)
R799–Wong Yuk Hong
R1242/C414–Jin Yanyan (金燕燕)
R1443/C214–So Chak Lung (蘇澤龍)
R1538/C436–Lam Kin Ming (林健明)
R1595–Ko Siu Por (高少波)
R1724–Law Hiu Yung Hilda (羅曉容)
R1727–Lai Wing Ki (黎詠棋)
R1739–Tai Kit Yee Steph (戴潔怡)
R1802–Cheng Fung Yi (鄭鳳儀)
R1803–Wong Siu Kit (王少傑)
R1805–Wong Hoi Tung (王鎧彤)
R1834/C227–Chan Long Ching Novah (陳朗醒)
R1836–Ha Cheuk Lun Jason (夏卓麟)
R1840/C1525–Chung Man Fong (鍾敏芳)
R1847–Tam Tin Yuet (譚天悅)
R1849/C20–Lam Long Fung (藍朗峰)
R1872–Hung Yat Lan (洪一蘭)

- R1875–Wong Yu Ling (王瑜翎)
R1884–Lui Pik Yiu (雷鬆僥)
R1888–Kwok Fun Ki
R1902–Wan Lok Ting (尹樂婷)
R1941/C196–Wong Chi On
R1984–Leung Yiu Ting (梁耀廷)
R1985–Ho Lai Mei (何麗美)
R1988–Chung Chuen Fong (鍾轉芳)
R1998/C108–Li Chun Ying Kathy (李俊盈)
R2059–Wong Wing Tung (黃詠彤)
R2116/C171–Wong Wing In (王詠妍)
R2117/C146–Leung Poon Hing (梁伴興)
R2173/C107–Li Chun Sze Joyce (李俊思)
R2317–Wan Pak Kin (溫柏堅)
R2427/C620–Ip Yu Cheung (葉裕祥)
R2443/C143–Yeung Shuk Kwan (楊淑君)
R2475–Leung Tat Fung (梁達峰)
R2485/C50–Cheung Shing Chi (張盛志)
R2537–Liu Nanxi (劉南茜)
R2539–Chung Him Yau (鍾謙柔)
R2546/C41–Li Ho Wah (李浩華)
R2572–Shum Ching Ki Jade (岑靖淇)
R2576/C64–Wong Wai Kit (王偉傑)
R2588–Wong Yuk Ching (黃玉清)
R2599/C593–Choy Pik Kwan (蔡碧君)
R2672–Su Yim Lei (蘇豔梨)
R2694–Chung Chi Ching (鍾梓澄)
R2708–Ma Chor Man (馬楚雯)
R2714–Chung Yiu Fai (鍾耀輝)
R2740–Chan Ming Sum (陳明心)
R3125–Lee Po Yee (李寶夷)

- R3134–Wong Pui Fung (黃培烽)
R3140–Chan Ka Wai (陳家偉)
R3151–Yeung Yuk Fai (楊育輝)
R3185/C198–Wong Kin Leung (黃健樑)
R3221/C603–Lam Sim Hing (林嬋卿)
R3223/C437–Lam Sim Ching (林嬋貞)
R3230–Lai Kam Ming (黎錦明)
R3259–Lam Sung Hing (林宋卿)
R3260–Lam Man Kuen (林曼君)
R3262–林長運
R3261–Liu Yuen Ting (廖婉婷)
R3263–Liu Yuen Shan (廖婉嫻)
R3265–Lam Cheung To (林長到)
R3283/C1571–Wong Ching Ki (黃正基)
R3286–周淑儀
R3297–Lam Chi Ming (林志明)
R3298–Chem Wan Ting (詹韻婷)
R3312/C555–Wong Mei Kuen (王美娟)
R3313–Chan Ka Wai (陳嘉偉)
R3314–Chan Kin Yip (陳建業)
R3315–Chan Ka Sing (陳嘉勝)
R3320–Lau Kei Kwan (劉紀均)
R3323–Cheng Chai Fung (鄭齊鳳)
R3332–Ip Wai Fung (葉煒鋒)
R3344–王美玲
R3374–Chan Wai (陳偉)
R3619/C21–Ko Man Lung (高文龍)
R3621–Ko Man Kit (高文傑)
R3709–Wong Wing Yee (黃穎怡)
R3731–Mak Ka Hei (麥嘉熙)
R3762/C818–Wong Man Ching Venice (黃敏貞)

