

**Minutes of 1279th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 19.8.2022**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands) (Acting)
Mr Vic C.H. Yau

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport and Logistics) 3
Transport and Logistics Bureau
Miss Fiona W.S. Li

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Victor W.T. Yeung

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Annie H.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1278th Meeting held on 5.8.2022

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1278th meeting held on 5.8.2022 would be sent to Members in due course. Subject to any proposed amendments by Members, the minutes would be confirmed.

[Post-meeting Note: The minutes, incorporating amendments to paragraph 5 proposed by a Member, were confirmed on 30.8.2022.]

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on Draft Outline Zoning Plan/Development Scheme Plan

2. The Chairperson reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations and comments on (i) the draft Cheung Sha Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K5/38 and (ii) the draft Urban Renewal Authority (URA) Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road Development Scheme Plan (DSP) No. S/K5/URA3/1.

3. The Secretary reported that the draft URA Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road DSP was submitted by the URA. Comments had been submitted by the URA (C1) and the Conservancy Association (CA) (C32). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(*as Director of Planning*) a member of its Committee;
- Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(*as Director of Lands*) a member of its Committee;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of
URA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with URA;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former Executive Director of URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund,
and a director and chief executive officer of Light Be
(Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of
a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
Renewal Fund;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban
Renewal Fund and being a member of the Hong
Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had
discussion with URA on housing development
issues;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS which currently had
discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which
currently had discussion with URA on housing

development issues;

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of Land, Rehousing and Compensation Committee of URA and a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;

Mr L. T. Kwok - his former serving organisation had received sponsorship from URA; and

Dr C.H. Hau - being a life member of CA and his spouse being the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of CA.

4. The Secretary also reported that the amendment item on the draft Cheung Sha Wan OZP involved a public housing development to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA. AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants for conducting technical assessments in support of the development proposal. Two other amendment items involved the incorporation of two completed developments of the URA DSPs into the OZP. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Ivan M.K. Chung - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(*as Director of Planning*) a member of its Committee;

Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a non-executive director of the URA Board and
(*as Director of Lands*) a member of its Committee and a member of HKHA;

Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs
(*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department*) who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidized Housing Committee of HKHA;

- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being the Deputy Chairman of Appeal Board Panel of URA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HA, URA and AECOM;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - being a former Executive Director of URA;
- Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu - being a director of the Board of Urban Renewal Fund, and a director and chief executive officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which was a licensed user of a few URA's residential units in Sheung Wan;
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund;
- Ms Lilian S.K. Law - being a former director of the Board of the Urban Renewal Fund and being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - being a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of Land, Rehousing and Compensation Committee of URA and a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with URA on housing development issues;

- Mr L T Kwok - his former serving organisation had received sponsorship from URA, 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;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA; and
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM.

5. As the item for agreement on hearing arrangement was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests relating to the proposed amendments, representers and/or commenters should be allowed to stay in the meeting. The Board noted that some of those Members had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

6. The Secretary introduced the details as below:

- (a) on 28.1.2022, the draft Cheung Sha Wan OZP involving mainly the rezoning of the site of Housing Authority's Wang Cheong Factory Estate from "Open Space" to "Residential (Group A)11" for public housing development was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 9 valid representations were received. The valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and a total of 27 valid comments were received;
- (b) on 28.1.2022, the draft URA Cheung Wah Street/Cheung Sha Wan Road DSP involving mainly the designation of "Residential (Group A)" zone for Site A subject to domestic and non-domestic gross floor area restrictions of 38,978m² and 5,197m² respectively and building height restriction

(BHR) of 140mPD and (ii) “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Open Space” for Site B, with the “G/IC” zone subject to BHR of 100mPD, was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, a total of 270 valid representations were received. The valid representations were subsequently published for three weeks and a total of 32 valid comments were received; and

- (c) in view of the similar nature of the representations and comments, the respective hearings of all valid representations and comments for the OZP and DSP were recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearings, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter in the hearing sessions. Consideration of the representations and comments of the OZP and DSP by the full Board were both tentatively scheduled for September 2022.

7. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the respective hearing arrangements in paragraph 6(c) above.

(ii) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 3 of 2022

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

(Application No. A/NE-KLN/604)

8. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) on 22.7.2022 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 17.6.2022 to reject on review application No. A/NE-KLH/604 for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) at Lots 32 S.A ss.1 and 32 S.B in D.D. 7, Tai Hang, Tai Po, which fell within “Village Type Development” (“V”) and “Agriculture” (“AGR”) zones on the Kau Lung Hang Outline Zoning Plan.

9. The application was rejected by the Board for the following reasons:

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

10. Members noted that the hearing date of the appeal was yet to be fixed and agreed that the Secretary would act on behalf of the Board in dealing with the appeal in the usual manner.

(iii) Appeal Statistics

11. The Secretary reported that as at 15.8.2022, a total of 15 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning). Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	39
Dismissed	168
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	211
Yet to be Heard	15
Decision Outstanding	0
<hr/> Total	433

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSS/25

(TPB Paper No. 10856)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

12. The Secretary reported that the amendment items mainly involved various public housing developments to be implemented by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA, which were supported by two Engineering Feasibility Studies conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD); and two sites to take forward the rezoning proposals under the latest area assessments of industrial land, which were supported by the technical assessments conducted by the Institute of Future Cities (IOFC) of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). Representations had been submitted by Kung Hei Investment Limited (R1), which was a subsidiary of CK Asset Holidays Limited (CK), the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (R2), which was a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD) and the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R18). The following Members had declared interests on the items:

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

Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs
(as Chief Engineer who was a member of the Strategic Planning
(Works), Home Affairs Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of
Department) HKHA;

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA, CUHK
and MTRCL, and past business dealings with CK;

- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA, and having current business dealings with CUHK;
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his former serving organisation 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;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD, being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) which had received a donation from a family member of the Chairman of HLD before, and having past business dealings with HLD;
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - being a former member of the Council of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before;
- Ms Bernadette W.S. - being an employee of HKU which had received a

Tsui donation from HLD before;

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

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung - her spouse being an employee of CUHK.

[Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai and Paul Y.K. Au left the meeting at this point.]

