

**Minutes of 1273rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.6.2022**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Prof Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr Gary C.H. Wong (a.m.)

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung (p.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Au

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

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Assistant Director (Regional 3)
Lands Department
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (a.m.)

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Kitty S.T. Lam (a.m.)

Ms Katherine H.Y. Wong (p.m.)

Opening Remarks

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1271st Meeting

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1271st meeting were sent to members before the meeting. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members on or before 20.6.2022, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes were confirmed on 20.6.2022 without amendments.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans

2. The Secretary reported that on 31.5.2022, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (re-numbered as No. S/K9/28) and the draft Urban Renewal Authority To Kwa Wan Road/Wing Kwong Street Development Scheme Plan (DSP) (re-numbered as No. S/K9/URA3/2) under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). On 31.5.2022, the CE in C also approved the draft Kwai Chung OZP (re-numbered as No. S/KC/30) under section 9(2) of the Ordinance. The approval of the draft OZPs and DSP was notified in the Gazette on 10.6.2022.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 31.5.2022, the CE in C referred the approved Kwu Tung North OZP No. S/KTN/2 and the approved Fanling North OZP No. S/FLN/2 to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Ordinance. The reference back of the two OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 10.6.2022.

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K22/7

(TPB Paper No. 10842)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

4. The Secretary reported that the amendments involved rezoning proposals in Kai Tak that were supported by the Study on Further Review of Land Use in Kai Tak Development (the Review Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as one of the consultants. Amendment Items J1 and J2 for development of a proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) were supported by a feasibility study with AECOM as one of the consultants. Amendment Item I was to take forward the decision of a section 12A application (application No. Y/K22/3), with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup) being one of the consultants of the applicant. Representations/comments had been submitted by HKHS (R1/C1) and the Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. (R51) (a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Co. Limited (HLD)). The following Members had declared interests on the items:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung (as Director of Planning)	-	being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
---	---	--

- Mr Andrew C.W. Lai (as Director of Lands) - being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHS;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a member of HKHS;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS;
- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research project for CEDD, having past business dealings with AECOM and HLD, and being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD ;
- Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with ARUP;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a former member of the Council of Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before; and
- Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui - being an employee of HKU which had received donation from HLD before.

5. Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Timothy K.W. Ma and K.L. Wong had not yet joined the meeting. The interests of Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung and Andrew C.W. Lai were considered

direct on Amendment Items (Items) J1 and J2 and were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As Messrs Daniel K.S.Lau and Franklin Yu, Ms Lilian S.K. Law, Dr C.H. Hau and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui had no involvement in the amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and/or submission of the relevant representations and comments, 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 attend the hearing, but other than those who were present or had indicated that they would attend the hearing, the rest had either indicated not to attend or made no reply. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Vivian M.F. Lai - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K)

Mr Ernest C.M. Fung - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Ms Joyce L.M. Lee - Town Planner/Kowloon

CEDD

Mr George K.M. Mak - Chief Engineer/East Development Office 5 (CE/E5)

Mr Jason K.C. Wong - Senior Engineer

Mr Tim C.C. Lam - Senior Engineer

Ms Melissa Y.T. Wayne - Engineer

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Rick K.W. Liu - Chief Transport Officer (CTO)

Mr C.H. Chan - Senior Engineer (SE)

Mr Marco H.Y. Tai - Engineer

Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)

Mr Raymond S.P. Yu - Senior Engineer (SE)

AECOM

Mr Igor W.L. Ho]

Mr Steven C.W. Wong] Consultants

Mr David T.F. Wong]

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1/C1 – HKHS

Mr Oliver Lin Fat Law] Representer's and Commenter's

KTA Planning Ltd -] Representatives

Mr David Chi Wai Fok]

R8/C14 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

Mr Samuel Wan Kei Wong] Representer's and Commenter's
Representative

R9/C22 – The Real Estate Developers Association of Hong Kong (REDA)

C7 – Peter Wu

C10 – Ip Alison Wai Yi

C15 – Maggie Lau

C16 – Li Hon Yee

C18 – Yue Lit Fung Owen

Masterplan Ltd -

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representers' and/ or Commenters'
Ms Wong Oi Chu] Representatives

R10/C50 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R33/C12 – Lam Wang Kei

Mr Lam Wang Kei - Representer and Commenter

R43/C11 – Worldwide Cruise Terminals (Hong Kong) Limited

Mr Jeffrey Cowne Bent - Representer's and Commenter's
Representative

R47 – Lee Tsoi Yan

Ms Lee Tsoi Yan - Representer

R51 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

Mr Albert Chi Kong Leung] Representer's Representatives
Ms Wong Nga Wai]

R71 – 張景勛議員辦事處

Mr Cheung King Fan - Representer's Representative

R72 – 歐展文

Mr Au Chin Man - Representer

C2 – Chan Yan Chi

Mr Chan Yan Chi - Commenter

C40 – Chan Yin Hang Kuby

Mr Chui Wing Wah - Commenter's Representative

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters and their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer, commenter or his/her representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. 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 the representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ernest C.M. Fung, STP/K, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the draft OZP, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10842 (the Paper).

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

R1/C1 – HKHS

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David Chi Wai Fok made the following main points:

- (a) Items J1 and J2 which involved a site zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for a DRE were to meet the rehousing demands arising from government and/or urban renewal projects. The site area was about 8,500m² with maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6.5 and non-domestic PR of 1.0, maximum site coverage of 65% and maximum building height (BH) of 100mPD. There would be two housing blocks for subsidized sale flats (SSF) and one block for public rental housing providing about 1,100 units. Not less than 2,700m² public open space (POS) within the development and social welfare facilities with gross floor area (GFA) of about 2,770m² (i.e. 5% of the total domestic GFA) would be provided in the podium of one block with independent access at To Kwa Wan Road to facilitate access for users of Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities. The social welfare facilities to be provided were subject to advice of the Social Welfare Department (SWD), and the floor space for such facilities would be handed back to SWD upon completion of the housing developments. A total GFA of about 8,500m² would be provided for retail/dining, cultural/leisure uses including alfresco dining facilities facing the waterfront;
- (b) the BH of the proposed development was compatible with the stepped height profile of the area. The BH gradually decreased from the south at Grand Waterfront at 176mPD, to the subject site at 100mPD and to the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) at 70mPD. Greenery ratio would be maximised at not less than 30% to improve the lower level pedestrian environment as well as visual amenity. The proposed development could improve the pedestrian connectivity of the area by bringing people from Ma Tau Kok Road to the waterfront. With integration of alfresco dining facilities and POS of 2,700m² within the development, it would bring activities, vibrancy and liveliness to the waterfront, and create synergy amongst other recreation and dining facilities in the area. The HKHS would also design and construct a POS of about 7,700m² adjoining the site, which would be handed over to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department for management and maintenance. The POS would be connected to the KTSP as part of the planned ‘Dining Cove’ at the Kai Tak Waterfront;

- (c) regarding the public concerns, the proposed development would not breach the 20% building free zone of the ridgeline when viewed from the strategic viewpoint at Quarry Bay Park and a 15m-building separation would be provided to allow sea breeze blowing to the inner district. The air ventilation assessment also demonstrated no significant change to the annual and summer prevailing winds when comparing the development under the previous zoning and the proposed development. The Traffic Impact Assessment concluded that the analysed junctions, including To Kwa Wan Road and Ma Tau Chung Road, were expected to have sufficient capacity to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposed development. The proposed development was also well served by various public transport services including buses, minibuses and ferry. The site was within 500m walking distance from the MTR Sung Wong Toi Station. Regarding the gas safety concern, a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) on the risk levels associated with the Ma Tau Kok Gas Works (MTKGW) arising from developments within the 300m-Consultation Zone of the Potentially Hazardous Installation (PHI) of the MTKGW (including the proposed development on the site) was completed in 2021. The Coordinating Committee on Land-Use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations (CCPHI) had reviewed the QRA and concluded that the risk level was acceptable. As the planned population of the site was less than that adopted in the QRA, the proposed development would not adversely affect the risk levels as compared with the assessment in the endorsed QRA report;
- (d) it was expected that the OZP amendment process, land grant and approval of general building plans could be completed within 2022. Construction work was scheduled for commencement in 2023 and the whole development was expected to be completed in 2027; and
- (e) if Items J1 and J2 were supported by the Board, the proposed development would contribute to housing supply by meeting the rehousing demands and create a vibrant and attractive waterfront for public enjoyment.

R8/C14 – Designing Hong Kong Limited

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Samuel Wan Kei Wong made the following main points:

- (a) they supported Item K, opposed Items F, G and H, and provided comments on Items J1, J2 and L;

Item K – Kwun Tong Waterfront

- (b) Item K involved rezoning the Kwun Tong Ferry Pier (KTFP) from “Other Specified uses” annotated “Pier” (“OU(Pier)”) to “OU(Pier)(1)” with incorporation of ‘Institutional Use’ and ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ as Column 1 uses and was supported as it allowed greater usage at the pier for a more vibrant waterfront. Besides, it was suggested to include ‘Eating Place (Restaurant Only)’ and ‘Shop and Services (Fast Food Shop)’ as Column 1 uses with the conditions that the sewerage works at the site should be connected to the public sewerage system. Based on past experience from the ferry piers in Central and Hung Hom, the provision of restaurants and fast food shops would allow people to gather and make the pier area more vibrant. The revenue generated from such uses would also help cross-subsidise ferry services and fare;

Item L – Cha Kwo Ling Waterfront

- (c) rezoning a piece of land at Cha Kwo Ling Road (CKLR) along the waterfront from “Government, institution or community” (“G/IC”) to “Open Space” (“O”) was supported. The waterfront area should be well integrated with the future residential development (i.e. the Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen development) which fell within the Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong and Lei Yue Mun OZP. A wide deck across CKLR between the waterfront open space and the future residential development at Cha Kwo Ling was proposed. Convenient pedestrian access from the waterfront would allow the open space users to visit the retail and dining facilities in the Cha Kwo Ling Tsuen development;

Items J1 and J2 - DRE

- (d) the area covered by Items J1 and J2 was the focal point at the waterfront, which gave an opportunity to provide a vibrant and attractive public space for residents and tourists. The area was an entry point for visitors coming from To Kwa Wan to Kai Tak. It should be well planned including provision of alfresco dining which would not be jeopardised by the need to provide emergency vehicular access at the detailed design stage, as with many examples such as the Harbour North along the North Point waterfront. Relevant requirements should be incorporated in the lease conditions so as to realise the proposed alfresco dining. Besides, future residents of the DRE should be clearly informed beforehand that outdoor dining would be allowed within the development so as to avoid their possible complaints on noise and other potential nuisance as with the case at the Tseung Kwan O waterfront;
- (e) bicycle parking spaces and landing steps should be provided so that cycling and kaito services could become possible transportation mode to relieve the current road traffic pressure;

Items F, G and H – Sites at Runway Tip

- (f) Items F, G and H were opposed as rezoning the three sites at the Runway Precinct would weaken the originally planned developments at the former runway area including the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal (KTCT) and the future Tourism Node (TN). Tourists and visitors should experience more exciting entertainment at the Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT), but the rezoning would reduce the commercial elements and hence the attractiveness of the area. In fact, more commercial facilities should be provided there to attract both cruise passengers and visitors to enjoy the harbourfront, which would in turn attract investors to the area to ensure more vibrant and sustainable development at the KTRT;
- (g) increase in residential developments and population there would generate adverse traffic impact on Shing Fung Road. The original plan for commercial

activities at the runway would achieve a better balance of traffic flow during peak hours. The three sites should be rezoned back to “Commercial” (“C”). There should also be requirements for bicycle parking and storage space for water sports; and

Others

- (h) the alignment of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) should be retained and the Government should consider alternative transportation mode to support the increasing number of residents and tourists in future as the runway area was segregated from other developed area. Cycling and kaito services could be regarded as alternative options but would be affected by weather conditions. Electric bus/mini-bus was an environmentally friendly transportation mode with cleaner fuel but it could not help reduce the road traffic volume. The government should consider different transport modes to reduce road traffic.