R3829–Wong Mei Fong (王美芳)
R4512–Wong Hang Yin (王幸妍)
R5512–Wong Heung Wing (王响榮)
C69–Ng Wai Ching (吳慧楨)
C106–Ho Ka Yan (何家欣)
C116–Wong Fung Yan (黃鳳欣)
C200–Cheung Yuk Tai (張玉娣)
C201–Wong Sik Yin (王適妍)
C340–Chan Lai Fan (陳麗芬)
C344–Tse Kam Wing (謝錦榮)
C351–Chung Wai Yi (鍾慧怡)
C353–Ma Wai Leong (馬偉亮)
C419–Wong Wai Fung Frankie (黃偉鋒)
C429–Kwok Kam Mun Leslie (郭金滿)
C480–Wong Tik Sze (王狄詩)
C481–Suen Wing Yan (孫詠茵)
C528–Wong Tik Sum (王狄森)
C553–Lau Chi Fai (劉志輝)
C608–Wu Man Hong Manfred (胡文康)
C615–Wong Ying Sau (王映秀)
C635–Shing Kwok Hung (成國雄)
C802–Choi Pak Hang (蔡栢鏗)
C807–Chik Tung Ming (植棟明)
C808–Lo Wai See (盧慧斯)
C819–Lam Chung Hei Owen (林頌曦)
C828–Ng Sui Ming (吳瑞明)
C832–Leung Yui Hin (梁睿軒)
C837–Chan Lap Kei (陳立基)
C928–Ng Kwan Yin (吳鈞然)
C1138–Wu Ka Man Carman (鄔嘉敏)
C1313–Ying Shan Shan (邢珊珊)

C1363–Leung Kin Wai Jerry (梁健偉)

C1434–Sin Wing Sze (單詠詩)

C1484–Mak Tsun Ho (麥浚豪)

Mr Ko Man Lung] Representers, Commenters and
Mr Lam Kim Por] Representers' and Commenters'
Mr Wong Ching Ki] Representatives
Ms Wong Man Ching Venice]
Mr Wong Cheuk Hung] Representers and Representers'
Mr Wong Siu Kit] and Commenters' Representatives
Mr Wong Yuk Hong]
Ms Sze Kai Mui]
Mr Wong Ping Fat] Commenters and Representers'
Mr Leung Yui Hin] and Commenters' Representatives
Mr Ng Cheuk Hang] Representers' and Commenters'
Mr Cheung Chun Ming] Representatives

47. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments and encouraged them to stay for the question and answer session.

R1536 – Au Kwok Kuen

48. Mr Au Kwok Kuen, Yuen Long District Council member, made the following main points:

- (a) he spoke in the capacity of Land Justice League's member and opposed all amendment items, in particular Item G;
- (b) noting that the Board had agreed to the development of Northeast New Territories New Development Area (NENT NDA) with more than 40,000 adverse representations/comments received, he believed that the Board would likely ignore the 8,000 adverse representations/comments received on the MOS OZP and allowed the proposed developments under the

amendment items;

- (c) development would usually result in the loss of a lot of flora and fauna and affect biodiversity. He visited the Kwu Tung North NDA recently and spotted many dead bodies of *Civets* (果子狸) in the works area;
- (d) Site G was very green and was home of many animals. Development thereat would reduce the greenery and exacerbate global warming. Felling a lot of trees and killing a lot of animals for development at Site G, which was very close to MOSCP, were not worthy;
- (e) PlanD should carry out a counting survey on the occurrence of individual animal species at Site G; and
- (f) he alleged that the private housing development at Site G was to facilitate the implementation of another private development to its further southeast (application No. A/MOS/65). The Board should not agree to Item G, and the Government should resume the land under application No. A/MOS/65 to help reduce global warming.

R84/C12 – Ma On Shan Village Concern Group

(which also represented 128 representers/commenters as listed in paragraph 46 above)

49. Mr Ko Man Lung made the following main points:

- (a) he grew up in MOST and was a villager of the Mid-Level District of MOST, i.e. Site G, which was proposed to be cleared for development;
- (b) the Mid-Level District of MOST had a history of about 70 years, and was a mining village for the Mine. All villagers, including himself, were descendants of miners from Chiu Chow. Villagers had a common language, the Chiu Chow dialect, and worshipped the same Gods, the Earth God of Heaven (天德大帝) and the Monkey King (齊天大聖). Like an indigenous village, villagers had a harmonious relationship with one

another;

- (c) his father passed away two years ago, but his mother still lived in the village. The village was his root, and a place holding his family together. If it was cleared, his family would fall apart. He felt obliged to defend the place;
- (d) MOST was an inseparable part of the history of the Mine. It extended from the Peak District, Ma On Bridge District, Mid-level District to the Pier District. Unfortunately, the Pier District had already been cleared and developed into Heng On Estate and Yiu On Estate. Clearance of the Mid-Level District of MOST would affect the integrity of the Mine's history;
- (e) the Mid-Level District of MOST was located in barren uplands and lacked infrastructural support. The Government's proposal to construct a viaduct to access Sites F and G, instead of widening the existing MOST Road, was not only cost-ineffective, but would also adversely affect the history of the Mine and the nearby MOSCP. There was neither detailed study nor proper consultation conducted for Item G. He doubted whether there was indeed no better site available for housing development;
- (f) he further queried whether the Government was assisting developers to seize their land; and
- (g) the Mine was the largest mine in the territory. Instead of residential development, the Government should consider developing the Mid-Level District of MOST into a tourist attraction to preserve its history and the way of living of the existing villagers, on a model similar to Jiufen in Taiwan.