13. Members noted that Messrs Franklin Yu and Timothy K.W. Ma, Dr C.H. Hau Mr L.T. Kwok and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui had not yet joined and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting, and Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai and Paul Y.K. Au had already left the meeting. Members also agreed that as the interests of Messrs L.T. Kwok and Stephen L.H. Liu, Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui were considered indirect, and Professor John C.Y. Ng, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau and K.L. Wong and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the amendments, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (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)

Ms Lily H. Lau - Town Planner/Fanling & Sheung Shui

CEDD

Mr Stephen W.C. Wat - Senior Engineer (SE)

Mr Terry T.L. Kea - Senior Engineer

Mr Terence C.K. Lam - Senior Engineer

Mr Simon W.P. Wong - Engineer

Mr Melvin Y.F. Lam - Engineer

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Alice W.Y. Lo - Senior Planning Officer

Ms Yoko M. Y. Cheung - Planning Officer

Consultants - Atkins China Limited

Mr Sean Wong

Mr Harry Chu

Representers, Commenter and Representers' Representatives

R1 – Kung Hei Investment Limited

Mr Erza Wong]

KTA Planning Ltd.]

Mr David C.W. Fok]

Ms L.Y. Lam]	
<i>LWK & Partners (HK) Ltd.</i>]	
Mr C.M. Chan]	Representer's Representatives
Mr Y.S. Lam]	
<i>CTA Consultants</i>]	
Mr C.W. Leung]	
<i>WSP (Asia) Ltd.</i>]	
Mr C.K. Chan]	

R2 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

Mr Tsang Chung Man - Representer's Representative

R8/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R9 – Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy 黃馮翠玲

Ms Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy - Representer

R11 – Helen Yu

Ms Helen Yu - Representer

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

representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenter and the representers' representatives. After the Q&A session, government representatives, the representers, commenter or the representers' representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

17. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FS, PlanD, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments to the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10856 (Paper).

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng, Messrs L.T. Kwok and Lincoln L.H. Huang, Professor Roger C.K. Chan and Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui joined the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

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

R1 – Kung Hei Investment Limited

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Messrs David C.W. Fok and Chan Chiu Man, made the following main points:

Background

- (a) the site owned by Kung Hei Investment Limited (R1) was the Park'N Shop Sheung Shui Fresh Food Distribution Centre (R1's Site). It had been zoned "Industrial" ("I") since 1987 and subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 5 and maximum building height (BH) of 25m. According to the '2020 Area Assessments of Industrial Land in the Territory' (Area Assessments

2020) conducted by PlanD, the industrial area (Sheung Shui Area 4) in which R1's Site was located was recommended to be rezoned from "I" to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") to facilitate land use restructuring and provide more flexibility. The maximum PR remained at 5 while the maximum BH was increased to 75mPD;

- (b) R1 proposed to rezone R1's Site to "Residential (Group E)" ("R(E)") for a composite residential use that was subject to a maximum total PR of 5.5 (domestic PR of 5 and non-domestic PR of 0.5) and with the same maximum BH of 75mPD;
- (c) R1's Site was occupied by an existing 6-storey industrial building (IB) for cold storage and ancillary office under single ownership of R1. The existing PR of about 4.4 was close to the permissible maximum PR of 5 under the "OU(B)" zone;
- (d) whilst R1 welcomed the rezoning of R1's Site to "OU(B)" which provided more flexibility, it was considered that the "OU(B)" zoning provided inadequate incentive for land owners to undertake redevelopments. Since Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 were relatively remote, it was not a prime location for business and retail uses. There were four approved applications for wholesale conversion of IB between 2012 and 2016 in the area, but only one of them was being implemented with approved general building plans. The land use restructuring and transformation were slow. As revealed by the Area Assessments 2020, warehouses accounted for about 83% of gross floor area (GFA) in the area;

R1's Proposal

- (e) given the economic conditions in recent years, the prospect of the commercial and retail markets was uncertain. It was considered more appropriate to redevelop R1's Site for residential use. The proposed development under R1's proposed "R(E)" zone would have two 19-storey residential towers atop a non-domestic portion comprising one storey of retail

uses and a landscaped podium. The retail frontage abutting Ka Fu Close would serve the local. The landscaped podium between the non-domestic and domestic portions and a 22.6m-wide building separation between the towers were proposed for air ventilation purpose. Those measures complied with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines of the Buildings Department;

- (f) technical assessments on noise, air quality, traffic and sewage aspects were conducted, which had ascertained the feasibility of the proposed composite residential/commercial development. For noise impact, the noise from fixed plants, railway and road traffic was assessed and it was revealed that the maximum railway noise level at noise sensitive receivers at R1's Site was 57 dB(A) during the night-time, which complied with the noise criteria (60dB(A) or below) under the Noise Control Ordinance. Traffic noise could be mitigated by acoustic windows. There would not be fixed noise sources since the abutting Kerry Warehouse (Sheung Shui) and Cambridge Plaza functioned as a noise shield. Regarding air quality impact from vehicle emission, it would be mitigated by the respective 5m-setbacks of the proposed development from Cheuk Wan Street and Ka Fu Close. There would not be adverse sewerage impacts;

Responses to the Paper

- (g) the Paper indicated that the proposed rezoning to "R(E)" was not supported as the proposed composite residential development was considered not compatible with the surrounding developments, which were predominantly IBs. R1's response was that the surrounding area was not predominantly industrial but the area was gradually transformed into a mixed-use neighbourhood. In Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30, about 83% of GFA in the area was for warehouse use and there were a number of sites rezoned for public housing developments since 2019. One of the public housing sites zoned "R(A)4" was only 60m to the south of R1's Site and separated by only on-street parking spaces and road. The current round of OZP amendments also involved rezoning of sites in Sheung Shui Area 30 for public housing, commercial use and Government, institution and

community (GIC) uses;