R9/C22 – REDA

C7 – Peter Wu

C10 – Ip Alison Wai Yi

C15 – Maggie Lau

C16 – Li Hon Yee

C18 – Yue Lit Fung Owen

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) REDA’s submission was made in the broad interests of Hong Kong as a whole and in the interests of maintaining sustainable development;
- (b) in 2007, when the Kai Tak OZP was prepared for the ‘no reclamation option’ in response to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, REDA made a very comprehensive representation and separate submissions to the Government. REDA also invited the project director of the London Docklands Development

Corporation to address the Board on lessons relevant to Kai Tak. Some developers made representations and suggested to establish a development agency with a mission to bring a high quality urban space in the Kai Tak Development (KTD). Members of REDA also shared their experience in similar overseas projects. Part of the theme of the KTD was to identify space for high quality housing, provision of POS and other facilities. Commercial space could stimulate the growth of Hong Kong economy. The existing Central Business District (CBD) was fully developed, and the KTD provided an opportunity to develop a new CBD2 with international reputation, and the London Docklands was a good example. The KTD needed to be served by the EFLS so that road traffic could be minimized. Otherwise, the KTCT at the former runway tip would not be viable. However, those advice/suggestions had been ignored. A development agency to coordinate the KTD was not established. The provision of open space and community facilities had been progressively reduced and rezoned for other purposes due to short term market considerations. The current amendments to take away the sustainable transport mode and conversion of more commercial sites to residential use would compromise the vision of KTD;

Commercial sites along the Runway

- (c) the commercial elements in KTD had been much diluted. According to the footnote of paragraph 2.1 of the Paper, the main reasons to consider rezoning the site for residential use was due to weak market sentiment and cancellation of tenders for sale of two commercial sites at the runway area and one bundled commercial site at the north apron area during 2018 and 2020. In fact, when the sites were tendered in 2019 and 2020, nine bids and four bids were respectively submitted by interested tenderers but the Government considered that those offers did not reach their minimum offer price and removed the sites from sale. The key issue was that the Government had overestimated the property price that was not in line with the market conditions instead of developers having no interest in the commercial sites;

EFLS

- (d) the EFLS was an important part of the KTD planning and the alignment had been indicated on the statutory plan since 2007. Removal of the EFLS should be an amendment item to the OZP and be subject to representation/comment under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) so that the public would have opportunity to express their view on the matter. According to Section 4(1)(a) of the Ordinance, the Board's draft plans (i.e. statutory plans) prepared for the lay-out of any such area might show or make provision for streets, railways and other main communications. As such, the alignment of the EFLS as shown on the OZP must be part of the OZP with the same statutory status as other land use zones listed in the same section of the Ordinance. Besides, Items E2 and E3 also involved areas shown as 'Road' on the OZP and the same treatment should have been adopted for removal of the EFLS alignment. Furthermore, the Explanatory Statement of the approved Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/6 (i.e. the previous version of the OZP) stated that the plan indicated a possible reserve for an EFLS and there was no reference stating that the EFLS was "for information only" or not form being part of the OZP. The present way of removal of EFLS from the OZP, not regarding it as an amendment item, was not following the provision of the Ordinance and could be subject to legal challenge;
- (e) the response in Annex IV of the Paper stating that the Board was not empowered to authorise transport related works and alignment was wrong. The Board was not asked to authorise the EFLS, and their representation/comment only stated that removal of the EFLS alignment was premature and proposed a shortened alignment and urged the Government to reassess it so that effective public transport would be provided in KTD;
- (f) the EFLS concept had been studied since 2001 and the public had reasonable expectations of the implementation of the EFLS. The reasons for not further pursuing the EFLS had not been clearly explained to the public. The public consultation for the EFLS in 2017 showed the alignment of how the EFLS could link up KTD, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. While walking was cited as

another alternative for environmentally friendly linkage mode in that public consultation, it would take a 60-minute walk from the KTCT to the MTR Kai Tak Station or a 70-minute walk from the KTCT to the MTR Kwun Tong Station, which was unrealistic. The multi-modal EFLS now proposed by the Government was not a system but a collection of transport facilities under a new label. The electric bus/mini-bus just changed the fuel sources but could not reduce the on-street traffic. A previous study had also concluded that traveller was not suitable for KTD. The traveller was slow, usually served short distance trips, required closure for long period of time for regular maintenance and did not provide direct connection to the MTR stations. The proposed traveller bridging across the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was difficult to build engineering-wise and might contravene the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. Cycling, usually for leisure, was not a common means of daily commuting and could only be viable within KTD but not for the densely developed urban area in the inland. The water taxi service was now suspended and mainly for tourists and previously, the ferry services were only provided at 30-minute interval;

- (g) a shortened EFLS to link the north apron area with Kwun Tong was proposed. The Government's response to the shortened EFLS proposal was only that it was not viable, but provision of essential basic public transport infrastructure should not be purely evaluated on construction cost. The Hong Kong Tramways Limited (C19) had been contacted and they noted REDA had made a representation regarding the need for EFLS at KTD. The Hong Kong Tramways Limited supported in-principle the need to implement a structured rail-based transport system in KTD. Should the Government restart the study and invite tender for private sector participation for such project, the Hong Kong Tramways Limited would consider to participate. The Board should ask the Government to properly re-consider the EFLS before removing it from the OZP;
- (h) interim transport measures were proposed to be implemented before population intake in the former runway area and they included: (i) special circular bus routes serving the runway area and the MTR Kai Tak and Sung Wong Toi Stations; (ii) the runway traveller to be extended from the former runway area

to the vicinity of the MTR Sung Wong Toi Station or KTSP to allow easy access to MTR station and public transport interchange; (iii) resident bus routes for the 10 residential projects on the runway to be run by say the owners of the concerned developments in a joint-venture-operator model before the development was occupied; and (iv) provision of water taxi services to Central, Wanchai and Tsim Sha Tsui;

TN

- (i) the runway tip was originally planned for the TN with both commercial and residential developments. Currently, the majority of sites along the runway were rezoned for residential use. Such zoning amendments would change the traffic pattern especially when those sites originally planned for hotel use were rezoned for residential use. However, the traffic study did not mention how the changes in the traffic pattern and traffic impact had been taken into account. The new residential sites near the KTCT would add population with peak hour traveling pattern similar to that of the originally planned residential developments and would aggravate the traffic condition of the former runway area given the poor connectivity situation of the area;

Proposals

- (j) REDA proposed to rezone Items F, G and H (or at least Item H) in the former runway area to “C” which were critical to sustain viability of the TN. It would also likely reduce traffic congestion along the former runway area; and
- (k) re-instate the previous EFLS alignment on the OZP. The Government was also requested to review the EFLS with different assumptions regarding viability and to consider the shortened alignment proposed by REDA which could be an option to realize the previous EFLS proposal. The Government was also urged to immediately implement the interim transport proposals before population intake in the runway area.

15. The Secretary clarified that four Members including Messrs Ivan M.K. Chung, Andrew C.W. Lai, Timothy K.W. Ma and K.L. Wong who had indicated direct interests in relation to the items involving HKHS were invited to leave the meeting at the beginning of the

hearing. As the amendment items (i.e. J1 and J2) related to HKHS were only two amongst other amendments made to the OZP, Members agreed that the four Members should be allowed to join the meeting but they should not participate in the discussion on Items J1 and J2.

[Mr Ivan M.K. Chung rejoined the meeting at this point.]

R10/C50 - Mary Mulvihill

16. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the planning for massive residential developments in Kai Tak would deviate from the planning vision to develop the area as a hub for sports, recreation, tourism, business and quality housing and a showcase for urban design and landscaping; and to plan the area as a sustainable and environmentally friendly development to contribute to Hong Kong as a world-class international city;

Items J1 and J2

- (b) the location of the proposed DRE would undermine the planning for KTD as a recreation node. In view of its harbourfront location and the close proximity to the KTSP, the site should not be used for residential development. Hotel development would be more suitable at the site to create a synergy effect serving the sports park users and visitors as there was only one hotel with 400 rooms at KTSP. There was no guarantee that the hotel at the TN would materialise at the moment in view of the pandemic. Besides, there might be a lot of activities before/after sports events at the KTSP. If the site (Items J1 and J2) was developed for residential use, noise and disturbance complaints from future residents were expected;
- (c) subsidised housing should be built in Kowloon City. HKHS could collaborate with the Urban Renewal Authority (URA) to implement the DRE projects. Besides, URA should provide rehousing units for their own projects;

Items A to C

- (d) in view of the current economic situation, high vacancy rate of private housing units, the surge in emigration, slowdown of the Mainland economy and rising interest rate, whether there was still strong demand for private housing was questionable. For example, a high level of vacancy was observed at the Harbour North in North Point;
- (e) a boys' home and one 100-place hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons were proposed at Sites 2A2 and 2A3 (Items A and B). From past experience, such facilities should not be provided in residential development as there was a strong possibility of discrimination and rejection by residents;

Item D

- (f) it would take a long time for the underground shopping street (USS) to materialise. Whilst the USS could provide an all-weather protected shopping environment, weather in Hong Kong was not extreme and outdoor dining/cafes and open air seating were more preferable. The shops in the USS would likely be similar to those within MTR stations that were boring and unattractive;

Item E1

- (g) there was strong objection to rezoning a strip of land along the north-western boundary of KTSP to "O" as the long narrow strip of land between a road and a building was not genuine open space;

Items F to H

- (h) rezoning the three "C" sites at the runway tip for residential use was a short-sighted proposal. Hotels and commercial buildings should be provided near the KTCT as they would be opened to the public, and could have food and beverage facilities facing the prime harbourfront. Residential buildings would be gated communities and the retail frontage in those sites might just become

residents' clubhouse facilities, which would deprive the public of the chance to enjoy the waterfront. The opportunity for boosting the local economy would be lost due to the lack of attractions including shopping and dining facilities to retain cruise passengers and visitors to enjoy the harbour view. Reference should be made to the provision of shopping facilities next to the Ocean Terminal and Tsim Sha Tsui ferry pier which was a successful example. To create a vibrant waterfront, a continuous retail frontage should be provided along the runway for the locals and visitors to enjoy;

- (i) the provision of one 40-place supported hostel for mentally handicapped person and one 50-place hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons at Site 4B5 (Item F) was inappropriate as the site was far from MTR stations and not close to main bus routes and there was a lack of amenities for the handicapped persons;

Others

- (j) landing steps should be provided to allow increased ferry services to link up various public piers. Besides, the road system in Kai Tak should include provision of cycle path and bicycle parking nodes. Environmentally friendly transport among residential estates, MTR stations and various recreation zones should be provided; and
- (k) R9's representation on the improper handling of removal of the EFLS alignment on the OZP was supported. The EFLS was essential for connecting KTD and Kwun Tong/Kowloon Bay. Cost should not be the deciding factor for not pursuing the EFLS. The project consultancies should find a way to implement the EFLS.

R33/C12 – Lam Wang Kei

17. Mr Lam Wang Kei made the following main points:

Items J1 and J2

- (a) he opposed the amendments to the OZP and questioned whether the increase of about 3,000 to 4,000 housing units could alleviate the housing demand. It would be more effective to focus on housing provision in the Northern Metropolis which could provide 6,000 to 8,000 units in a single project;

Items F to G

- (b) it was not appropriate to rezone Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 (Items F to G) for residential use to provide only 2,000 units there as the rezoning defeated the original planning intention for the former runway area. In the previous OZP amendments, some land parcels at the former runway facing the harbour had already been rezoned from commercial to residential use and the justifications at that time was that commercial land was still available in the area. The same rationale was quoted in the current rezoning exercise saying that commercial uses would be provided at the TN. There was concern on whether the TN would be rezoned for residential use in the next round of OZP amendment;
- (c) the vision of the Energizing Kowloon East Office stated that the commercial sites at the former runway area would include hotel development to serve the KTCT and the TN. With items F to G rezoned for residential use, sites for hotel developments in Kai Tak were very limited (i.e. a 800-room hotel at the TN and a 400-room hotel near the KTSP). Whether the TN could still be sustainable with limited provision of hotel facilities to serve visitors was questionable; and

EFLS

- (d) the whole transportation concept for Kai Tak had drastically changed without the EFLS. The proposed alternatives such as elevated walkway with traveller, cycling that was mainly for recreation and water taxi that was for tourists could not properly serve the Kai Tak residents. The feasibility to

provide the elevated walkway with travellers connecting the former runway area and the former south apron with the Kwun Tong area across the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter was doubted, especially having regard to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance. The KTD should be planned properly to avoid complaints in the future, which might be similar to complaints on the bad planning of siting concrete batching plants at Yau Tong, causing traffic congestion in Kwun Tong.