50. Mr Wong Ping Fat made the following main points and showed some photos of his family's village life with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

- (a) he grew up in MOST and was still a villager there. The school he studied

in had become the Evangelical Lutheran Church Hong Kong (ELCHK) Grace Youth Camp (基督教香港信義會恩青營(鞍山探索館)), which was a gathering place for villagers/alumni;

- (b) his father, a shotfirer who worked in the Mine, died of *Pneumoconiosis* (肺積塵) in the 1970s. His mother, 91 years old, still lived and farmed in MOST; and
- (c) MOST was an epitome of their society. There were all kinds of celebration of traditional Chinese festivals. Villagers of MOST were close and would not only share home-made traditional food like Chiu Chow stuffed tea cake (茶粿) and turnip cake (蘿蔔糕), but also the recipes and skills in cooking them.

51. Mr Wong Siu Kit made the following main points and showed photos of his family with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

- (a) he grew up in MOST, but moved out to start his own family upon adulthood;
- (b) his father was also a miner from the Mainland. His father went back to the Mainland to marry his mother after settling down in the village;
- (c) his 80-year-old mother still lived in MOST. He never had to worry about his mother, knowing for sure that the neighbours would help taking care of her. He would retire in two years, and originally planned to move back to the village to take care of his mother. The OZP amendment jeopardised his plan; and
- (d) he did not recall any help or welfare provided by the Government to MOST villagers. Churches, on the other hand, provided much services, like education, in MOST regardless of whether the villagers were Christians or not.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang joined this session of the meeting during Mr Wong's presentation.]

[Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung joined and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

52. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wong Yuk Hong made the following main points:

- (a) the Ma On Shan Village Concern Group (MOSVCG) had obtained a fairly large number of authorisation to present its views to the Board, but had no intention to filibuster. Noting the long-term implications of the amendment items of the OZP and the widespread public concern they attracted, MOSVCG wanted to ensure that sufficient time was allocated for the public to voice out their concerns;
- (b) MOSVCG organised two eco-tours before the representation hearing. The eco-tour included an hour's tour of the structures of the Mine like the 110ML Entrance and the Minerals Preparation Plant, an hour's tour around the Mid-Level District of MOST and Shun Yee San Tsuen, and an hour's dialogue with the villagers. Many of the participants supported conservation of the Mine and had authorised MOSVCG to speak on their behalf;
- (c) if the OZP amendments were published a little earlier, those surviving miners back then could have told the Board their stories personally;
- (d) the photos shown in MOSVCG's PowerPoint presentation were personal collections of the villagers. If MOST was cleared, villagers might not have enough space in their new homes to store those and other memorable items, which would be buried beneath the new housing development; and
- (e) on the personal level, he was the grandson of a miner. His grandfather, like most miners, was poor and had no money to build his own house,

and had to live in another villager's pigsty after marriage.

53. Mr Wong Yuk Hong and Mr Leung Yui Hin went on to play a video clip of an interview with a MOST villager and four audio recordings of interviews with MOSVCG's eco-tour participants, without revealing the identity of the persons in the video clip and audio recordings, which covered the following main points:

Video Clip

- (a) the lady grew up in the Mid-Level District of MOST;
- (b) like most villagers, she was born in the village as it was far away from hospitals/clinics;
- (c) when she was small, her family had to live in the kitchen of another villager. Village life was tough but fun;
- (d) almost all residents of the Mid-Level District of MOST were from Chiu Chow. Villagers celebrated traditional Chinese festivals together happily;
- (e) the Mine was vital to the territory's development as the Japanese-run iron mine had trained many shotfirers and technicians, who in turn participated in infrastructural projects like the Lion Rock Tunnel;
- (f) the Mine, including the associated MOST, should be preserved as a whole as a tourist attraction. If the Mid-Level District of MOST was cleared for housing development, the integrity of the mining culture would be compromised;
- (g) the Mid-Level District of MOST was a small valley with little development potential. The construction works of the housing development would destroy the backyard of MOS;
- (h) there were many precious wild animals like *Red Muntjac* (赤麂) and

Porcupine (箭豬) in the area, and the proposed housing development would take away the habitat of those animals;