- (h) the Paper indicated that the “OU(B)” zone would promote restructuring of Sheung Shui Area 4 into an area for non-industrial and servicing uses, and provide employment opportunities for the North District. However, R1 considered that rezoning an industrial area to “OU(B)” was not effective for promoting land use restructuring in new town outside the urban area. One example of such unsuccessful case was the Tung Tau Industrial Area (TTIA) in Yuen Long;
- (i) the TTIA with an original area of about 11.63 ha was zoned “I” in 1991 and then rezoned to “OU(B)” in 2001 pursuant to PlanD’s land use reviews and area assessments. However, land use restructuring was not quite achieved in the decade after the rezoning. In 2011, the sites in the western and northern fringes of the TTIA involving government land and buildings under single ownership were rezoned from “OU(B)” to “R(E)1”. The area rezoned “R(E)1” was 4.7 ha, i.e. about 40% of the TTIA. Since then, three out of the seven “R(E)1” sites were granted planning permissions for composite residential uses and two of them (namely Twin Regency and Wang Fu Court) were completed. On the other hand, within the remaining TTIA (6.9 ha), there was only one implemented wholesale conversion development for commercial use;
- (j) according to PlanD’s previous area assessments, the GFA used for warehouse in the TTIA increased from 46% in 2009 to 58% in 2020 and only 9% of the GFA in the TTIA was occupied for commercial use. There was also an application (No. Y/YL/16) for rezoning an “OU(B)” site to “R(E)2” approved in 2021. These demonstrated that rezoning to “OU(B)” did not provide adequate incentives for redevelopment due to the remote location of the TTIA and the maximum development intensity which was similar to the existing IBs. Since Sheung Shui Area 4 was at a more remote location than the TTIA and with more GFA being used for warehouses, rezoning R1’s Site to “R(E)” would be more effective to encourage restructuring of the area;

- (k) the Paper indicated that Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 would remain as a major employment centre in the North District. R1's view was that there would be jobs available from local employment centres in the surroundings of R1's Site including the Kwu Tung North and Fanling North New Development Areas (NDAs) and the On Lok Tsuen Industrial Area. Besides, the existing workers at R1's Site would not be affected by the redevelopment as they could be arranged to work in other warehouses of R1;
- (l) the Paper indicated that R1's Site was located in the centre of "OU(B)" zone and surrounded by active IBs, thus the proposed composite residential development might result in industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem. R1's view was that there were only 2% of GFA in the industrial area of Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 used for general industrial uses and 83% used for warehouses. The technical feasibility of R1's proposal was ascertained and any concerns on potential I/R issue would be addressed in the subsequent s.16 stage under the proposed "R(E)" zoning;
- (m) the Paper indicated that rezoning only one IB site to "R(E)" would lead to piecemeal development. R1's view was that the crux of the issue should be the land use compatibility of R1's proposal. The proposed composite residential development was compatible with the adjoining "OU(B)" and "R(A)" zones, as well as the character of the area intermixed with new residential and business uses. Taking into account the nearest planned public housing development (about 60m to the south of R1's Site) as abovementioned, the proposed composite residential development was actually an extension of the residential use. Moreover, with the planned public housing developments in Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30, the area would be served by sufficient supporting transport and community facilities such as the footbridge system to MTR Sheung Shui Station, public transport interchange, schools and GIC facilities; and
- (n) R1's Site and the adjoining land parcels under single ownership had potential for residential developments to achieve land use restructuring.

“R(E)” zoning was considered appropriate for the proposed composite residential development at R1’s Site, which could be a pilot development to effectively kick-start the phasing out of existing industrial uses through redevelopment for residential use on application to the Board.

R2 – The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited

21. Mr Tsang Chung Man said that the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited opposed Item C1. There was a 600mm high pressure pipeline near Castle Peak Road-Kwu Tung Section. The boundary of the Item C1 site should be adjusted to exclude the pipeline. Furthermore, the project proponent of the public housing development should evaluate the potential risk on the town gas pipeline in the vicinity as well as conduct a quantitative risk assessment (QRA) due to the increase in population near the gas pipeline and determine the necessary mitigation measures. The Hong Kong and China Gas Co. Ltd. should be consulted in the design stage of the development.

R9 – Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy 黃馮翠玲

22. Ms Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident affected by Item C1. The proposed development should not proceed or the village settlements of Tsung Pak Long, where she resided, should be excluded from the proposed development site;
- (b) the North District Council (NDC), Fanling District Rural Committee (FDRC) and Sheung Shui District Rural Committee (SSDRC) were consulted on the amendments to the OZP, but the villagers were not. They were notified in person by some government representatives about resumption of their village for the proposed housing development on 17.12.2021. The villagers were all very worried;
- (c) the villagers had been living in Tsung Pak Long for decades. While there was a need to increase housing land supply, other options such as bare or vacant sites in the 16,000 ha of green belt could be explored instead of

resuming their village;

- (d) the Item C site was divided by a nullah into two portions. The eastern portion which was about two-thirds of the site was occupied by brownfield operations such as metal factory and warehouse. The western portion which was about one-third of the site was the Tsung Pak Long Village. About 3,300 units of flat would be produced at the Item C site, and exclusion of their village from the site would only reduce about 1,000 units, which was not very significant. There would be a few ten thousands of housing units in the Kwu Tung North NDA and 900 odd units in the adjacent housing site to the west. Furthermore, the vacant public and private housing units in Hong Kong were over 800 and 50,000 respectively and there was a mismatch of housing resources;
- (e) only nine out of 32 ha of land in the Fanling Golf Course site would be used for developing about 12,000 public housing units due to ecological conservation. Their village should also be preserved likewise; and
- (f) despite the compensation and rehousing arrangement, it was unfair to destroy their homes that they had built for decades. The living environment they currently enjoyed could not be compensated. Their small village should be preserved.

R8/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

23. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the current plan-making and representation process provided opportunity for representers/commenters to provide their insights and views from a local perspective. For instance, R11 provided background information on the impact on Tai Tau Leng Village in an informative and concise manner from the perspective of someone who was very familiar with the locality that would facilitate other people including the Board to better understand the area;

Rezoning of Industrial Area

- (b) the rezoning of the industrial area in Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 would be welcomed by developers and the commercial developments would provide employment. However, there was a concern about the accommodation of brownfield operations such as car repairing which was essential for the community and provided thousands of jobs. The gentrification of the “I” zones with no alternative sites provided for workshops would be a concern;
- (c) there was no information on the number of workers that would lose their jobs due to R1’s proposal and the alternative employment opportunities that would be provided under the OZP amendments. It was important to provide adequate job opportunities close to public housing developments, so that carers could work between times when the elderly and children were sent to care centres and schools respectively. They could save travel time and devote as much time as possible to their families;

Tree Felling and Compensation

- (d) a total of 1,035, 173, 515 and 148 trees were surveyed under Items A1 to A3, Item B, Item C1 and Items D1 and D2 (part) respectively. Most of the trees would be felled including some of substantial size. There was no information about the impact on flora and fauna. Since the sites would be developed into densely populated towers, more trees should be grown;
- (e) whilst 350 new trees were proposed within the future public housing development at the Item A1 site, the trees to be provided on podium would only be small decorative trees which could not attract birds, butterflies or fauna;
- (f) for Item B, 100 out of 173 trees that were in direct conflict with the proposed development were recommended to be felled but only about 20 new trees were proposed within the future development. For Items D1 and D2 (part), some

compensatory trees were proposed outside the public housing site boundary and some of them would be planted along a highway;