R47 – Lee Tsoi Yan

18. Ms Lee Tsoi Yan made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in To Kwa Wan for many years and she opposed Items J1 and J2;
- (b) the site was strategically located close to the KTSP and was more suitable for commercial/hotel development to support the sports park and transform the area into an iconic place of Hong Kong. The site should not be for cramping three pencil blocks to accommodate only 1,100 rehousing units. The HKHS consultant's report stated that the impact of the proposed residential development was acceptable. However, the DRE would create irreversible impact on the waterfront site. With the limited non-domestic GFA, the provision of such facilities was minimal. Pencil like development on a small piece of land was not welcomed;
- (c) a lot of those affected by redevelopment projects were either elderly or disabled persons. Since the site was located about 12 to 15 minutes' walk from the MTR Station with only minimal retail facilities to be provided at the DRE, and there was a lack of retail facilities for daily necessities nearby with only local shops in Wyler Garden and the Grand Waterfront, it was not a convenient location for rehousing purpose;
- (d) the URA was carrying out an urban renewal project at Wing Kwong Street close to the MTR station. A vacant site near Harmony Garden was considered more

appropriate for the DRE as that site was only four to five minutes' walk from the MTR station and was much closer to the core area of To Kwa Wan with more shops for purchasing daily necessities; and

- (e) in conclusion, the site should be retained for provision of tourism facilities/ hotel and open space.

R51 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas)

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Leung Chi Kong Albert made the following main points:

- (a) they opposed Item J1 for residential development due to safety concern. The site was located less than 90m from the MTKGW, and fell within the consultation zone of the PHI of the MTKGW;
- (b) the MTKGW was in operation and the gas production capacity was about 2.6 million m³ per day (i.e. about 1/5 of total town gas production capacity in Hong Kong). The MTKGW was a strategic and indispensable gas plant, which ensured reliable gas supply in Hong Kong. The proposed DRE with about 1,100 flats with retail and dining facilities and POS would lead to substantial increase in resident and transient population. However, according to the Planning Statement for the DRE in Annex VI of MPC Paper No. 9/21, there was only a generic and ambiguous statement stating that the proposed DRE would not adversely affect the risk level as compared with that assessed in an QRA. There were no further elaboration and quantitative details in relation to the conclusion. It was abnormal for CCPHI to refer to another endorsed QRA report to draw a conclusion on the risk level of a project. HKHS should have conducted a QRA specifically for the DRE project;
- (c) Towngas had never compromised safety and had prudently adopted QRA on in-house modification of the MTKGW. According to Chapter 12 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), sizable developments within the consultation zone of PHI were normally not approved.

Development proposals in the consultation zone should be assessed against the Government's risk guidelines to ensure that risks to the public were within acceptable limits;

- (d) Towngas had prepared a QRA for the DRE project based on the public information available and the QRA indicated that with the DRE, additional hazard was very substantial (i.e. the risk in terms of potential loss of life was increased by more than 25%) and proposal with such increase in risk level had never been approved before. In addition, the increasing risk of vandalism/sabotage on the MTKGW should be assessed by quantitative method instead of by a qualitative method. It appeared that the HKHS had not engaged a professional to conduct a proper and independent QRA to analyse the risk and confirm the acceptance of the risk level. When the Kowloon City District Council was consulted in November 2021, HKHS did not mention the risk issue relating to the proposed DRE development; and
- (e) while there was a need to increase housing supply in Hong Kong, it was unacceptable to neglect the potential risk to public safety. It was unprecedented in other places for gas works to be encircled by high-rise developments. In any case, Towngas should be consulted to ensure that safety requirement would be put in place in Item J1 site to control the potential risk within acceptable range.

C2 – Chan Yan Chi

20. Mr Chan Yan Chi made the following main points:

- (a) He opposed Item J1. It was a short sighted decision to rezone a small piece of prime waterfront site for residential use. The provision of about 1,100 housing units at the site could not relieve the housing demand;
- (b) the site was located in a prime location which was close to the KTSP, and should be used for facilitating the operation of the sports park so as to create a synergy effect, particularly when Hong Kong would be co-hosting the National

Games with Guangdong and Macao in 2025. Sports events would be held at the KTSP and it might be awkward for guests/visitors to be overlooked by three residential towers at 100mPD when enjoying the sports events;

- (c) if the site was for residential use, the noise and light impacts from the KTSP might affect the nearby residents. Residents living near the Hong Kong Stadium were facing the same issue;
- (d) Plan H-7 of the Paper showed that the BH profile was gradually decreasing from the Grand Waterfront at 176mPD to the area of '5 Streets' at 110mPD then to the two existing industrial buildings at 65mPD and the KTSP at 55mPD. The proposed BH of 100mPD at the site between the two existing industrial buildings and the KTSP was considered not compatible;
- (e) although the site was well served by public transport, it was doubtful whether the transport capacity could serve additional 3,000 residents from the proposed DRE development and the 50,000 KTSP's visitors on event days. The chronic traffic problem caused by pick up and drop off areas for tourist buses near Wyler Garden and illegal parking near the Kowloon City Ferry Pier would be further aggravated;
- (f) future residents of DRE might have to bear the maintenance and management costs of the parts of the site that would be opened up for public use. On the other hand, the proposed development might reduce the opportunity for visitors to freely access the DRE site and the pedestrian connectivity from the To Kwa Wan inland to the waterfront might be blocked; and
- (g) the Board should act as a gate keeper to safeguard the planning intention of Kai Tak. Rezoning the site for residential use was not in line with the long-term planning vision and intention of Kai Tak for commercial, cultural and leisure uses, and transforming Kowloon East (KE) to CBD2.

R43/C11 – Worldwide Cruise Terminals

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jeffrey Cowne Bent made the following main points:

- (a) the representation was jointly made by the KTCT operator, key legislators of the transport and tourism sector, major cruise lines companies and companies of the travel and transport industry to oppose Item H;

Current situation of the cruise industry in Hong Kong

- (b) the cruise passenger throughput that the Government originally projected for 2023 had been achieved in 2016. The investment on KTCT had been paid back in November 2021. The KTCT was much highly used as compared to other leisure facilities, e.g. the Hong Kong Coliseum, in the past years. As cruising had fully resumed in over 100 countries even in the pandemic, it was expected that cruising would soon be resumed in Hong Kong;

Proposals

- (c) Recommendation No. 1: Site 4C5 (Item H) adjacent to the KTCT should be retained for hotel development so as to create synergy for cruise services. Currently, the TN and the Kai Tak Runway Park (Runway Park) were converted to permanent quarantine facilities and the chance for hotel development at the TN was minimal. Besides, most of the cruise passengers were big family groups with elderly and children. They usually carried a lot of luggage and would take taxi to the hotel. All the traffic from the KTCT relied on the single access road (i.e. Shing Fung Road) on the runway. Besides, overseas cruise guests would arrive one to two days earlier or stay one to two days after the cruise trip. The provision of hotel within walking distance, which was similar to the airport hotel next to the Hong Kong International Airport in Chek Lap Kok to serve the travellers, could benefit the cruise passengers as about 60% of the cruise guests were non-locals. Typically, a ship could carry over 4,000 people. The hotel rooms in Kai Tak could only serve a small portion of the

guests and it was critical to keep at least one site for hotel development if not all three sites;

- (d) Recommendation No. 2: it was suggested to provide ‘park-and-cruise’ facilities to reduce car traffic. A 450-cruise passenger survey conducted in August 2021 showed that 44% of them owned a car and 84% of them supported the ‘park-and-cruise’ concept. The ‘park-and-cruise’ concept could reduce ‘tidal’, uni-directional traffic and could avoid empty vehicles going in/out of the cruise terminal for pick up and drop off only and would induce less pollution. For Site 4C5 (Item H), the ‘park-and-cruise’ facilities could be located in the lowest three floors as those floors had no sea view and hotel rooms located above the car park podium could then have unobstructed sea view. Such provision could allow easy walking connection from the car park or hotel to the terminal for cruise passengers. Making reference to cruise terminals built within the last 10 years with extensive parking at a rate of 2,000 parking spaces per berth, about 4,000 spaces for the two berths in KTCT might be required; and
- (e) Recommendation No. 3: the ferry operators would like to have landing steps at (i) the KTRT for connection to North Point; (ii) between the waterfront of Sites 4C4 and 4C5 (Items G and H) for connection to Hung Hom; and (iii) along the Kwun Tong promenade from Lai Yip Street (which was 300m away from the MTR Ngau Tau Kok Station) so that alternative transportation mode could be provided in Kai Tak for public benefit.

22. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representers, commenters and their representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson further said that, as stated in the paper, the removal of the indicative alignment and station of EFLS from the OZP was not an amendment item of the OZP. In the previous versions of OZP, the EFLS alignment was indicated as a possible reserve which required further investigation and feasibility study. Being an indicative transport alignment, it was not a statutory land use on the OZP subject to agreement of the Board. Hence, the

meeting should not engage in discussion about the details of the EFLS, such as the alignment and capacity, as if the EFLS was an amendment item requiring the Board's endorsement. However, there was no problem to enquire on the associated traffic impacts that were related to the amendments.

Rezoning Commercial Sites for Residential Use

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

Planning Intention and Positioning of Kai Tak Development (KTD)

- (a) whether rezoning of the sites in KTD from commercial to residential use would affect the vision of KTD, synergy with the KTCT and vibrancy of the TN as well as development of CBD2 in KE;
- (b) whether there was a target GFA for CBD2 and whether the total commercial GFA in KE could meet the target;
- (c) whether demand and supply study on commercial GFA had been conducted prior to rezoning the sites;
- (d) the estimated demand for hotel rooms in KTD, whether adequate sites were reserved to meet the hotel demand and whether hotel use might be permitted on the site abutting the KTCT (i.e. Site 4C5);
- (e) whether cultural facilities would be provided within CBD2;

Items F to H (Former Runway Area)

- (f) whether commercial developments at the three sites (Items F to H) were essential to support development of the TN;

- (g) the intended uses and commercial GFA of the three sites (Items F to H), and the proposed GFA of the TN;
- (h) noting that the developer could seek planning permission for developing hotels under the “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) zoning, how a hotel use would be allowed at Items F to H, whether hotel use was permitted under lease after land disposal, and whether composite commercial and residential development was permitted under the “R(B)” zoning; and
- (i) the operation period of the quarantine facilities at the former runway area.

24. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, made the following main points:

Rezoning Commercial Sites for Residential Use

Planning Intention and Positioning of KTD

- (a) the CBD2 covered a wider area in KE including KTD, Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. After the rezoning, the KTD would still provide an overall commercial GFA of about 2 million m² (compared to 2.28 million m² under the previous OZP). The total commercial GFA in KE was expected to increase to a total of more than 4 million m² including revitalisation and redevelopment of existing industrial buildings in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. The economic role of KTD as an important component of CBD2 in KE would still be maintained;
- (b) the target GFA for CBD2 was about 4 million m² which was comparable to the scale of the CBD in Central. KE currently had a total commercial GFA of about 2.9 million m² and an additional supply of about 1 million m² under construction and approved developments (including revitalisation and redevelopment of existing industrial buildings) in the short to medium terms. The target GFA could still be met after rezoning the five “C” sites, which

was not anticipated to pose significant impact on the overall goal to transform KE into CBD2;

- (c) study on demand and supply of commercial GFA had not been conducted for the KTD. Nevertheless, after rezoning, a commercial GFA of about 2 million m² would still be supplied in KTD. The commercial clusters at Kai Tak City Centre and former south apron were to serve as an extension of San Po Kong and Kowloon Bay Business Areas respectively;
- (d) there was no information on projected demand for hotel rooms in KTD. One hotel with about 400 rooms was under construction at the KTSP. The Commissioner for Tourism had advised that having a hotel next to the KTCT could support the operation of KTCT by providing an option for cruise passengers to choose to stay close to KTCT and access to the terminal by foot. The planned hotel at the TN (Site 4D2) with about 700 to 900 rooms would not be affected by the rezoning. In addition, the Notes of the “R(B)” zone covered, amongst others, ‘Hotel’ as a Column 2 use and planning application for hotel at Site 4C5 could be submitted to the Board for consideration;
- (e) regarding provision of cultural facilities in KTD, Site 1M2 at the former north apron area was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Art and Performance Related Uses” for the provision of cultural-related uses;

Items F to H (Former Runway Area)

- (f) commercial developments in KTD were provided in three clusters at (i) the former north apron area near San Po Kong; (ii) the former south apron area near Kowloon Bay; and (iii) along the former runway with the proposed TN at the tip of it. The rezoning of the three sites at the former runway area for residential use would not affect the overall goal to transform KE into CBD2;
- (g) the TN site itself was a mega hub (total GFA of about 229,000m²) for commercial, hotel, retail, entertainment and leisure uses. The scale of the

TN was rather large to attract patronage, with the GFA comparable to other similar developments in the territory, such as Tsim Sha Tsui Victoria Dockside. As additional references, the GFAs of Langham Place and Pacific Place were 163,000m² and 423,000m² respectively. The rezoning would not affect the retail frontage (GFA of about 22,000m²) designated on the development sites alongside the promenade of the Runway Precinct. Together with the attractively designed Runway Park and the KTCT, the former runway area would continue to be a tourism, entertainment and leisure hub as envisioned under the OZP;

- (h) the three sites previously zoned “C” at the former runway area were intended for hotel and commercial (including retail, eating place, etc) developments with a total GFA of about 227,000m² (i.e. GFA of 90,000m², 80,000m² and 57,000m² for Sites 4B5, 4C4 and 4C5 respectively). In addition, the TN would provide a GFA of 229,000m² for tourism, entertainment and leisure uses. For the current “R(B)” zoning of the Items F to H sites, ‘Hotel’ was a Column 2 use and planning permission from the Board could be sought for hotel development; and
- (i) the land allocations for temporary quarantine facilities at the TN and Runway Park would expire in early 2025 whilst those at the Items F to H sites would expire in late 2022.

25. With regard to possible hotel use under “R(B)” zoning at the Items F to H sites by way of planning application, the Chairperson supplemented that the three sites would be put up for land sale and the Government would not normally entertain lease modification within five years from land sale. However, for sites with special considerations, it might be stated in the information note that was made known to all bidders at land sale stage that the Government could consider lease modification say for hotel use for the respective site(s) if planning permission was obtained from the Board.

26. Some Members raised the following questions to the representative of R9/C22:

- (a) whether the representer had conducted any market demand study of commercial floor space to support their opposition to rezoning of the “C” sites;
- (b) how the rezoning of the “C” sites would affect the vision for KTD and CBD2;
- (c) whether the three sites at the former runway area, if retained as “C” zoning, were more suitable for office or hotel development; and
- (d) whether the development potential of KTD would be affected by replacing the previous EFLS with the multi-modal EFLS.

27. In response, Mr Ian Brownlee, representative of R9/C22, made the following responses:

- (a) no study on the demand and supply of commercial GFA in KTD/KE was conducted by REDA. However, there were continuous demand and interests for commercial and hotel floor spaces in KTD as evident from the multiple bids previously submitted by developers for the land sale of the two waterfront “C” sites (Items G and H);
- (b) the original planning intention of KTD was for the development of an office node near the Station Square and MTR Kai Tak Station in the former north apron area. The rezoning would reduce the critical mass and would dilute the office node function thereat, thus affecting KTD’s role in the CBD2. Hence, the rezoned sites (Items A to C sites) should be retained for office use;
- (c) the three sites at the former runway area (Items F to G) should be retained for hotel use. The TN and the KTCT required commercial uses in the surrounding sites to create sufficient attractions and supporting facilities. Some commercial sites in the western part of the runway were already rezoned for residential uses in the previous rounds of OZP amendments. The further rezoning of the three sites closest to the TN and KTCT would have significant adverse impacts on the original planning vision for a tourism and entertainment hub at the KTRT; and

- (d) there was no comment on how the replacement of the previous EFLS with the multi-modal EFLS might affect development potential in KTD. It was noted, but not agreed, that the removal of the EFLS alignment should not be discussed at the meeting. In any case, the Government was urged to seriously consider ways to improve traffic and transport facilities for residents who would be moving into the housing developments at the runway in the near future.

28. Some Members raised the following questions to the representative of R43/C11:

- (a) whether the proposed hotel at the TN with about 700 to 900 rooms was sufficient to meet the demand from cruise passengers, and what the representer's views on Items F and G were; and
- (b) whether one hotel with 900 rooms or two hotels with 500 rooms each at the former runway area would better meet the needs of cruise passengers.

29. In response, Mr Jeffrey Cowne Bent, representative of R43/C11, made the following responses:

- (a) according to the original plan of KTD, there were seven hotel sites including one at the TN. With the rezoning, only one hotel with about 600 to 900 rooms would be left at the TN. There were also doubts on implementation of the TN noting the rather permanent quarantine facilities built thereon. About 60% of the cruise passengers was overseas tourists and some 10% of passengers on each cruise ship was sufficient to fully occupy rooms in a hotel. Hence, there was demand for two hotels at the former runway area. The overseas passengers were mainly family travellers with kids and seniors and hotels should be provided near the KTCT to meet their demand. The housing demand in Hong Kong was mainly for public rental units and not private luxury flats. There was a need to strike a balance between the need for meeting housing demand and achieving the vision for KTD; and
- (b) the three sites at the former runway area should preferably all be retained for hotel developments. If such option was not agreed by the Board, at least the

site abutting the KTCT (Item H) should be retained for hotel development to provide better synergy with the KTCT. It would also be more desirable to provide two hotels, say one four star and one five star, to cater for different service needs of visitors.

Traffic and Transport

Multi-modal EFLS

30. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) details of the multi-modal EFLS including its connectivity with KE and whether this proposal, without a rail-based system within KTD, would affect the planning and design of KTD;
- (b) whether the water taxi service under the multi-modal EFLS would be operated with a fixed schedule;

Items F to H (Former Runway Area)

- (c) whether the public transport services could cope with additional population from the three rezoned sites under Items F to H;
- (d) whether there was any plan to better address the transport demand of cruise passengers;
- (e) the provision of public parking spaces at the TN and whether there would be parking facilities for 'park and cruise' travellers as proposed by R43; and
- (f) the travelling time between the TN and the nearest MTR Station.

31. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr George K.M. Mak, CE/E5, CEDD, Mr Rick K.W. Liu, CTO, TD and Mr C.H. Chan, SE, TD made the following main points:

- (a) as shown on Plan H-16 of the Paper, the proposed multi-modal EFLS comprised a package of green initiatives including: (i) deployment of electric buses/minibuses with six new routes to connect KTD/the former runway area with Kwun Tong Action Area (KTAA) and Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) which would largely cover the areas intended to be served by the elevated mode of EFLS; (ii) a traveller network comprising a 600m-long bridge for pedestrians and cyclists connecting the former runway and the Kwun Tong promenade across the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter, an elevated walkway along Wai Yip Street connecting the KBAA and the KTAA, and an elevated walkway along Sheung Yee Road to connect KBAA; (iii) a 13km greenway network in various open spaces in KTD for shared uses by pedestrians and cyclists of which 7.5 km would be completed in 2023 and the remaining sections to be completed after 2025; (iv) establishing a ‘water taxi’ service point in the KTD area; and (v) constructing an elevated landscaped deck to connect the MTR Kwun Tong Station. The proposed multi-modal EFLS would enhance connectivity between KTD and KE;
- (b) the road network for KTD was being developed in phases. Shing Fung Road, which provided access to sites along the former runway, was widened in 2019 with doubled capacity to a dual two-lane carriageway. CEDD was constructing Road D3 (Metro Park Section) along the northwestern part of the former runway. With its anticipated completion in late 2022, it would provide a direct road link between the former runway area and the former north apron area in which the MTR Kai Tak and Sung Wong Toi Stations were located. Traffic would then have an alternative route and no longer need to route through Kowloon Bay to gain access to the two areas. With the completion of Trunk Road T2 and the Central Kowloon Route in future, traffic volume along the existing east-west corridors such as Kwun Tong Road would be alleviated and the traffic condition in KE would be further improved;
- (c) the water taxi service would be operated on designated routes with fixed schedule initially with five calling points including one at the former runway

tip in KTD. The operator might apply to TD for adjusting the schedule and calling points;

Items F to H (Former Runway Area)

- (d) currently there were three bus routes and one minibus route serving the former runway area. The bus services were operating at 20 to 30-minute intervals and the schedule would be reviewed by TD upon population intake at the former runway area. TD was planning to extend one existing bus route serving West Kowloon to KTCT and introduce a new bus route plying between KTCT and Tsim Sha Tsui. The current travelling time by bus from the former runway area to MTR Kai Tak and Ngau Tau Kok Stations was about 20 minutes and it was expected that the travelling time would be shortened upon the opening of Road D3 (Metro Park Section). With regard to the provision of transport facilities for residential developments at the former runway area, developers may submit application to TD for consideration on a case-by-case basis;
- (e) regarding public transport for the KTCT, out-bound cruise passengers travelling to the KTCT for boarding should not be a major concern as they usually arrived at more spread out times by using different transport means. However, the large number of in-bound cruise passengers disembarking from the cruise ships at the KTCT would create high demand for public transport at a particular peak time. To facilitate dispersal of large number of passengers, TD would notify the bus companies, minibus operators and taxi trades in advance to strengthen the public transport services prior to arrivals of the cruise ships at the KTCT. In addition, the cruise terminal operator might operate shuttle services for cruise passengers to different destinations;
- (f) there were 127 existing public car parking spaces for use by the KTCT. On top of the around 1,000 ancillary car parking spaces proposed at the TN, 100 additional public car parking spaces would be provided at the TN for public use; and

- (g) the travelling time for pedestrians between the former runway area to the MTR Ngau Tau Kok Station via the proposed bridge across the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter in the multi-modal EFLS would be about 15 minutes.

DRE (Items J1 and J2)

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

- (a) whether the project proponent had submitted a QRA report prepared by others;
- (b) whether additional population from the proposed DRE would generate higher risk due to proximity of the DRE to the MTKGW;
- (c) expiry date of the lease for the MTKGW; and
- (d) information on total number of new flats in Kowloon City District.

33. In response, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD and Mr Raymond S.P. Yu, SE, EMSD, made the following main points:

- (a) the MTKGW was a PHI and according to Chapter 12 of HKPSG, proposals for any developments within the 300m-consultation zone that would result in an increase in population should be submitted to the CCPHI for consideration. EMSD was a member of CCPHI responsible for providing advice on gas risk. A QRA to assess the risk levels associated with the MTKGW arising from developments in the 300m-consultation zone (including the DRE site) was completed in 2021. The planned population of the proposed DRE development was less than that adopted in that QRA. QRA reports which included operation details of the gas plant were normally not disclosed to the public given their sensitive nature. The CCPHI, having consulted relevant Government departments, had considered the risk

assessment for the DRE including the assumptions, methodology and possible mitigation measures set out in the said QRA and drew the conclusion that for the developments covered by the QRA, the estimated individual risk level was acceptable and considered that the societal risk levels could comply with the Government's Risk Guidelines. In this connection, EMSD had no comment on the submitted planning statement for the DRE in respect of the gas risk. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry, EMSD had not received the QRA recently conducted by R51 for the DRE development;

- (b) the lease term of the MTKGW would expire in 2034; and
- (c) the estimated number of flats (existing and planned) at KTD, and in Kowloon City, Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong districts were 59,000, 210,000, 160,000 and 300,000 respectively. The total number of flats in KE would be about 700,000 at a ratio of 60/40 for public and private housing.

34. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the representative of R51:

- (a) noting the proximity of the Grand Waterfront to the MTKGW, whether there was any information regarding the mitigation measures previously adopted by the developer to address the risk issue;
- (b) whether the proposed DRE would affect production of the MTKGW and whether feasible mitigation measures could be adopted to address the risk issue; and
- (c) whether there was plan to redevelop the MTKGW for residential use upon expiry of the lease term.

35. In response, Mr Albert Chi Kong Leung, representative of R51, made the following main points:

- (a) the project proponent should take the initiative to prepare a QRA instead of adopting a report prepared by others. There was no information on what project the QRA considered by CCPHI was related to. Despite the sensitive information in the QRA, the conclusion and/or an executive summary of the report would normally be disclosed to the public. For the current case, there was only a brief description which was rather unusual. Details on risk analysis and proposed mitigation measures were not provided to demonstrate compliance with the Risk Guidelines in the HKPSG. The information in the Paper did not reveal whether CCPHI considered that the risk level had increased or not. According to a QRA recently conducted by the representer, additional hazard of the DRE was substantial with risk in terms of potential loss of life increased by about 25% which was unacceptable. The risk assessments for the Grand Waterfront and the DRE were quite different as the latter involved a different planning context with a large number of transient population to/from the KTSP and the proposed POS in the vicinity with more open design with shop fronts and alfresco dining. The representer had no intention to hinder the DRE development. A note should be added under the “R(A)6” zone that the project proponent should consult the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited regarding the proposed mitigation measures. Hong Kong Police Force’s view that the risks of sabotage on the gas plant were low was not agreed;

- (b) the Grand Waterfront located at the former MTKGW (South Plant) was completed in 2006. As the residential development involved closure of one of the two plants at the MTKGW, the societal risk was apparently lower. The developer had then proposed different mitigation measures to address the concerns of EMSD and CCPHI. Those mitigation measures included adjustments in the number and disposition of the towers, the adoption of a L-shaped layout to reduce direct frontage to the MTKGW, setback of balconies facing the MTKGW and emergency stairs to San Ma Tau Street;

- (c) the proposed DRE would not affect production capacity of the MTKGW;

- (d) since the DRE was scheduled for completion in 2027 whilst the lease of the MTKGW would only expire in 2034, mitigation measures had to be

implemented by the project proponent during the interim period. For example, there should not be openings (windows, balconies, alfresco dining, etc) facing the MTKGW. However, whether the project proponent was willing to implement such mitigation measure was out of their control; and

- (e) he was not in a position to comment on whether the MTKGW should be redeveloped.

36. Some Members raised the following questions to the representatives of R1/C1:

- (a) details on integration of the POS with the surroundings and whether the proposed alfresco dining would create nuisance to residents of the DRE, e.g. noise and exhaust fume; and
- (b) whether there was scope to provide a bazaar or small function hall in the DRE for cultural and art activities to serve the community.

37. In response, Mr David Chi Wai Fok, representative of R1/C1, made the following main points:

- (a) based on the current design, the podium (with proposed commercial use and residents' clubhouse) of the proposed development would provide a vertical buffer of 10m between alfresco dining facilities and the first residential floor. Besides, the alfresco dining facilities would only be located along the frontage facing the promenade and POS. The concern on exhaust fume would be dealt with during the detailed design stage. It would be stated clearly in the sale brochure that there would be alfresco dining on the ground floor of the residential towers; and
- (b) commercial facilities were planned on the lower floors of the DRE, including retail shops, restaurants and alfresco dining facilities to complement the 'Dining Cove' concept. Currently, bazaar or accommodation for arts and cultural activities was not proposed at the DRE.

KTSP

38. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) commercial GFA of the KTSP and its maximum seating capacity, and commercial GFA of developments within walking distance of the KTSP; and
- (b) information on parking facilities at the KTSP.

39. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the development scheme under the approved planning application (No. A/K22/28), there would be a hotel and office development at KTSP with a total GFA of 32,000m². There would also be additional commercial/dining uses within the KTSP with a total GFA of about 60,000m². The residential sites in the former north apron area (Area 2) within 500m walking distance from KTSP also had provision of retail GFA;
- (b) the maximum seating capacity of the KTSP was about 65,000, including 50,000 seats in the Main Stadium, 10,000 seats in the Indoor Sports Centre and 5,000 seats in the Public Sports Ground; and
- (c) about 600 car parking spaces would be provided at the KTSP.

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

40. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives and the representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives and the representers, commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

41. The Chairperson said that for sites under Items A to C and F to H, both commercial or residential use might be considered compatible in the local context. That said, having noted the slackened demand for commercial land in recent years, it was doubted that those sites could be properly used if retained as “C”. Furthermore, the rezoning of the three commercial sites at the former runway area might advance developments thereat, and as the government representatives had explained, the rezoning would not affect the commercial cluster at the TN site and the intention to develop the KTRT as a tourism hub. The quarantine facilities at the TN site were under temporary land allocations and only temporary in nature. The CBD2 with a total commercial GFA of over 4 million m² would not be affected. Earlier residential developments on the three runway sites could optimize the use of valuable land resources and bring vibrancy to the area. Land sale for the Item H site, which was close to the KTCT, where appropriate, could allow flexibility for hotel development to meet changing market demand subject to obtaining planning permission.

42. As for the provision of DRE under Items J1 and J1, the Chairperson said that such provision was an important policy initiative to provide rehousing for those affected by Government’s development clearances or urban renewal projects taken forward by the Urban Renewal Authority. Currently a number of the DREs were being planned in the New Territories and there were limited DRE sites in the urban area and Item J1 was targeted for completion in 2027. She added that the CCPHI had considered the risk level of the proposed DRE development acceptable.

43. In response to a few Members’ question, the Chairperson clarified that DRE was a kind of subsidized housing with two different components, i.e. rental and SSF, which were both for permanent residence. The owners of the SSFs were exempted from income means test.

DRE (Items J1 and J2)

44. All Members supported Item J1, including the land use zoning and development parameters noting that DRE was needed to rehouse people affected by government or urban renewal projects. A Member appreciated the layout and design of the proposed DRE

development which would provide convenient pedestrian connections to the adjoining POS and waterfront promenade and the inner part of Ma Tau Kok, e.g. the “13 Streets” area. A few Members opined that the grounds of representation submitted by R51 opposing the proposed DRE for risks associated with the MTKGW was unsubstantiated, and the mitigation measures recommended by R51’s representative including no window and opening facing the MTKGW were unreasonable. They were of the view that the MTKGW should be phased out upon expiry of its lease term to avoid interface issue with the surrounding developments in accordance with the current planning intention. A Member remarked that the lease term of the MTKGW would expire in 2034 shortly after population intake at the DRE in 2027 and interim interface issue should not be a major concern. Based on past experience from the Grand Waterfront located even closer to the MTKGW, the proposed DRE at the J1 site should be feasible. The concern on gas safety could be addressed during the detailed design stage and the requirements for implementation of mitigation measures could be included in the lease conditions as appropriate and the operator of the MTKGW might be consulted on a need basis.

Items A to C

45. All Members indicated that rezoning of the sites in the former north apron area (Items A to C) for residential use was acceptable. A Member opined that after the rezoning, there would still be commercial uses in the nearby KTSP and others sites in Area 2. Another Member said that rezoning of those sites was acceptable as they were close to other residential sites and were in vicinity of the inland areas.

Items F to H (Former Runway Area)

46. A Member opined that rezoning the three commercial sites (Items F to H) for residential use to meet changing planning circumstances was acceptable. However, there should be flexibility to allow hotel development, particularly for the site adjoining the KTCT (Item H), and an incremental approach for land disposal should be adopted. The same Member also expressed concern on the cumulative traffic impact generated from the residential developments and the KTCT. Another Member said that notwithstanding the reduction in commercial GFA, the current “R(B)” zoning for the three sites was acceptable and residential developments could also bring vibrancy to the surrounding area.

47. The Vice-chairperson and some Members expressed reservation on rezoning the three sites (Items F to H) for residential use and opined that they should be reserved for commercial use. They were of the views that the rezoning would affect the critical mass of commercial GFA to sustain the KTRT as an attractive destination, vibrancy of the TN, viability of the KTCT, and the intention to develop the KTRT as a tourism hub and leisure destination for overseas and local visitors. The opportunity offered by the KTRT was unique and should not be foregone due to market conditions, and impact of the rezoning was irreversible. The reduced commercial GFA would affect the role of KTD as a component of CBD2. A Member suggested that Items G and H might be combined to form a larger site to enhance the development potential, design flexibility and financial viability. Another Member opined that given the good accessibility to the MTR Ngau Tau Kok Station in future, the three sites were suitable for commercial use. The same Member also pointed out that Item H was suitable for hotel development to complement the role of the KTCT and the provision of social welfare facilities at Item F was supported.

48. A Member considered that residential development at Item G was acceptable but Items F and H should be reserved for commercial developments to complement the function of the TN and the two sites could be amalgamated at podium level. Another Member said that item H was not suitable for residential use as it was too close to the KTCT and might be affected by chimney emissions from the cruise ships. A Member said that Items G and H facing the Victoria Harbour should be reserved for commercial developments. Another Member suggested that given the strategic location of Item F facing the inner harbour, it could be developed together with Item H to provide water-based cultural and recreational facilities.

49. The Vice-chairperson concurred with R43/C11's view that two hotels should be developed at the KTRT to provide choices for visitors. A Member pointed out that the 'park and cruise' concept suggested by R43/C11 might not be practical in the Hong Kong context because the majority of visitors would travel to the KTCT by taxi or other means of public transport.

50. Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, Director of Planning, said that the planning for KTD had been evolving to take into account the latest planning circumstances and aspirations of the community since 2007. The transformation of KE involved developments and redevelopments of existing industrial buildings in the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone and the planned Action Areas in Kwun Tong and Kowloon Bay. Developments in the inland areas in KE could create synergy effect to support the TN and KTRT with improved connections proposed

under the multi-modal EFLS. The rezoning of Items F, G and H would not affect the creation of a tourism, entertainment and leisure hub in the KTRT. The TN with a total GFA of about 220,000m² was a significant development creating critical mass, and for reference, the Site 3 in New Central Harbourfront had a GFA of 150,000m². Furthermore, the timing for land disposal would be under control by the Government. The “R(B)” zoning also allowed flexibility for hotel development by way of planning application.

51. A Member said that the “OU(B)” sites in KE might be too far away from KTD to create synergy. Another Member opined that existing bus services to the KTCT were inadequate and public transport services should be improved to serve the former runway area. A few Members remarked that the KTCT was a gateway and would present the first image of Hong Kong to visitors, and residential developments next to the KTCT were considered incompatible.

52. While noting some Members’ reservation on Items F, G and/or H for the aforementioned reasons, the Chairperson asked Members to consider retaining the “R(B)8” zoning of Item F since the site was not facing the Victoria Harbour and the planning work for provision of social welfare facilities thereat was at an advanced stage. In response to a Member’s question, the Chairperson said that the initially committed facilities included residential care home for the elderly cum day care unit for the elderly, home care services for elderly persons, day activity centre, supported hostel for mentally handicapped persons and hostel for severely mentally handicapped persons. The current zoning could facilitate early availability of the much needed facilities. There was public expectation that the facilities would be available in the near future.

53. As Members had proposed different rezoning options for Items F, G and/or H, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed that the Board should cast a vote. After voting, more Members supported retaining the “R(B)8” zoning for Item F and reverting Items G and H to the original “C” zone.