- (i) she did not receive any consultation letter or notice regarding the clearance of the Mid-Level District of MOST;
- (j) every city needed a buffer zone between development and non-development areas. Housing development at Site G was not compatible with MOSCP across the road as country park visitors would not want a housing development right next to their recreational outlet, while residents of the housing development would be affected by the nuisance of recreational activities in the country park;

Audio Recordings

- (k) the Mine was not only part of the territory's mining history, but part of Hong Kong people's collective history as well;
- (l) people living in the Mid-Level District of MOST were connected to the Mine and were an integral part of the mine's history;
- (m) there was a need to conserve the Mid-Level District of MOST together with the Mine;
- (n) historical value was more important than development. Urban development should not destroy the history of Hong Kong;
- (o) housing development in the Mid-Level District of MOST was not economical in view of the heavy investment in infrastructural support for about 1,000 housing units only;
- (p) driving villagers away for housing development was putting the cart before the horse;

- (q) the Government had not provided support to the villagers in the mining days, and therefore should not ask the villagers to leave go of their homeplace and contribute to the territory's housing supply;
- (r) the future housing development at Site G would not benefit the locals as the villagers could not afford the housing units;
- (s) public consultation on the amendment items of the OZP should have been done more properly; and
- (t) the Government should exercise its discretion when clearing Site G.

[Professor John C.Y. Ng left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

54. In response to a matter concerning meeting procedures raised by a Member, the Chairperson pointed out that sections 6, 6A and 6B of the Town Planning Ordinance stipulated that only persons who had submitted written representation or comment were entitled to be heard, either in person or by an authorised representative during the Board's representation hearing meeting. While the Board had no practical means of ascertaining whether persons appearing in the video clip and audio recordings presented by MOSVCG at the subject hearing were representers/commenters or not, the Board had already exercised some flexibility in accommodating the presentation of those videos. Noting that the contents of the videos were getting repetitive, the Chairperson encouraged MOSVCG not to repeat those points which had already been made. The Chairperson further suggested MOSVCG to focus on issues which had not yet been touched upon by the concern group, like the number of households in MOST and their composition, whether there was any annual gathering/event held in MOST in memory of the Mine, and the relationship between Shun Yee San Tsuen and the Mid-Level District of MOST.

55. Mr Ng Cheuk Hang responded that repetition was inevitable owing to the thousands of representers/commenters involved. Such repetition reflected that many people were against the amendment items of the OZP. MOSVCG considered that all public views were important and must be heard. Otherwise, the purpose of the hearing would be defeated.

[Professor John C.Y. Ng rejoined this session of the meeting at this point.]

56. Ms Mary Mulvihill remarked that the Chairperson's suggestion for the representers and commenters to provide information on the number of households in MOST was an indication that proper consultation had not been conducted, and that proper research into the conditions of Site G had not been undertaken.

57. The Chairperson responded that the statutory plan publication process was in itself part of the public consultation process. Whilst the Government would carry out household surveys in the area, residents of MOST could also provide the available information in hand, if any, for Members' reference. The Chairperson considered it appropriate for the Board to ask questions during the hearing to supplement the written and oral submissions of representers/commenters. She urged those attending the hearing sessions to avoid repetition of points already made.

58. Mr Ng Cheuk Hang made the following main points:

- (a) MOST should be viewed as a whole rather than four physically separate villages. There were many activities in MOST such as animal rearing, handicraft and convenience stores;
- (b) although the iron mine had long been closed down, mining was a collective life experience of the villagers, and the Mine and MOST should be preserved like the Blue House in Wan Chai and its villagers should be allowed to stay;
- (c) the iron mine's history was connected not only to Hong Kong, but to the Mainland, Asia and the World as well. The World War II, Korean War and Vietnam War resulted in an increase in demand for steel, which in turn, caused the rise and fall of the mine;
- (d) while there were views that MOST should be cleared as soon as possible

for the much needed housing development since the land was under Government's ownership, MOST villagers had invested money in building their houses, pigsties, etc., and had a legitimate expectation to continue living in their houses forever;

- (e) the enhancements to ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for Government's development-related clearance exercises introduced in May 2018 could not address the villagers' expectation to preserve their present lifestyle;
- (f) there were many elderlies in MOST, and the removal process would be a torture to them. Besides, the rehousing units would be smaller than the existing houses in MOST, which represented a reduction in their living quality;
- (g) there was much injustice in land allocation in Hong Kong;
- (h) there were numerous more accessible locations for the development of the 1,040 private housing units. There was no need for housing development at the fringe of MOSCP;
- (i) heritage conservation in Hong Kong focused mainly on indigenous/fishing villages. There was no systematic study on non-indigenous/squatter villages except MOST. Many universities had studied the area extensively, and the Sha Tin District Council (STDC) had published a book titled 《鞍山歲月：馬鞍山風物誌》 in 2002. PlanD should carry out a study on non-indigenous villages;
- (j) MOSVCG objected to residential development at Site G and proposed to rezone the site to "Other Specified Use" annotated "Living Museum" or "Local Tourism"; and
- (k) the public consultation process should be reviewed.