- (g) it was proposed to plant a total of 815 compensatory trees at Tong Hang, but the site looked quite small in size. No further details were provided on how the compensatory trees would be accommodated at the Tong Hang site and how they would integrate with the local environment and terrain thereat. It was not acceptable to have remote off-site compensatory planting since it could not contribute to the cleansing effect of trees nor absorbing ambient heat and lowering temperatures;
- (h) the Board did not uphold the representations in respect of two other OZPs, which involved amendments resulting in the felling of three thousand trees, in the last TPB meeting. The accumulative impact of tree felling on aspects such as climate change should be studied;

Air Ventilation and Visual Aspects

- (i) the air ventilation mitigation measure of planting trees with appropriate sized canopies in frequently accessed outdoor spaces would not be implemented. Tree species requiring space to grow bigger in the long term would not be planted;
- (j) the photos used in the Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment were taken on a badly polluted or cloudy day which did not provide a clear picture of the adverse visual impacts. It was also unclear whether the Executive Council's approval on increasing development intensity for public housing where technically feasible in December 2018 had been reflected in the visual and other impact assessments;
- (k) the mitigation measure of providing a 15m-wide building separation was always proposed but its effectiveness was questionable. The building separations were wider in older developments such as City One Shatin;

GIC Facilities

- (l) there would be no GIC facilities to be incorporated in the private housing developments under Items A2 and A3. Given the aging population, provision of social welfare facilities equivalent to 5% of the domestic GFA within planned public housing developments was considered insufficient;
- (m) it would be more suitable for a medium-rise private development at the Item B site. The proposed public housing development would create a wall effect bordering the green hillside and would be visually incompatible with the surroundings. She spoke to HA officials and learnt that they did not favour such small development site as it lacked the traditional supporting facilities in a normal public housing development;
- (n) as discussed in other hearings for OZP amendments, the need for more schools was debatable and should be subject to review based on the falling number of students and plans to close down some existing schools. The ongoing rezoning of a number “G/IC” sites to residential land uses and their supporting facilities was unsatisfactory. While the Paper mentioned that appropriate sites would be found for GIC services, the availability of such sites was questionable. Sites originally intended for community services and recreational facilities should not be used for housing developments;

Housing Demand and Supply

- (o) the need to provide a large amount of public housing units was questionable given the decline in population, increase in interest rates and the poor economic conditions. Noting that empty housing units were available in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA), the Government should consider acquiring some of these housing units as an option for retirees or those Hong Kong citizens who preferred living and working in the Mainland as a solution to meeting housing needs; and
- (p) OZP amendments for housing developments were unnecessary since the

population in Hong Kong was declining and there was a lot of empty housing units. Vacancy tax was proposed previously to address the issue related to the then estimated 200,000 empty units. The recent trend of emigration would worsen the situation. Families with limited means to upgrade their quarters should be provided with allowances instead of building more housing units.

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

Rezoning of Industrial Area

25. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the current situation and the types of commercial and industrial operations in the industrial area;
- (b) the rationale behind the rezoning of the Item D4 site (in Sheung Shui Area 4) as "OU(B)" and its role in the overall planning of Sheung Shui/Fanling New Town;
- (c) whether the existing industrial undertakings could continue their operations under the "OU(B)" zoning;
- (d) the planning intention of Sheung Shui Area 4, and whether the area was intended to be transformed for residential developments in the long term;
- (e) in addition to rezoning sites in Sheung Shui Area 4 from "I" to "OU(B)", whether there were any other policy initiatives to facilitate land use restructuring;

- (f) whether the case of the TTIA presented by R1 was relevant to the Item D4 site;
- (g) whether the I/R issue for a residential development at R1's Site was minimal as claimed by R1; and
- (h) whether Shek Wu Hui Sewage Treatment Works abutting the northwest of Sheung Shui Area 4 would be a consideration for not rezoning the area for residential use.

26. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) according to the Area Assessments 2022, for the uses in private IBs in the industrial area of Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30, there were 83% used for warehouse/storage, 10% vacant/under renovation and 4% used for office. The vacancy rate was 5.3% which was lower than the territorial level of 6.4%;
- (b) the transformation in the industrial area was gradually taking place. There were a few wholesale conversion applications for commercial or retail related uses including Applications No. A/FSS/209, 234, 241 and 246 approved by the Board. The special waivers for these four cases were executed for wholesale conversion and the conversion works for the last case were almost completed. Taking that into account, the Area Assessments 2022 recommended to rezone Sheung Shui Area 4 from "I" to "OU(B)" to further facilitate land use restructuring, and provide more flexibility for redevelopment. In tandem with On Lok Tsuen (another industrial area in Fanling Area 25), the area zoned "OU(B)" in Sheung Shui Area 4 would provide a wider variety of job opportunities and would be a major employment node for the Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town and the North District;

- (c) the existing industrial undertakings would not be affected by the “OU(B)” zoning. The operators could continue their existing operations until they detailed to change to some other uses which should then conform to the provisions under the “OU(B)” zone;
- (d) Sheung Shui Area 4 was mainly zoned “OU(B)” which was intended primarily for general business uses. To its northwest, there was Shek Wu Hui Sewage Treatment Works. While a public housing development was planned to the southeast of the “OU(B)” zone, the intention of the remaining portion of Sheung Shui Area 4 was for business use and there was no intention to transform the area for residential use;
- (e) apart from change in land use zonings, the Government had launched other incentive measures to facilitate wholesale conversion and redevelopment of IBs. For example, to encourage the redevelopment of pre-1987 IBs outside residential zones, relaxation of non-domestic PR up to 20% subject to the approval by the Board was introduced;
- (f) the area of the TTIA was about 7 ha while that of the Item D4 site was 4.2 ha. The scale of the “OU(B)” zone in Sheung Shui Area 4 was smaller. Moreover, the site context was different. For the TTIA, the “R(E)” zones were located in the western and northern fringes of the industrial area. To the further north of those “R(E)” zones was Nam Sang Wai where was mainly under a wetland conservation zone. In comparison, whilst there were four planned/proposed public housing developments in the periphery of Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30, R1’s Site was surrounded by existing IBs to its north, west and south. The composite residential development proposed by R1 would inevitably be subject to I/R interface issue and was considered incompatible with the surrounding developments;
- (g) R1 considered that the I/R issue was minimal given that the dominant use in the area was warehouse/storage and there was a planned public housing site to the east of R1’s Site. As a matter of fact, measures had been adopted by HD in the layout of the said planned public housing development to address

the possible I/R issue. The measures included positioning the residential blocks away from the IBs as far as possible, adopting single aspect design at the western frontage facing the industrial area and using a stand-alone car park block as a buffer between the public housing blocks and IBs; and