Others

54. A Member said that the multi-modal EFLS with enhanced public transport facilities and a traveller network was generally acceptable. Another Member said that whilst a mono-rail design for the previous EFLS was not supported, the previous EFLS alignment with a loop-system of mass rail connecting KTD and Kwun Tong was important to enhance connectivity of

KTD. The multi-model EFLS might be less effective in creating synergy between KTD and the larger CBD2. The Vice-chairperson indicated that deletion of the original EFLS was not the most desirable and the effectiveness of the multi-model EFLS concept was uncertain. Another Member echoed that cycling had not been considered by the Government to be an effective transport mode in the Hong Kong context. The Vice-chairperson and another Member urged that the Government should re-consider a mass transport system to serve KTD and enhance its connection with the inner areas like Kwun Tong.

55. The Vice-chairperson and another Member remarked that it was unclear why the deletion of the EFLS alignment was not an amendment item. In response, the Chairperson said that the removal of the EFLS alignment was not an amendment item as the ELFS alignment was all along indicated on the OZP for information and not for the Board's approval. Hence, its deletion would also not be treated in the context of the OZP amendment and it was only for reflection of the Government's latest decision that had been separately promulgated to the public.

Conclusion

56. The Chairperson concluded that except for Items G and H, Members generally supported the land use zonings and development parameters of all the other amendment items. Members generally considered that other grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10842, and the presentation and responses made by the government representatives.

[Mr Franklin Yu left the meeting during the deliberation session.]

57. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R1** to **R7** as well as **R8** (part), **R9** (part) and **R10** (part).

58. The Board decided to partially uphold **R8 (part), R9 (part), R10 (part), R11 to R36, R39 to R43** and to propose amendment to the draft OZP by reverting the zoning of the sites under Amendment Items G and H from "Residential (Group B)9" and "Residential (Group B)10" to "Commercial (7)" and "Commercial (5)" respectively. The proposed amendments to the OZP would be published for further representation under section 6(C)2 of the Town

Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for three weeks and the Board would consider the further representations, if any, in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance.

59. The Board decided not to uphold (i) remaining parts of **R8, R9, R10, R11 to R36 and R39 to R43**, and (ii) **R37 to R38, and R44 to R115** and considered that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations and the reasons were:

“Items A to D and F

Planning Intention and Position of KTD

- (a) the rezoning of the three sites (Sites 2A2 and 2A3; 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10; 4B5) for residential use will help meet the housing demand and achieve optimal use of land resources to respond to the changing economic and social needs, and would not affect the intention of developing Kai Tak Development (KTD) into a sustainable and vibrant district with a mix of community, housing, business, tourism, sports, leisure and infrastructural uses. After the rezoning, there will still be commercial GFA close to 2 million m² in KTD which would continue to contribute to the transformation of Kowloon East into Core Business District 2. The amendments to the outline zoning plan (OZP) have undergone public consultation and are considered suitable in terms of technical feasibility and land use compatibility (**R8 to R21, R23, R29, R31 to R34, R42, R43, R71 to R73, R75, R92, R100, R101 and R103**);
- (b) the cluster of existing and planned uses at the Kai Tak Runway Tip for developing a tourism hub and the retail frontage along the Runway Precinct are not expected to be affected by the rezoning of the site (Site 4B5). The Tourism Node, in particular, is intended to be a focal point to provide commercial and tourism-related uses with hotel and parking facilities to serve residents, visitors, tourists and the public and to enhance the vibrancy and variety of uses for public enjoyment of the waterfront setting (**R8 to R10, R15, R33, R34 and R43**);

Incorporation of Social Welfare Facilities at the Reviewed Sites

- (c) the incorporation of the proposed social welfare facilities at the three sites (Sites 2A2 and 2A3; 2A4, 2A5(B) and 2A10; 4B5) is intended to meet the acute demand for social welfare facilities and echoes the Government's policy to build a caring and inclusive society. The proposed uses of a commensurate scale are considered compatible with the residential neighbourhood and technically feasible, without incurring any adverse impacts on the surrounding areas (**R10 to R12, R14, R18 to R20, R22, R24 to R32, R34, R36, R40, R41, R71 to R76, R80 to R82, R84 to R87, R91, R95, R97, R99, R101, R103, R105 to R108 and R110 to R112**);
- (d) the inclusion of social welfare facilities as Column 1 uses for the "Residential (Group B)8" subzone for Site 4B5 is to facilitate wider and increased provision of such facilities to meet the acute demand of the community. The proposed uses are of appropriate scale and compatible with the surrounding developments and will not affect the integrity and planning intention of developing the former runway tip into a tourism hub (**R23, R33 to R35, R37 to R41, R71, R72, R77 to R79, R83, R86, R88, R89, R91 to R93, R96, R98, R102, R103, R105 to R110 and R113**);

Technical Aspects

- (e) as demonstrated in the technical assessments conducted, the proposed residential developments at the reviewed sites are technically feasible with no insurmountable technical problem in terms of traffic, visual and air ventilation aspects (**R8, R9, R10, R12, R15 to R18, R19, R21, R22, R24 to R28, R35, R37, R38, R40 to R42, R71, R87, R90, R91, R94, R100, R108, R114 and R115**);

Items J1 and J2

Impact on Overall Planning of the KTSP and the Surrounding Areas

- (f) the proposed Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE) development is intended to meet the rehousing demands arising from Government development and/or renewal projects, and will in turn facilitate urban renewal. With provision of an at-grade public open space of not less than 2,700m² for public enjoyment and commercial facilities on the lower floors, the DRE development will also complement the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) in terms of enhancing the connectivity between KTSP and the inner area of Ma Tau Kok and bringing vibrancy to the waterfront areas (**R46 to R49, R52 to R54, R57 to R61 and R63 to R70**);

Technical Aspects

- (g) as demonstrated in the technical assessments conducted, the proposed DRE development will not cause significant impacts on traffic, environment, landscape, visual, air ventilation and risk aspects (**R10, R46 to R56, R58 to R68, R114 and R115**);

Alternative Sites

- (h) the site is considered suitable for the proposed DRE development irrespective of whether other suitable sites are available. Other possible sites will be separately considered for suitable developments/redevelopments subject to availability and technical feasibility (**R47 to R49, R53, R60, R61 and R64 to R68**);

Item I

- (i) the rezoning of the site at San Ma Tau Street for commercial development is mainly to reflect a section 12A application (No. Y/K22/3) partially agreed by the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board on 1.2.2019. Taking into account the technical assessments conducted, no significant traffic, visual, environmental, geotechnical and air ventilation problems are envisaged (**R44 to R49, R114 and R115**);

Items E1 to E3, K and L

- (j) Items E1 to E3 are to reflect the latest site boundary of KTSP and the adjoining open space. There will be no reduction in open space provision arising from the amendments (**R10**);
- (k) the incorporation of 'Eating Place' in Column 1 of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Pier(1)" zone is not supported due to the stringent requirements for such use including loading, sewage, fire safety and electricity capacity. Restaurant use may be allowed upon application to the Board (**R8 and R10**);

Provision of Government, institution and community (GIC) Facilities and Open Space in KTD

- (l) the existing and planned provision of GIC facilities and open space is generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in KTD in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned bureau/department's assessment, except for some facilities. The shortfall for school places is assessed on a wider district basis and could be addressed by the provision in the wider district. For child care centres, the Social Welfare Department will consider their provision in the planning and development process as appropriate, with a view to meeting the demand and long-term goal (**R11, R29, R35, R40, R42, R47 to R49, R52 to R57, R60, R61, R63 to R68, R70 and R101**); and

Removal of the indicative alignment and station of the Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) shown on the OZP

- (m) as stated on the Kai Tak OZP and its Explanatory Statement, the indicative alignment and station of EFLS requires further investigation and feasibility study. The removal of the obsolete information is for information only and to reflect the Government's latest decision and shall not be regarded as an amendment item to the OZP (**R9, R14, R35, R39 and R40**)."

60. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

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

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr. L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr. Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West
Transport Department
Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung

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

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Assistant Director(Regional 3),
Lands Department
Ms Jane K.C. Choi

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr C.K. Yip

Secretary

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Questions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KLH/604

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Village Type Development” and “Agriculture” Zones, Lots 32 S.A ss.1 and 32 S.B in D.D. 7, Tai Hang, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 10843)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

61. The following representatives from the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan | - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po & North District (DPO/STN) |
| Mr Tony Y.C. Wu | - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE) |

Applicant’s Representatives

Mr Yeung Siu Fung
Mr Man Siu Chung

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

63. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site), the background of application, the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC/the Committee) of the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10843 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

64. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representative to elaborate on the review application.

65. Mr Yeung Siu Fung, the applicant's representative, made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant had submitted three planning applications, including the current one, for a proposed New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) - Small House (SH) at the Site. The application site of the two previous applications (No. A/NE-KLH/557 and 596) involved Lot 32 S.A in D.D. 7. For application No. A/NE-KLH/557, about 61% of the footprint of the proposed SH fell within "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone. For application No. A/NE-KLH/596, the proposed SH footprint had less than 30% falling within the "AGR" zone and the majority part fell within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone;
- (b) noting that the Board might give sympathetic consideration to application with less than 30% of the proposed SH footprint falling within the "AGR" zone, the applicant had acquired the adjacent lot from his family so as to amalgamate Lot 32 s.A ss.1 and Lot 32 s.B in D.D. 7 to form the Site, such that the proposed SH footprint could be adjusted with a view to occupying less area of the "AGR" zone. The applicant had spent more than \$60,000 for the associated land administration/legal fee;
- (c) while the portion of the proposed SH footprint falling within the "AGR" zone had already been reduced from about 30% to 17% under the current application, the applicant could not understand why the current application was still not approved by the Committee, given that the approval of the application would not affect the planning intention of the "AGR" zone;
- (d) it was agreed that SH developments should concentrate within the "V" zone. However, vacant land within the subject "V" zone was mostly owned by Tso/Tong and the owners of other private land would not sell their land as they would keep it for use of their descendants. Vacant land available for SH development within the "V" zone became less;

- (e) the Site was the only piece of land in Tai Hang Village owned by the applicant and he was unable to acquire another piece of land within the “V” zone. The applicant had spent a large sum of money to acquire the adjacent lot and submitted several planning applications to the Board;
- (f) it was impossible to build a SH on government land within the “V” zone, as much of the land was reserved for the widening of Tolo Highway and Tai Wo Service Road West. There was no infill site within the “V” zone available for SH development. Besides, SH development on government land involved complicated procedures which might take a very long time, say about 15 to 20 years, to complete. Priority for building SHs would usually be given to the elderlies who were yet to own a SH. As the applicant was only 25 years old, there was barely a chance for the Government to allocate him a piece of government land for building a SH; and
- (g) there were two approved applications for SH development in the vicinity of the Site which fell outside the ‘village environs’ (‘VE’) of Tai Hang. It was hoped that the Board could give sympathetic consideration to the current application.

66. As the presentations of PlanD’s representative and the applicant’s representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

67. The Chairperson asked PlanD’s representative to clarify if the proposed SH footprint was located within the “V” zone and the ‘VE’ of Tai Hang, and whether such information was an important consideration for the current application under the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for NTEH/SH in New Territories (the Interim Criteria). In response, Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan, DPO/STN, PlanD, said that the proposed SH footprint was located completely outside the ‘VE’ and 83% of the footprint fell within the “V” zone. According to the Interim Criteria, if more than 50% of the proposed SH footprint was located outside the ‘VE’, favourable consideration could be given by the Board if not less than 50% of the proposed SH footprint fell within the “V” zone provided that there was a general

shortage of land in meeting the demand for SH development in the corresponding “V” zone. For the current application, there was sufficient land in the “V” zone of Tai Hang Village in meeting the outstanding SH applications and 10-year SH demand forecast, and therefore favourable consideration under the Interim Criteria could not be applied.

[Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung joined the meeting during the question and answer session.]

68. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives and the applicant’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

69. Two Members showed sympathy to the applicant as there was only a relatively small portion of the proposed SH footprint (i.e. 17%) falling within the “AGR” zone. A Member also raised concern on the future use of the Site if the application was not approved, having considered that the Site was unlikely to be used for agricultural rehabilitation. Another Member said that the applicant seemed to have a misconception that sympathetic consideration would be given by the Board for application with less than 30% of the SH footprint falling outside “V” zone, which needed to be clarified. The meeting agreed that PlanD would follow up on this.