59. Mr Leung Yui Hin played the remainder of the audio recordings, which covered the following main points:

- (a) the Government should develop brownfield sites, and leave the “GB” zones untouched;
- (b) housing shortage should not be an excuse to develop the “GB” zones;
- (c) residential development at Site G would damage the natural environment;
- (d) the Government did not manage Hong Kong’s land resources properly;
- (e) the Government should respect squatter villagers’ rights just like indigenous villagers’ rights;
- (f) as miners contributed to Hong Kong’s prosperity, the Government should be more humane and compensate the miners for their hardship;
- (g) high-rise development near the 110ML Entrance was unreasonable;
- (h) there were safety issues associated with development near disused mines;
- (i) history and culture could not be quantified;
- (j) MOST villagers should open up their houses for the public to appreciate the mining history; and
- (k) the people-land connection of MOST should also be conserved.

60. Mr Leung Yui Hin made the following main points with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation:

History of the Mine and MOST

- (a) history could not be passed on without people to tell it. People who lacked interest in the history of their own place had no sense of belonging to the place;
- (b) the history of the Mine started with the discovery of an iron ore in MOS in 1905 and ended in 1976 with the closure of the mine;
- (c) the iron mine witnessed wars and turmoil in the region, and miners were mostly refugees from the Mainland. Miners were poor but helpful and assiduous, and helped one another to build houses using junk ore and soil from rivers when they were off work;
- (d) houses were usually built against slopes to save construction materials. Due to the use of junk ore, the walls were usually thick and irregular. The original roofs were made of asbestos, which were later replaced by tiles. Pig rearing was common among villagers. The kitchen of the house, where both human food and pigswill were prepared, was usually detached/semi-detached and linked to the house by a covered walkway;
- (e) Lam and Wong were the major surnames of villagers in the Mid-Level District of MOST;
- (f) MOST comprised four villages, all emerged and evolved due to the Mine. All villagers settled there because of the iron mine, and were hence part of the mine's history. Driving people out of a historical site and leaving all the historical buildings behind was not in line with the principle of conservation;

Conservation

- (g) conservation was no less important than housing development. Hong Kong's conservation efforts were subpar in that most historical buildings/sites had already been lost to development over the years. Even the graded explosives storeroom of the Mine was nearly demolished

by the Lands Department's Squatter Control Unit;

- (h) MOST complied with some of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)'s selection criteria for a cultural heritage. Specifically, it borne/was:
 - (i) "a unique or at least an exceptional testimony to a cultural tradition or to a civilisation which is living or which has disappeared";
 - (ii) "an outstanding example of a type of building, architectural or technological ensemble or landscape which illustrates (a) significant stage(s) in human history"; and
 - (iii) "an outstanding example of a traditional human settlement, land-use, or sea-use which is representative of a culture (or cultures), or human interaction with the environment especially when it has become vulnerable under the impact of irreversible change";
- (i) whilst the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had graded a number of buildings of the Mine, some structures, including the catchwater within the Mid-Level District of MOST, a water tank and a control room, were ungraded. If the zoning amendments were approved without a thorough investigation, there could be irreversible damage(s) to the relics of the Mine;
- (j) tourism was an important economic pillar of the territory, and yet there were few local historical attractions. The Mine, and its mining villages could fill this gap. There were in fact previous proposals to conserve MOST's cultural heritage and to set up a geological park in MOS. It was disappointing that those proposals were dropped;

The Amendment Items

- (k) the Government's technical assessments for the amendment items

demonstrated that there would be serious congestion at critical junctions and sections of roads, and felling of over 3,000 trees;

- (l) it was ironic that after spending some \$16 million to carry out a feasibility study for residential development at Site G for over 10 years, the Board/the Government still knew very little about the relationship between the Mine and MOST, and what cultural heritage was within the Mid-Level District of MOST. It was premature to decide on Item G without a thorough knowledge of MOST's cultural heritage value; and

Statutory Plan-Making Process

- (m) the representation and comment process was unnecessarily complicated. Specifically, commenters were required to fill in a complicated form, specify the particular representation(s) that they were commenting on, and make comments on specific views expressed in the representation(s). The complicated process had restricted the public's participation in the statutory plan-making process.

[Dr Roger C.K. Chan left this session of the meeting during Mr Leung's presentation.]

[Mr Peter K.T. Yuen left this session of the meeting at this point.]