- (h) it was the planning intention to locate the Shek Wu Hui Sewage Treatment Works and the industrial area in Sheung Shui Areas 4 and 30 were on the northern periphery of the Sheung Shui and Fanling New Town and at a distance from the core residential developments in the town centre in the early stage of the new town development. When the new town was further developed and expanded, and some housing developments were recently planned near the industrial area after demonstration of technical feasibility. As such, interface issues between the said housing developments and the sewage treatment works and business uses were not a concern and R1's proposal was not supported for the abovementioned reasons.

Air Ventilation Impacts

27. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the findings of the preliminary air ventilation assessment – expert evaluations (AVA-EEs);
- (b) noting that podium design was adopted in the proposed public housing developments, how the wind environment of the pedestrian level could be improved; and
- (c) the summer prevailing wind directions and their relation with the building gaps proposed in the layouts.

28. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD, and Mr Stephen W.C. Wat, SE, CEDD, made the following main points:

- (a) AVA-EEs had been conducted for the proposed housing developments.

Considerations including the prevailing wind directions, the context of the development sites and their surroundings, and existing wind corridors such as main roads were taken into account in the assessments. According to the findings of the AVA-EEs, 15m-wide wind corridors had been designated in the schemes where appropriate as recommended under the EFS to maximise air ventilation and mitigate any adverse air ventilation impacts. With the mitigation measures, it was expected that there would be no adverse air ventilation impact on the proposed developments and their surroundings. Further quantitative AVAs would be conducted at the detailed design stage to refine the scheme and further improve the wind environment;

- (b) in formulating the initial schemes for Items A1 to A3, podium design was adopted for the provision of community facilities and car parks. Design considerations had been made to minimise the scale of or even avoid podium design for better air ventilation at the street level. For instance, a 15m-wide east-west pedestrian corridor designated at the Item A1 site and the 15-wide building gap proposed between the two primary schools sites to the south of the Item A1 site would also serve as wind corridors. Furthermore, a stand-alone ancillary block of car park and social welfare facilities, instead of a podium, would be provided at the Item B site at Ching Hui Road; and
- (c) the summer prevailing wind direction was mainly easterly and the two 15m-wide east-west wind corridors abovementioned were proposed to allow wind penetration.

The Item C1 Site

29. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the Item C1 site was within Tsung Pak Long Village as claimed by R9;
- (b) if the western portion of the Item C1 site was excluded from the public

housing development as proposed by R9, what the implication was for that portion being sandwiched between the proposed comprehensive residential development at Oi Yuen to the west and the development in the remaining portion of the Item C1 site;

- (c) the land ownership of the Item C1 site; and
- (d) the existing population of the Item C1 site.

30. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, made the following main points:

- (a) the area where the Item C1 site was located was generally called Tai Tau Leng by locals. Tsung Pak Long Village was a recognised village zoned “Village Type Development” located further northwest of the Item C1 site (across Fanling Highway);
- (b) there was an existing nullah in the western part of the Item C1 site. The area to the west of the nullah that was mainly occupied by domestic squatter structures was proposed to be excluded from the public housing development by some representers including R9. That portion of the site would accommodate two residential blocks involving about 1,200 to 1,300 units. The area to the eastern side of the nullah was mainly occupied by brownfield operations. The area to the immediate west of the Item C1 site was Oi Yuen with a proposed comprehensive residential development under approved s.16 application No. A/FSS/156. If the western portion of the Item C1 site was excluded from the public housing development, the opportunity to develop the Item C1 site in a comprehensive manner would be compromised and accordingly, the supply of public housing units would be reduced. Hence, the western portion should not be excluded as proposed by R9;
- (c) about half of the land within the Item C1 site was government land; and

- (d) there were several tens of squatters within the Item C1 site and the exact population was subject to the Lands Department's freezing survey.

31. In response to a Member's question on whether the Item C1 site was Tsung Pak Long Village, Ms Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy (R9) said that their village was traditionally part of Tsung Pak Long Village but was separated from it due to the construction of Fanling Highway. The name had been used by the villagers over the years and was indicated on the signage of their village. In response to another Member's question on whether R9's settlement was a squatter or a small house, Ms Wong said that most of the settlements in the Item C1 site were squatters and there was some agricultural land.

Development Intensity

32. In response to a Member's question on the justifications for the proposed BHs of the public housing developments with GIC facilities and car parks being up to 160mPD and 170mPD, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD said that for a public housing development with GIC facilities and car parks, whether a higher BH would be required to accommodate such facilities was subject to the site context and topography. Amongst the four proposed public housing developments, the ancillary parking and social welfare facilities at Item B site would be provided in a stand-alone block and the maximum BH of the 'podium-free' development was 140mPD. For the Item A1 site, which was at a higher site level of 15mPD, the maximum BH of 170mPD was proposed to allow the design of the residential blocks atop podiums to accommodate some relatively large scale GIC facilities such as public transport interchange and car parks. Some other non-domestic uses such as community hall would be provided in a separate structure.

Local Consultation

33. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the consultation programme of NDC and the relevant RCs; and
 - (b) with regard to R9's representation, how the local views could be reflected in the prevailing consultation mechanism.

34. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD made the following main points:
- (a) NDC, FDRC and SSDRC were consulted on 12.10.2021, 20.10.2021 and 22.10.2021 respectively on the proposed housing developments and proposed OZP amendments. The DC member of the constituency of Tai Tau Leng also attended the relevant meeting; and
 - (b) the relevant documents concerning the OZP amendments were available online for public inspection. The respective DC or RC members could collect local views on the OZP amendments and reflect such views in the concerned DC and RC meetings. Moreover, upon exhibition of the draft OZP, members of the public could submit written representations during the statutory consultation period.