70. The Chairperson remarked and Members noted that sympathetic consideration under the Interim Criteria could not be applied to the current application as there was sufficient land within the “V” zone to meet both the outstanding SH application and the 10-year SH demand forecast. Members agreed that the Board should adopt a consistent approach in considering applications for SH and the principles laid down in the Interim Criteria should be followed. Members also agreed to state clearly in the rejection reasons that the subject application did not comply with the Interim Criteria in that there was no shortage of land in meeting the demand for SH development within the “V” zone.

71. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes. It is also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) the proposed development does not comply with the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories in that there is no general shortage of land in meeting the demand for Small House development in the “Village Type Development” zone of Tai Hang.”

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferment of Review of Application No. A/I-TCTC/61 (1st Deferment)

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 2567 in D.D. 3 TC, Ha Ling Pei Village, Tung Chung, Lantau Island

(TPB Paper No. 10838)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

72. The Secretary reported that on 23.5.2022, the applicant requested deferment of consideration of the review application for 90 days to allow more time for preparation of further information (FI) to address departmental comments.

73. Members noted that the justifications for deferment met the criteria set out in Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPB PG-No. 33A) in that the applicant needed more time to prepare FI to address outstanding issues, and the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties. Notwithstanding the above,

as set out in TPB PG-No. 33A, normally the applicant would be given two months for preparation of the submission of FI. In that regard, if the applicant's request for deferment was acceded to, a deferment period of two months instead of 90 days should be allowed.

74. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to defer a decision on the review application for two months, instead of 90 days as requested by the applicant, pending the submission of FI from the applicant. The Board agreed that the review application should be submitted for its consideration within three months upon receipt of FI from the applicant. If the FI submitted by the applicant was not substantial and could be processed within a shorter time, the review application could be submitted to an earlier meeting for the Board's consideration. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of the submission of FI, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

The Draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSSE/C – Consideration of a New Plan

(TPB Paper No. 10844)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

75. The Secretary reported that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP) was to take forward a land supply initiative proposed by the Government upon the recommendation of the Task Force of Land Supply on partial development of the Fanling Golf Course (FGC) for housing development. The draft OZP was prepared on the basis of the findings of the "Technical Study on Partial Development of FGC Site – Feasibility Study" (the Technical Study) which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The draft OZP covered a site proposed for public housing development by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) with the Housing Department (HD) as the executive arm.

76. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;
(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)
- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] being a member of Hong Kong Housing
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] Society (HKHS) which had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which had discussion with HD on housing development issues; and
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his serving organization currently renting premises in various estates of HKHA at concessionary rent for welfare services, and formerly operating a social service team which

was supported by HKHA and openly bid funding from HKHA.

77. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. According to the procedure and practice adopted by the Board, as the zoning to facilitate the proposed public housing development on the new draft OZP were proposed by the Planning Department (PlanD), the interests of the above Members on the item only needed to be recorded and the above Members could participate in the discussion of the item. The Secretary also reported that a letter was received from the public on the item and was tabled at the meeting.

78. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting.

PlanD

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mr Anthony K.O. Luk | - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East (DPO/FS&YLE) |
| Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung | - Senior Town Planner/Fanling Sheung Shui (STP/FS) |
| Mr Todd T.W. Wan | - Town Planner/Fanling Sheung Shui |

CEDD

- | | |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mr John W.H. Chung | - Chief Engineer/North (CE/N) |
| Mr Daniel T.L. Lau | - Senior Engineer |
| Ms Elaine S.S. Shih | - Engineer |

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

- | | |
|--------------------|--|
| Mr Boris S.P. Kwan | - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/North |
| Ms Chole C.U. Ng | - Nature Conservation Officer |

HD

- | | |
|------------------|---------------------------|
| Ms Alice W.Y. Lo | - Senior Planning Officer |
|------------------|---------------------------|

Consultants

- | | |
|----------------|------------------|
| Mr Emeric Wan |] WSP(Asia) Ltd. |
| Mr Ernest Tip |] |
| Mr Dennis Chan |] |

Ms Anny Li]
Mr Klinsmann Cheung] Ecosystems Ltd.
Mr Vincent Lai]

79. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the Paper.

80. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FS, briefed Members on the background of the draft OZP, the Planning Scheme Area (the Area) and its surroundings, the major findings of the Technical Study and the planning intention for the Area, the proposed public housing development, the proposed land use zonings and the consultation with District Council and Rural Committee as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10844 (the Paper).

81. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

Ecological Considerations

82. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details on the ecological corridors identified in the Area, including their directions and linkages;
- (b) the hydrology in the Area and its ecological significance;
- (c) noting that the intention was to conserve the existing natural landscape, whether the existing golf course, which was not naturally formed, would be preserved; and
- (d) whether the ecological corridor located in Sub-Area 1 would be affected as a result of the proposed development.

83. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N, CEDD, Messrs Emeric Wan and Klinsmann Cheung from the consultants made the

following points:

- (a) as shown on Plan 4 of the Paper, two potential ecological corridors for commuting of various fauna species were identified in the Area. The woodland habitats in Sub-Area 2 were connected together and formed an ecological corridor. Another one was identified near Sub-Area 4, which connected with the woodland extending out to the southeast of Sub-Area 4. The ecological corridors, which were not tangible corridors with fixed and regular form, allowed the species to commute within the Area and cross the Area between the natural habitats and greenery in the immediate surroundings of the Area;
- (b) the natural hilly terrain between Sub-Area 1 and Sub-Area 2 formed a watershed for the hydrology in the Area, where surface runoff would flow either to Sub-Area 1 in the north or to Sub-Areas 2 to 4 in the south. The topography and hydrology in Sub-Areas 2 to 4 were interconnected, contributing to the formation of swampy woodland, especially the Chinese Swamp Cypress at the lowland area in Sub-Area 4;
- (c) from the perspective of conservation of the Area, it was not intended to distinguish between man-made and natural landscape features. The main objective was to respect and preserve the status quo of the existing terrain for Sub-Areas 2 to 4; and
- (d) the “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone did not cover the entire Sub-Area 1. The two existing green knolls located in the south-eastern part of and beyond the boundary of Sub-Area 1 where the ecological corridor was identified would be conserved under the zoning of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Recreation cum Conservation” (“OU (Recreation cum Conservation)”).

Tree Preservation and Compensation

84. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) details of the tree preservation and transplantation proposals and whether any rare species would be affected; and
- (b) the successful rate of tree transplantation.

85. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N, CEDD and Mr Emeric Wan from the consultant made the following points:

- (a) there were 1,225 trees within Sub-Area 1, 70 of which were Trees of Particular Interest (TPIs) (including 46 rare/protected species and 24 mature trees with Diameter at Breast Height (DBH) of 1m or more). Amongst the 70 TPIs, only 11 mature trees with DBH of 1m or more would be removed, with the rest of the TPIs to be retained or transplanted. The rare/protected species would either be retained or transplanted to Sub-Areas 2 to 4. Considering that Sub-Area 1 was quite large with area of about 9 ha, only 70 TPIs were identified in the survey and such proportion was considered relatively low. Regarding the locations for compensatory planting and transplanting, the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) under the Technical Study recommended to make use of the existing turf nursery areas in Sub-Areas 2 and 3 for transplanting, such that the woodland area in the Sub-Areas could increase and the function of the ecological corridor could be strengthened. If needed, off-site planting and transplanting locations would also be considered; and
- (b) there were many successful cases of tree transplanting of TPIs in other projects. The TPIs in the Area to be transplanted were not in very large size, and major difficulties in transplanting of which were not anticipated.

Heritage Preservation

86. The Chairperson and Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the clan graves in the Area were of any heritage significance and

what would be the arrangement if these graves need to be removed;

- (b) whether Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had any assessment on the heritage value of the Old Course of FGC which was built over 100 years; and
- (c) was there any social relationship between FGC and the locals.

87. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD and Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N, CEDD made the following points:

- (a) a clan grave of Qing Dynasty in Sub-Area 1 would have interface with the proposed public housing development and might require relocation subject to further study in the detailed design stage. According to the existing land administrative policy and mechanism, relevant government department would liaise with the descendants of the clan grave regarding the suitable relocation site and compensation arrangements. Other than the said clan grave in Sub-Area 1, the rest of the clan graves located within Sub-Areas 2 and 3 would be preserved;
- (b) while the FGC, including the Area, had a history of over 100 years, it was a new item pending grading assessment by the AAB; and
- (c) there was cordial relationship between FGC and the villagers nearby. For example, FGC would allow villagers to visit the clan graves during Ching Ming and Chung Yeung festivals.

88. The Chairperson enquired if there was scope that the clan grave in Sub-Area 1 could remain intact. In response, Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N2, CEDD said that CEDD would liaise with HD on the design of the proposed public housing development in Sub-Area 1 and confirm if it was necessary to relocate the clan grave in the detailed design stage.

“OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” Zone

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

- (a) the planning intention of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone, and whether conservation or recreation would play a more important role in the zone;
- (b) given the high ecological value of Sub-Areas 2 to 4 and the presence of Chinese Swamp Cypress in Sub-Area 4, what the reasons were for not designating Sub-Areas 2 to 4 with conservation zonings, such as “Conservation Area” (“CA”) or “OU” annotated “Nature Park”, which could allow more stringent development control. Also, whether it was possible to zone the area where the Chinese Swamp Cypress were located as “CA”;
- (c) elaboration on the definition of passive recreation; details of the Columns 1 and 2 uses of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone and the definition of ‘Playground/Playing Field’ use under Column 1;
- (d) the future planning of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone, and whether it was planned as a park under the management of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department or if it would be used as a public golf course managed by the current golf club; and
- (e) whether there was any conservation strategy or statement to guide the conservation or future development of the Area.

90. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD and Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N, CEDD made the following points:

- (a) the Area was being used as a golf course, while at the same time it harboured rich ecological and natural resources. The “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone was primarily to conserve the existing natural landscape and ecological features. It was also intended for the provision of space for recreational uses serving the needs of the general public. The

zoning had struck a balance in meeting the needs of nature conservation and providing flexibility for recreational uses serving the public;

- (b) unless there was specific need for statutory planning restriction for the area where the Chinese Swamp Cypress were grown, Sub-Areas 2 to 4 would not be zoned “CA” and protection of which would be secured as Government land. To prevent disturbance to the natural landscape and ecological resources in the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone, various mitigation measures, such as restriction on the number of visitors and activities, operation hours, access control to features of conservation importance would be more effective when implementing future passive recreational uses;
- (c) in tandem with the planning intention to conserve existing natural landscape and ecological features, and to provide passive recreational uses serving the needs of the general public, there were various permitted uses under Column 1 of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone, including passive recreational uses such as ‘Barbecue Spot’, ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’, ‘Golf Course’, ‘Park and Garden’ and ‘Picnic Area’, etc. Except those compatible recreational uses under Column 1, other commercial and recreational uses were included in Column 2 and may be permitted subject to approval from the Board on the premise that these uses would not adversely impact on the conservation of the Area. There were other Column 1 uses, such as ‘Public Convenience’ which was considered small in scale and was intended to support the passive recreational use, ‘Tent Camping Ground’ which would not involve fixed structures, and ‘Private Utility Installation of Private Project’ which was intended to allow flexibility for utility installations. According to the Definition of Terms, ‘Playground/Playing Field’ referred to any land used for a playground or a playing field for ball games for the use and enjoyment of the general public;
- (d) the detailed uses of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone were

formulated in consultation with the Home Affairs Bureau (HAB) and the future management of development within the zone was yet to be confirmed. ‘Golf Course’ was a Column 1 use always permitted in this zone and it might be a potential use in future; and

- (e) the Area was government land and the Government would have full control of the future use within the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone. The ecological significance and planning intention for the Area had been detailed in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP and if needed, further elaborations could be incorporated.