61. As the presentations of 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, and their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer the question. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Procedural Propriety

62. Noting Mr Lam Chun Fung (R3258)'s allegation made in the morning session

that Items D to G did not follow the proper zoning amendment procedures, two Members requested PlanD to clarify the procedural propriety issue of the said amendment items. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the established public consultation procedures for OZP amendments had been followed as detailed in paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2 of the Paper;
- (b) in particular, the Development and Housing Committee of Sha Tin District Council (STDC) was consulted on 30.6.2020 and 3.7.2020, and the Planning, Housing and Works Committee of Tai Po District Council on 14.7.2020. At the request of a STDC member, a meeting with the representatives of MOST was also held on 13.7.2020;
- (c) the proposed amendments were then submitted to RNTPC of the Board for agreement on 21.8.2020 and 18.9.2020, and the OZP amendments were gazetted on 16.10.2020. The publication of statutory plan for representation and comment was in itself part of the public consultation process. Upon completion of the representation hearing process, the Board was obliged to submit the draft OZP together with the representations and comments to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for a final decision; and
- (d) there was no procedural impropriety in relation to the amendment items. Items D to G were zoning amendments supported by technical assessments and were published for public inspection following the statutory plan-making process.

Rationale for Residential Development at Site G

63. A Member enquired about the rationale for rezoning Site G for residential development. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following main points with the aid of the visualiser:

- (a) there was a need to increase the land supply for housing development;
- (b) Site G was in close proximity to the built-up areas and accessible via MOST Road;
- (c) according to the Preliminary Environmental Study conducted under the Engineering Feasibility Study, the plantation area in the middle part of Site G had low ecological value;
- (d) as shown in the photos of Site G taken by PlanD, temporary structures/buildings in Site G were similar to those in other parts of the New Territories;
- (e) according to AMO, there was no graded historic building/structure and no building pending grading assessment at Site G at the moment; and
- (f) all in all, Site G was in line with the selection criteria for “GB” review.

Upgrading of MOST Road

64. Regarding a representer’s allegation that the upgrading of MOST Road was to facilitate a private development to the further southeast of Item G, some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed upgrading of MOST Road would indeed facilitate any other private developments in the area;
- (b) the alignments of the upgrading of MOST Road and the access road to the said private development; and
- (c) whether the existing MOST Road could meet the daily needs of the villagers of MOST.

65. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following main

points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the upgrading of MOST Road by the Government was required to support the proposed developments at Sites C to G. The private development in question was the subject of a planning application No. A/MOS/65 which was approved by RNTPC of the Board in 2005. A land exchange application including the associated road scheme to improve and widen MOST Road in connection to the application was submitted to LandsD. The associated road scheme was gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance in 2008. Due to title issues, the processing of the land exchange application was however terminated in 2014 and had not been approved. Hence, the associated road scheme had not been authorised either. There was no agreement between the Government and the project proponent of the said private development; and
- (b) the alignment of the upgrading of MOST Road only partially overlapped with the access road to the concerned private development.

66. The Chairperson supplemented that it was only normal and understandable for infrastructural projects prompted by new developments to bring convenience to a wider area served by an inter-connected infrastructural network. The onset of such positive impact should not be viewed as collusion. If the Government were to hold back worthy projects on the ground of such unfounded allegations, no development in the territory would be possible.

67. As to whether the existing MOST Road was sufficient to serve the local villagers, Messrs Leung Yui Hin, Ng Cheuk Hang, Wong Yuk Hong and Wong Cheuk Hung made the following main points:

- (a) MOSVCG objected to the upgrading of MOST Road. MOST Road was enclosed by the “GB” zone and the country park and encroachment onto either was undesirable. Without Item G, upgrading of MOST Road would not be needed;

- (b) the existing MOST Road was sufficient to cater for the transport needs of both the MOST residents and country park visitors. There was no need for such extensive road widening;
- (c) hikers and visitors of the MOSCP would generally prefer a more natural path to a widened road. Besides, the works area of the road project would be potentially larger and would encroach onto more greenery due to the need to maintain traffic on the existing MOST Road in the interim; and
- (d) the existing traffic problem in MOST, mainly illegal parking, was essentially a traffic management issue as there was no control on vehicular entry to the area.

68. Ms Sze Kai Mui added that the Government's proposal to upgrade MOST Road by constructing a viaduct was both expensive and unnecessary. She said that even the applicant of application No. A/MOS/65 only proposed to widen MOST Road in-situ, which would not affect the graded buildings.

Geotechnical Issue

69. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether Ms Sze Kai Mui (R3788) had any mining tunnel map or not; and
- (b) whether the web of mining tunnels in the area would render Site G unsuitable/unsafe for development.