35. In response to a Member's question on the time of being notified about the proposed housing development, Ms Wong Fung Chui Ling Cindy (R9) said that the affected villagers were notified on 17.12.2021 when government representatives visited their village and distributed notices of the proposed housing development at the Item C1 site. While consultation with NDC and the two relevant RCs were conducted by the Government, none of the DC or RC members had informed them about the OZP amendments.

Landscape and Tree Preservation

36. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) the tree compensation arrangement; and
 - (b) noting that the site at Tong Hang would also be the off-site tree compensation area for some other housing projects, whether it was large enough to cater for tree compensation for the subject housing developments.

37. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD and Mr Terry T.L. Kea, SE, CEDD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the off-site location for compensatory planting was near Tong Hang Fresh Water Service Reservoir. It had an area of 0.83 ha and gradient of 23 to 24 degrees. After evaluating factors including the site gradient, exposure to sunlight and the vegetation nearby, the Tong Hang site was considered a suitable location for off-site tree compensation. The compensatory ratio would be 1:1 in terms of number of trees (rather than girth size or tree canopy coverage). The tree compensation would be carried out in accordance with the relevant government technical circular; and
- (b) about 20% to 30% of the Tong Hang site would be used to accommodate about 900 trees for compensatory planting of the subject proposed housing developments. Sufficient space would be reserved for compensatory planting needs to support both the housing sites under the current OZP amendments and other housing projects.

Others

38. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that a site for primary school had been reserved to meet the future demand and that there would be a surplus of primary classrooms in the Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town, how the primary school sites might be better utilised in future if the population had aged and the demand for primary school had reduced; and
- (b) noting R2's concern on the impact of the proposed development at the Item C1 site on the 600mm high pressure town gas pipeline and PlanD's presentation that such pipeline was not included in the Item C1 site, whether liaisons with the concerned public utility company could be conducted in an earlier stage to avoid misunderstanding and the need for submission of representation.

39. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FS&YLE, PlanD made the following

main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) whilst there would be a surplus of primary school classrooms in the Fanling/Sheung Shui New Town according to the planned provision, school site reservation was not only based on the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. According to the Education Bureau (EDB), in the 2019/20 school year, there were a total of 28 public primary schools in the North District, 18 of which were located in school premises over 30 years of age and/or with site area less than 3,000m² which was below the current standard. The EDB might consider reprovisioning such schools in new school sites. Furthermore, PlanD conducted regular reviews of “G/IC” sites, including vacant or under-utilised school sites, for other optimal uses. The primary school site under Item D2 was reserved upon request by EDB; and
- (b) QRA had been conducted under the EFS for the existing high pressure gas pipeline for the proposed development at the Item C1 site. The pipeline was not included in the Item C1 site. HD was advised to liaise with R2 on any possible interface issues in the implementation stage. The concerned government departments could liaise with relevant public utility companies in an earlier stage in future projects.

40. In response to a Member’s question on whether PlanD’s responses had addressed R2’s concerns, Mr Tsang Chung Man, R2’s representative, said that town gas was supplied to Yuen Long and Tuen Mun via the said pipeline. Two major concerns about the pipeline included the prevention of damage of the pipeline during the construction stage of the proposed public housing development and the impact of the pipeline on the public housing development after completion. The two concerns were addressed as the pipeline was not included in the development site and a QRA had been conducted. PlanD’s responses were considered generally acceptable.

41. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the presentation had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations and comments and inform the representers and commenters of the Board’s

decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers and commenter and the representers' representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

42. The Chairperson invited views from Members.

43. In response to a Member's remark about the overall picture of the housing demand and supply in Hong Kong, the Chairperson said that the Government formulated the Long Term Housing Strategy and updated the long term housing demand projection annually and presented a rolling 10-year housing supply target. The Government had identified land for providing about 330,000 units to meet the public housing supply target of about 301,000 units. The housing supply under the OZP amendments, with about 16,000 units, would contribute to achieving that target.

44. Members noted that the amendments for housing developments would be a major source of flat production to meet the acute housing demand and overall there was not much controversy on the amendment items. They generally considered amendments to the zonings and relevant Notes to the OZP were appropriate but expressed views on various issues below.

Item C1

45. A Member noted that only a few tens of households living in squatters would be affected by the proposed housing development at the Item C1 site, and was of the view that the scale of the affected parties was considered relatively not substantial and they would be compensated with ex-gratia allowances and/or rehousing arrangements in accordance with the prevailing policies.

Item D4

46. A few Members considered that there was no strong justification to meet R1's representation. R1's Site was located in the centre of the "OU(B)" zone under Item D4 and surrounded by existing IBs and there would be possible I/R interface issue if the proposed

composite residential development was developed. The intention for the Item D4 site to be zoned “OU(B)” to facilitate the land use restructuring and provide a wider variety of job opportunities in the North District was agreed. Together with the commercial zone in Sheung Shui Area 30 to the south of the “OU(B)” zone, the area would be an important node for commercial, business and retail uses. Given the different site context as explained by PlanD’s representative, the TTIA was not comparable and hence, not relevant for consideration of the Item D4 site. Furthermore, R1’s proposal to rezone R1’s Site to “R(E)” was piecemeal and not supported.

47. A few Members further pointed out that the existing warehouses/industrial undertakings in the IBs or brownfield operations in other sites were being phased out but there should be alternatives such as multi-storey buildings to facilitate those operators to continue their essential operations. Relevant bureaux/departments should offer assistance to the operators.

Design of Public Housing Developments

48. A few Members were of the view that the proposed public housing developments were high density developments with tall buildings of more than 40 storeys, but the drawings submitted showed very congested layout with standard blocking and limited recreation space. HD should submit drawings that provided more information on the planning and design concepts of the proposed public housing developments for Members’ consideration at the OZP amendment stage. The Vice-chairperson said that taking into account the Government’s goal to be a low-carbon eco-city, HD was obliged to incorporate sustainable building design into the layouts for improving the wind environment in the district and tackling heat-island effect. For instance, the scale of podiums should be minimised and the use of underground space might be explored as appropriate. Two Members remarked that the construction of basements also had downsides including high construction cost, increased energy consumption for the lighting and air ventilation installations, high maintenance and management fee and longer construction time. Low-rise stand-alone non-domestic block or terraced podium might be alternative design options. The Chairperson added that public fill arising from excavation for basements was another consideration. A few Members considered that there should be room for HD to refine the layouts of the proposed housing developments by reviewing the disposition of building blocks, the integration of residential towers with local open space and GIC facilities and designating building gaps that better aligned with

prevailing wind directions to mitigate air ventilation impacts on the surroundings. The layout and design of the developments should not be compromised for the sake of expediency.