91. Some Members raised concern on the future management of development within the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone and were worried that the Area could not be properly conserved under the “OU” zoning. In that regard, the Chairperson remarked that the Area would be handed over to the Government in September 2023 and it would then be the Government’s responsibility to manage the site and to decide on the future management parties. The Government was well aware of the ecological significance of the Area and would put in efforts to conserve it. The Board should focus the discussion on the proposed land use zonings and the associated development parameters on the draft OZP, rather than the future management of the Area.

Proposed Public Housing Development and “Residential (Group A)” Zone

92. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there were any past planning experiences of having a residential development next to an area designated for conservation purpose and whether there was any assessment on the ecological impact of the proposed residential development on Sub-Area 4;
- (b) how the zoning boundary of “R(A)” was defined;
- (c) the net site area of Sub-Area 1; and noting that the development density of Sub-Area 1 was quite high, whether it was technically feasible to develop

Sub-Area 2 or include part of Sub-Area 2 into the development site of the proposed development to maximize the development potential;

- (d) whether there were any traffic improvement measures to cater for the additional traffic generation from the proposed development; and
- (e) the future development of Fanling/Sheung Shui area.

93. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD and Mr John W.H. Chung, CE/N, CEDD made the following points:

- (a) previous cases of planning residential development next to an area designated for conservation purpose were not uncommon in Hong Kong. Various assessments would be required to ensure that the proposed residential development would have no unacceptable impacts on the area of conservation. For the proposed public housing development, the EIA and EcoIA had demonstrated that the proposed development in Sub-Area 1 would not affect the ecology of Sub-Areas 2 to 4. Besides, an assessment on the hydrology of the Area had also been carried out. As mentioned before, the flow of surface runoff was governed by the hilly terrain between Sub-Area 1 and Sub-Area 2 from which surface runoff would flow northwards and southwards respectively, and the proposed development in Sub-Area 1 would not affect the hydrology in Sub-Areas 2 to 4;
- (b) the “R(A)” zoning boundary was determined with reference to the existing contour and landscape features;
- (c) the domestic and non-domestic plot ratios (PR) of the proposed public housing development was 6.5 and 0.5 respectively, which were comparable to those of the new public housing developments in new towns. Various technical assessments had been undertaken to ensure that there would not be insurmountable problems associated with the proposed development as well as conservation of the Area. Nonetheless, the

proposed development scale had already reached the maximum due to the ecological and traffic concerns;

- (d) traffic to/from the proposed development would be via Ping Kong Road, Po Kin Road, and Fan Kam Road connecting with Fanling Highway. Various junction/road improvement schemes were proposed in Fanling/Sheung Shiu area which could cater for the proposed public housing development. The proposed road improvement schemes for the Tai Tau Leng Roundabout, junction of Castle Peak Road – Kwu Tung/Fan Kam Road would be carried out under different projects, whereas those for the junction of Po Kin Road/Ping Kong Road would be carried out under this project. According to the traffic impact assessment under the Technical Study, with implementation of these improvement schemes, the nearby junctions would operate satisfactorily even after completion of the proposed development. Traffic impact resulted from the proposed development was considered acceptable; and
- (e) major developments around the Area mainly comprised four proposed housing sites in Fanling/Sheung Shui (FSS) New Town (which were in the midst of statutory OZP amendment processes), and Kwu Tong North/Fanling North New Development Area (KTN/FLN NDA). KTN/FLN NDA would provide some 72,000 flats while the four housing sites in FSS New Town would provide about 20,000 flats.

Impacts on Golf Sports Events

94. In response to Members' concerns on whether the current proposal would hinder the development of golf sports in Hong Kong and whether the capacity of FGC for holding international golf sports events might be diminished, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD said that the Government recognized the importance and contribution of the FGC in the development of golf sports in Hong Kong. The FGC was composed of three distinct courses (the Old, New and Eden Courses) having a total area of about 172 ha. The Area known as the Old Course of the FGC was situated to the east of Fan Kam Road separated from the main part of the FGC and mainly comprised an eight-hole course with golf fairways, covering only part

of the FGC (i.e. 32 ha.). The New Course and Eden Course (with two 18-hole courses) of the FGC located to the west of Fan Kam Road would be retained. International and local golf sports events or competitions were mainly held at the New Course and Eden Course while the Old Course was normally used as the warm-up and training areas and for provision of car parking spaces for visitors during the time of the events. To support the holding of major golf sports events, a public vehicle park which would provide similar number of car parking spaces as in the existing carpark at the Old Course (i.e. about 280 car parking spaces) was proposed in the public housing development within the “R(A)” zone. This would be additional provision on top of the ancillary car parking spaces for the proposed public housing development as required under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.

95. Regarding a Member’s concern on whether the proposed public housing development would bring negative effect in respect of the ambience for holding international golf sports events in the remaining part of the FGC, the Chairperson supplemented that HAB which had been involved in the planning for the Area since the commissioning of the Technical Study would give thorough considerations to ensuring that the proposed development in Sub-Area 1 would not adversely impact on the holding of international golf sports events. HAB also advised that the provision of car parking spaces was needed to support the events.

[Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and Wilson Y.W. Fung joined the meeting, and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting during the questions and answers session.]

96. Some Members considered that Sub-Areas 2 to 4 should be designated with a conservation zoning to better conserve the ecology and hydrology of the Area, in particular the precious Chinese Swamp Cypress in Sub-Area 4. The planning intention and the Column 1 uses of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone should be reviewed to highlight the importance of conservation of the sub-areas and to ensure that the future recreational activities in the sub-areas would not induce adverse impacts on the natural landscape resources therein. More stringent development control for Sub-Areas 2 to 4 should be considered and reference could be made to the planning and management of Mai Po Nature Reserve and Long Valley Nature Park. In particular, a Member raised that although the Area was currently used as a golf course, the number of visitors to the golf course was limited and there was also no nighttime activity in the Area. As some species of animals were active at night, there was concern on the inclusion of ‘Tent Camping Ground’ as a Column 1 use under the “OU (Recreation cum

Conservation)” zone as it involved nighttime activity that might cause disturbance to wildlife there. The inclusion of ‘Barbecue Spot’ under Column 1 might not be appropriate as well. Some Members shared the same concern and had reservation on the inclusion of these two uses under Column 1 of the “OU” zone. There were also suggestions from Members that Sub-Areas 2 to 4 should be zoned as “OU (Conservation cum Recreation)” instead of “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” to prioritize the importance of conservation of the sub-areas. A Member commented that the traffic impact brought by the proposed development should be carefully looked into to avoid saturation of traffic capacity of Fan Kam Road, and any traffic improvement measures might need to be specified in the ES.

97. Some Members agreed to the designation of “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone to allow a dual purpose of both conservation and public enjoyment of the Area although they shared the view that the Column 1 uses of the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone should be reviewed.

98. Some Members supported that suitable recreational uses could be allowed in Sub-Areas 2 to 4. However, based on the current information, it was difficult to consider whether the future recreational uses would be compatible with the conservation intention of the sub-areas. A Member supported the draft OZP as it could facilitate the increase of the housing supply while conserving the existing ecological features of significance in the Area, and not affecting the holding of international golf events. The Member suggested that the draft OZP should be exhibited as soon as possible so that the public consultation process could commence.

99. As Members had no further questions or comments on the draft OZP, the Chairperson consolidated Members’ major views as follows:

- (a) Members generally agreed to exhibit the draft OZP for the Area for public inspection, but there was scope to refine the details of the draft OZP, particularly for the proposed “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone;
- (b) Members agreed with the general planning intention for the Area, i.e. to develop the northern-most portion for public housing development and to conserve the existing natural landscape and ecological features in the remaining southern portion with provision of passive recreational uses to

serve the general public;

- (c) for the northern-most portion, Members had no particular comment on the development parameters of the proposed public housing development and agreed that the proposed “R(A)” zoning and its development restrictions as set out in the draft Notes in the Paper would provide a reasonable basis for plan exhibition; and
- (d) for the remaining southern portion, Members were of the view that the planning intention and schedule of uses for the proposed “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone in the draft Notes and the associated descriptions in the draft ES should be refined with a view to better reflecting the priority of conservation for this part of the Area and the passive recreational uses thereat should not compromise the conservation intention and should serve the general public.

100. PlanD was invited to refine the draft Notes and the ES taking into account Members’ views.

101. After deliberation, the Board decided to defer exhibition of the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area OZP No. S/FSSE/C for public inspection pending PlanD’s refinement of the draft Notes and ES, particularly for the “OU (Recreation cum Conservation)” zone to reflect the views of the Board. The revised Notes and ES should be submitted to the Board for further consideration when ready.

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/26

(TPB Paper No. 10841)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

102. The Secretary reported that the amendments of the draft Cha Kwo Ling, Yau Tong, Lei Yue Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K15/26 (the draft OZP) involved two proposed public housing developments to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) and the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) (with the Housing Department (HD) as the executive arm of HKHA), which were supported by a Feasibility Study and a Design Review respectively, both commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) with AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultants. A representation and a comment were also submitted by HKHS (R1/C1).

103. Amendments were also made to the Notes of the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone at Yau Tong Bay on the draft OZP to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB) on a s.12A application No. Y/K15/4, which was submitted by Main Wealth Development Limited, a joint venture of owners of Yau Tong Marine Lots including Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK), Henderson Land Development Limited (HLD), Swire Properties Limited (Swire), Wheelock Properties (HK) Limited (Wheelock). Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the s.12A application.

104. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung <i>(as Director of Planning)</i>	-	being an ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
Mr Paul Y.K. Au <i>(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)</i>	-	being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;

- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research project with CEDD; having past business dealings with AECOM and HLD; having current business dealings with Swire; being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD; being a Principal Lecturer of the School of Biological Science of HKU and his department had received donations from Swire Trust; being a life member of the Conservatory Association (CA) and his wife being the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of CA which had received donation from Wheelock before;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHS, HKHA and SHK;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; having current business dealings with ARUP; his spouse being an employee of SHK;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a member of HKHS; being a former Executive Director and Committee Member of the Boys' & Girls' Clubs Association of Hong Kong which had received sponsorship from SHK;

- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS;
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his serving organization currently renting premises in various estates of HKHA at concessionary rent for welfare services, and formerly operating a social service team which was supported by HKHA and openly bidding funding from HKHA;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a member of the Council of Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before; and
- Miss Winnie W.M. Ng - being a Director of the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd. (KMB) and Long Win Company Limited (Long Win); SHK being one of the shareholders of KMB and Long Win.

105. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting and Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. Members also noted that as the item was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

106. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10841 (the Paper). On 3.12.2021, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 187 representations were received and three were made with identity information missing and should be treated as not having been made pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the

Ordinance. The 184 valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and a total of five valid comments were received.

107. In view of the similar nature of the representations and comments, the hearing of all representations and comments was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for Q3 2022.

108. After deliberation, the Board noted that the representations made with the required information missing as mentioned in paragraph 1.3 of the Paper should be considered as invalid pursuant to sections 6(2)(b) and 6(3)(b) of the Ordinance and agreed that:

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter.

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representation and Comments on the Draft Chek Lap Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-CLK/15

(TPB Paper No. 10845)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

109. The Secretary reported that the amendments of the draft Chek Lap Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-CLK/15 (the draft OZP) involved various sites in Chek Lap Kok Airport Island and Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities Island which were supported by technical study conducted by the Airport Authority Hong Kong (AAHK) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) was one of the consultants of the study. A comment was also submitted by AAHK (C2).

110. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung - being an Executive Director of the AAHK;
and

Mr Franklin Yu - having current business dealings with
ARUP.

111. Members noted that Mr Franklin Yu had already left the meeting. Members also noted that as the item was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

112. The Secretary briefly introduced the Town Planning Board (the Board) Paper No. 10845 (the Paper). On 31.12.2021, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, one representation was received. The representation was subsequently published for three weeks and a total of two valid comments were received.

113. In view of the similar nature of the representation and comments, the hearing of all representation and comments was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representation and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for August 2022.

114. After deliberation, the Board agreed that:

- (a) the representation and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the Board; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter.

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

115. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 7:10 p.m.