70. In response, Ms Sze Kai Mui made the following main points:

- (a) whilst she had no mining tunnel map, her father-in-law was the driver of the electric locomotive inside the mining tunnels; and

- (b) the mining tunnels were like a spider web, and the Government had not sent anyone down to map out and assess the geological conditions therein. No geotechnical impact assessment had been carried out, either. Given that the hill was observed to have partially collapsed already, further piling in the vicinity would cause the entire hill to collapse. The safety risk was not worth it.

71. In response, Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD made the following main points with the aid of the visualiser:

- (a) the series of mining tunnels (between 240ML and 144ML) mentioned by representer No. R3788 were located in the Peak District of MOST which was about 2km from Sites D and E, and 1.1km from Site G. It was unlikely that construction works of Items D to G would affect the geotechnical stability of those mining tunnels;
- (b) in 2017, the Geotechnical Engineering Office of CEDD conducted an assessment of the preliminary feasibility of cavern development, at the mountain where Sites D to G were located, and found that it was technically feasible. The 110ML Tunnel had already been taken into consideration in the assessment; and
- (c) CEDD had conducted a preliminary geotechnical appraisal (GA) for Sites D to G using borehole logs and geotechnical records of nearby areas. The GA concluded that the carrying out of site formation and building works at Sites D to G would not result in any insurmountable problem.

Heritage Conservation

72. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the seven spots for conservation identified by the representers would be affected by the proposed development, and whether those structures/buildings on the seven spots had been assessed but remained

ungraded, or had not yet been assessed;

- (b) whether the Government would abandon the amendment items if insurmountable problems were identified by the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), and which authority was responsible for deciding the fate of graded buildings on Government land (GL) but not built by the Government;
- (c) the reason why the HIA was not conducted before the plan publication; and
- (d) whether the buildings were graded individually or on an area basis.

73. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the seven spots for conservation identified by the representers fell within CEDD's works limit. While there was no information at hand on whether the structures/buildings on the seven spots had been assessed by AMO, those spots remained without grading at the moment;
- (b) if the draft OZP together with the amendment items were approved by CE in C, relevant government departments would proceed with the detailed design and a HIA would be conducted. Ungraded buildings/structures within the works limit would also be assessed under the HIA and the findings would be submitted to AMO and AAB for consideration; and
- (c) AMO had taken a holistic approach in the historic building grading assessment exercise, and there were six assessment criteria – historical interest, architectural merit, group value, social value and local interest, authenticity, and rarity. None of the structures of the Mine was included in the list of 1,444 Historic Buildings when it was published for consultation. During the consultation period, new items were proposed by the public for AMO's assessment, and the grading results were

published in 2016. The historic buildings of the Mine were graded in 2016. In any case, the existing graded buildings would not be affected by the amendment items. The amendment items would not encroach onto any graded historic buildings/structures except a pier of the Mineral Preparation Plant, which was a Grade 3 historic building (i.e. buildings of some merit; preservation in some form would be desirable and alternative means should be considered if preservation was not practicable). In light of the above, AMO considered that a HIA could be conducted at the detailed design stage to determine how best to conserve historic buildings while allowing development to meet the community's needs.

74. Mr Gabriel T.O. Woo, PTL/H, CEDD supplemented the following main points with the aid of the visualiser:

- (a) there were a few graded buildings which would be preserved on site but located within the works limit near the 110ML Tunnel Entrance, and CEDD would ensure that they would not be adversely affected during the site formation and infrastructure works;
- (b) CEDD would adopt a viaduct design for the relevant section of the upgraded MOST Road to avoid encroachment onto the relics of the Mineral Preparation Plant. The alignment of the proposed road would also be adjusted in the coming detailed design to avoid a graded water tank; and
- (c) there was an existing hiking trail to the southwest of the plant from which the Mineral Preparation Plant could be viewed.

75. Mr Wong Yuk Hong supplemented that it was ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) which led AMO to assess the structures of the Mine, but during the process, ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp) missed out some structures. Therefore, the seven spots for conservation were brought to the attention of the Board. To his knowledge, those spots proposed for conservation had not been assessed by AMO. He also expressed concern that the funnel through which iron ore was dropped into the Mineral Preparation Plant

would no longer be visible after the viaduct had been built.

76. Regarding the grading mechanism of historic buildings, a Member advised the meeting that if a building had been nominated and assessed but did not meet the assessment criteria, it would be recorded as “not graded” in the list. The buildings were individually graded in 2016, and hence there were proposals to adopt a “point-line-plane” approach for heritage conservation. Another Member supplemented that in addition to the list of graded historic buildings in 2016, the public might propose any buildings for AMO’s assessment. Even for the graded historic buildings, the public could also propose a review of the grading.