Tree Compensation

49. Whilst having no objection to the Tong Hang site proposed for off-site compensatory planting for the subject housing projects, two Members pointed out that the government representatives should have provided more information to substantiate that the site was large enough to accommodate the compensatory trees. In future, information, for instance, on how the trees were to be planted and the interface with the tree compensation arrangement for other housing projects should be provided.

Public Consultation

50. A Member considered that public consultation was essential and enquired on how the overall consultation mechanism could be enhanced to facilitate dissemination of information and engagement of affected parties in an earlier stage of the development. In response, the Chairperson remarked that the current statutory consultation in the plan-making process was an open mechanism to invite representations and comments. The Government had also been exploring the possibility of advancing consultation with the affected lot owners and occupants on resumption and clearance issues under the current proposals to streamline development related process.

51. Two Members welcomed enhancement of the consultation mechanism. They also pointed out that the current statutory consultation mechanism provided opportunities for the affected parties to express their views and concerns to the Board in the hearings and should be maintained in the plan-making process.

Conclusion

52. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally agreed that there was no need to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10856 and the presentations and responses made by the government

representatives at the meeting.

53. Regarding the concern on air ventilation aspect, HD would conduct further quantitative AVAs at the detailed design stage. Members' views on the need to improve the layouts of the proposed public housing developments as detailed in paragraph 48 above to minimise their air ventilation impacts would be conveyed to HD.

54. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) noted the views of Representation No. **R18** and decided not to uphold Representations No. **R1 to R17**, and agreed that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui OZP should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Items A1 to A3, B and C1

- (a) the Government has adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply, including carrying out various land use reviews on an ongoing basis. Taking into account that there are no insurmountable technical problems identified for the proposed housing developments, it is considered suitable to rezone the sites to “Residential (Group A)7” (“R(A)7”) to “R(A)10” respectively (**R2 to R17**);
- (b) Engineering Feasibility Studies (EFSs) with technical assessments on the potential impacts on various aspects, including visual, air ventilation, landscape, traffic, drainage, risk, environmental, ecological and geotechnical have been conducted and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical problem in developing the sites for public/private housing developments. Under the EFSs, relevant mitigation measures have been proposed to minimise the possible impacts of the proposed developments (**R2 to R17**);
- (c) the planned Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities are generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population in the district in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and the assessments by relevant bureaux/departments, except for some social welfare facilities. Appropriate GIC facilities will be provided in the

proposed housing developments to serve the residents and locals. The provision of community facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant bureau/departments (**R3 to R8**);

Item C1

- (d) the “R(A)10” zone is intended to facilitate comprehensive public housing development to meet the acute demand of public housing and fully utilize the land resources. The proposal to exclude the area to the western side of the nullah would lead to loss of public housing units. There is no strong planning justification to exclude that part of the “R(A)10” zone to meet the representers’ proposal (**R9 to R11**);
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan for inviting representations/comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance (**R9 to R17**);
- (f) the compensation and rehousing arrangements for affected residents are outside the scope of the Outline Zoning Plan and not within the ambit of the Town Planning Board. When land is required to be resumed and cleared for development projects, the Government will follow up with the affected parties on their compensation and rehousing arrangements in accordance with prevailing policies and established mechanism (**R9 to R17**);

Items D1 to D4

- (g) the proposed rezoning to “Residential (Group E)” is not justified as the proposed composite residential development is considered not compatible with the surrounding developments, which is predominantly an industrial area (**R1**); and

- (h) the existing industrial operations in Sheung Shui Areas 4 & 30 Industrial Area will not be affected by the rezoning to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business”. Besides, job opportunities may be provided to the surrounding residents in the future commercial and/or business developments (**R8**).”

55. The Board also agreed that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

[Messrs Stephen L.H. Liu and Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/31

(TPB Paper No. 10857)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

56. The Secretary reported that the amendments on the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K13/31 (the OZP) involved the rezoning of a cluster of government land in Kowloon Bay for commercial and open space uses which was supported by the Planning and Engineering Study for the Development at Kowloon Bay Action Area – Feasibility Study commissioned by the Energizing Kowloon East Office of the Development Bureau with Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) as the consultant. It also involved a proposed public housing site to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the Housing Department was the executive arm of HKHA, and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was one of the consultants for conducting technical assessments in support of the development proposal. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Andrew C.W. Lai - being a member of HKHA;
(as Director of Lands)
- Mr Paul Y.K. Au - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs
(as Chief Engineer who was a member of the Strategic Planning
(Works), Home Affairs Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of
Department) HKHA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA and
AECOM, and owning properties in Kowloon Bay;
- Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM and
co-owning with spouse a property and his company
owning a property in Kowloon Bay;
- Dr C.H. Hau - having past business dealings with AECOM;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and
Tender Committee of HKHA and having current
business dealings with ARUP;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] being a member of the Hong Kong Housing Society
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD on
housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS
which currently had discussion with HD on housing
development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and an ex-employee of HKHS which
currently had discussion with HD on housing
development issues; and

- Mr L.T. Kwok - his former serving organisation 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.

57. Members noted that Messrs Franklin Yu and Timothy K.W. Ma, Dr C.H. Hau and Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting, and Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai and Paul Y.K. Au had already left the meeting. Members also agreed that as the interests of Messrs L.T. Kwok was considered indirect, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, K.L. Wong and Vincent K.Y. Ho and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the amendments, and the concerned properties of Mr Vicent K.Y. Ho were not affected by the amendments, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

58. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the representers and commenters inviting them to attend the hearing, but other than R6/C2 who was present, 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.

59. The following government representatives and representer/commenter 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 William W.L. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon (STP/K)

Mr Jeffrey P.K. Wong - Town Planner/Kowloon

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Emily W.M. Ip - Senior Planning Officer (SPO)

Ms Christina Y.Y. Chan - Senior Architect (SA)

Mr David M.K. Lee - Senior Civil Engineer

Energizing Kowloon East Office, Development Bureau (EKEO, DEVB)

Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk - Senior Place Making Manager (Planning)
(SPMM(P))

Mr Kelvin K.C. Chan - Place Making Manager (Planning)

Consultants – ARUP

Mr W.L. Lee - Associate Director

Mr Tommy Chan - Senior Engineer (SE)

Representer and Commenter

R6/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

60. The Chairperson extended a welcome. He then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representer/commenter would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, the representer/commenter would be allotted 20 minutes for making oral submissions. There was a timer device to alert the representer/commenter two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the

representor/commenter had completed the oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or the representor/commenter. After the Q&A session, government representatives and the representor/commenter would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representors and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

61. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

62. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, PlanD briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representors and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10857 (the Paper).