77. With respect to the arrangement for the graded historic buildings on GL, the Chairperson supplemented that the Government had an established scheme seeking to revitalise graded buildings on GL. The Government also launched a funding scheme with \$1 billion to support the use of vacant government sites/premises, regardless of whether the premises were historic buildings or not, if non-government organisations were interested in revitalising those sites/premises.

78. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) conservation efforts made by MOST residents;
- (b) noting MOSVCG’s proposal to open up villagers’ houses for the public to appreciate the mining history, whether the four villages of MOST had discussed about and agreed on such proposal; and
- (c) if the Government came up with a hybrid proposal of heritage conservation and development, whether MOST residents would consider.

79. In response, Mr Wong Yuk Hong, Mr Ko Man Lung and Ms Sze Kai Mui made the following main points:

- (a) MOSVCG currently jointly organised eco-tours to the area with ELCHK (Grace Youth Camp). MOST villagers were very eager to tell their stories

and welcomed tour participants to visit their homes. As the cooking skills of traditional Chiu Chow food should also be preserved and passed on, MOSVCG planned to organise workshops on cooking Chiu Chow traditional food in future;

- (b) residents of all four villages of MOST had discussed among themselves and agreed to revitalise the area; and
- (c) the Government should encourage the villagers to stay in MOST to pass on the area's history. While villagers of MOST were open-minded to any concrete development cum conservation proposal that the Government might come up with on the premise of no village clearance, the hypothetical proposal lacked details and was too vague.

80. Mr Lam Chun Fung supplemented that MOST was different from indigenous villages in that it was a naturally formed mining community. While the land was under the Government's ownership, villagers had a right to claim adverse possession of the land. MOST should be preserved as a whole.

[Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

Uniqueness of MOST

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

- (a) which part(s) of Chiu Chow the residents of MOST mainly came from, and whether Chiu Chow people and their houses in MOST bore any differences with those in other parts of Hong Kong or South China;
- (b) noting that there were Chiu Chow settlements in many parts of Hong Kong, whether there was anything unique/special about the Mid-Level District of MOST's Chiu Chow culture, in particular, any mining-related tradition that was still retained in the village;

- (c) who were the gods or goddesses being worshipped in MOST's temple for protection of the miners in the old days;
- (d) whether women were forbidden to enter the mine; and
- (e) noting MOSVCG's claim that the four villages of MOST should be viewed as one, whether there were any joint activities of the four villages such as festive celebrations or road repairs.

82. In response, Messrs Ko Man Lung, Wong Yuk Hong, Lam Kim Por and Wong Cheuk Hung made the following main points:

- (a) Mr Ko came from Jiayang and some villagers came from Jiexi and Puning. Residents in the Mid-Level District of MOST were descendants of Chiu Chow miners who were different from Chiu Chow businessmen, say in Kowloon City. Residents in MOST shared and exchanged their agricultural produce and there was no business element involved;
- (b) Chiu Chow people were particularly industrious, united and helpful, and this culture alone was worth preserving. Rituals were performed in the temple during festive seasons which the concern group would talk more about during the session of the meeting on 12.7.2021;
- (c) all residents of the Mid-Level District of MOST would gather at the temple to celebrate the Hungry Ghost Festival (盂蘭節) and the Birthday of Earth God of Heaven (伯公誕), etc. If the Mid-Level District of MOST was cleared, villagers could no longer worship their Gods;
- (d) according to Mr Ko's knowledge, women were not allowed to enter the mine though he was not very sure;
- (e) while houses in MOST were built with junk ore, houses in other parts of the territory were built with concrete. The detached/semi-detached kitchen was also a special feature of houses in MOST. Such built form

was worth preserving; and

- (f) MOST Road was currently maintained by Mutual Mining & Trading Company. Since the mine was closed down in 1976, the Government did not take over the maintenance of MOST Road, and any damage to the road was repaired by the residents of the four villages of MOST. Regular gatherings/events were held among the four villages such as Christmas party and welfare activities for the elderly (handing out rice to the elderly for free).

83. Mr Lam Chun Fung supplemented that houses in MOST were usually built against slopes following the topography. He considered such unique building style to be a kind of heritage which should be preserved.

84. As regards the joint activities held among the four villages, Ms Sze Kai Mui supplemented that some villagers would hand out homemade rice cake during Chinese New Year, while she handed out face masks to every household in MOST for free during the pandemic.

Social Impact Assessment

85. A Member asked the reason why a social impact assessment (SIA) was not conducted for Item G, and whether it would be conducted after the Board had made a decision on Item G. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, PlanD said that in general, no SIA would be conducted for the potential housing sites identified under the “GB” review. As Site G fell entirely on GL, there were established mechanisms to clear the land if CE in C finally agreed to proceed with the proposed development.

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

86. As Members had no further questions 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 the hearing session was completed

and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives and government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

87. The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.