63. The Chairperson then invited the representor/commenter to elaborate on the representation/comment.

R6/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

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

Items A1 to A6

- (a) while the amendments were in line with the transformation of the district and some sites would be rezoned from "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") to "Open Space" ("O") to enhance the provision of open space, the crux of the issue was how the local community would be benefited. The attraction of the public open space (POS) on the podium decks of commercial buildings and managed by the developers would be limited;
- (b) the inclusion of proposed POSs at podium deck level within the commercial

developments for calculation of open space provision under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was strongly objected. Those POSs would not be genuine open space and only passive uses would be allowed, which was similar to the so-called POS at Cheung Kong Centre;

- (c) underground developments and elevated walkways, which were permitted in the at-grade public open space within private development (POSPDs), was strongly objected as those areas would simply become paving and landscape area without large trees and the possibility of creating a mini-ecosystem. The plantings would be limited to ornamental trees;
- (d) there was no indication that any active recreational facilities, such as children's playground and elderly exercise facilities would be provided in the at-grade POSPDs. The "O" zoned area would turn into paving with potted plants. The working population in the area should have the opportunity to exercise in properly designed open space during their breaks;
- (e) at-grade pedestrian linkage to the waterfront should be provided instead of using footbridge. The open space would turn into pockets of podium spaces on different levels that needed to be linked by escalators and lifts;

Item B

- (f) Item B was strongly objected. Hundreds of small businesses had been evicted from affordable premises resulting in unemployment of a large number of workers;
- (g) the tenants' objections were valid. They were not able to relocate to other industrial buildings since many of them had special operation requirements such as heavy loading. They were dissatisfied with the Government's relocation plan as there were only 60 vacant units in HKHA's factory estates for bidding by over 2,000 tenants;
- (h) the landlords in private sector were pressed by the Government to reduce or

even waive rents for their tenants pursuant to the economic measure in the pandemic. On the contrary, the HKHA terminated the tenancies by only giving three months' notice according to the tenancy agreement of the Yip On Factory Estate (YOFE). Tenants were not legally or contractually entitled to relocation or any form of compensation. Members should not only be concerned about resolving the housing problem but should also have regard to the welfare and prospects of grassroots and workers;

- (i) premises in other industrial buildings had high rental costs and the synergy of different operations within the factory estate would be lost. The factory estate could meet the need for specific services/production. It should be preserved, renovated and refurbished instead;
- (j) the proposed public housing development was not in line with the positioning of Kowloon East area where was being transformed into another core business district to support Hong Kong's long-term economic development;
- (k) the surrounding buildings were all either commercial or industrial and the public housing development would be deprived of the support services. The development would be enclosed on two sides by developments of 120mPD and 170mPD that there would be issues of air ventilation and natural light penetration. The Item B site abutted busy highways and was subject to air and noise pollutions. It was not suitable to provide Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities for the elderly and mentally handicapped at the lower floors of the development. These facilities would not comply with the Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Regulation and the Building (Planning) Regulations for adequate natural lighting and ventilation requirements;
- (l) the recommended mitigation measures including acoustic windows and fixed windows at affected units to address the adverse air quality and noise impacts were contradictory to the advice from experts for openable windows in the time of COVID; and

- (q) the need to provide a large amount of public housing units was questionable given the decline in population, increase in interest rates and the poor economic conditions. Noting that empty housing units were available in the Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area (GBA), the Government should consider acquiring some of these housing units as an option for retirees or those Hong Kong citizens who preferred living and working in the Mainland as a solution to meeting housing needs.

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

Item B (YOFE)

66. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the number of factory units in YOFE;
- (b) with regard to PlanD's response in paragraph 5.2.1 (b) of the Paper, the details about the units of vacant private flatted factory spaces that were generally comparable to YOFE in terms floor space and rent; and
- (c) how the proposed building height (BH) of 120mPD for the Item B site was determined.

67. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Vivian M. F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD and Mr William W.L. Chan, STP/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) there were 1,400 factory units within YOFE;

- (b) according to Hong Kong Property Review 2022 by the Rating and Valuation Department, the vacant private flatted factory space in the territory at year-end of 2021 was about 920,000 m² and that in Kwun Tong was 189,100 m². The rent of HKHA's factories ranged from \$80 to \$140 per m² while that of private flatted factories ranged from \$80 to about \$200 per m² subject to the district, location, building age and facilities of the factories; and
- (c) the proposed BHR of the Item B site (i.e. 120mPD) was determined based on the BH profile adopted in the Kowloon Bay Business Area (KBBA) and the proposed BHR was the same as that for the street blocks to the immediate and further north along Wang Hoi Road.

68. Some Members raised the following questions to HD's representatives:

- (a) the number of tenants in YOFE;
- (b) whether the tenants that had moved out would continue their industrial undertakings elsewhere;
- (c) the number of domestic storeys in the proposed public housing development and whether the proposed BHR of 120mPD had imposed a constraint on the building design;
- (d) the connectivity of the Item B site to its surroundings;
- (e) the waterfront could be accessed from the Item B site;
- (f) the GIC facilities and kindergarten within the Item B site could be accessed;
- (g) the connectivity within the Item B site; and
- (h) the reasons for the four podiums within the Item B site being not connected, and whether there would be footbridges to link them up.

69. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Emily W.M. Ip, SPO, HD and Ms Christina Y.Y. Chan, SA, HD made the following main points:

- (a) the occupancy rate of YOFE in November 2021 was about 87%. From mid-2021, HD had sent advance notice to the tenants about the removal and ex-gratia allowance arrangement. As at July 2022, about 90% of the tenants had moved out from YOFE. About 10 tenants had submitted applications for tenancy termination and ex-gratia allowance, and they would move out by end of November 2022;
- (b) about ten YOFE tenants had moved to HKHA's two remaining factory estates (i.e. Chun Shing in Kwai Chung and Hoi Tai Factory Estates in Tuen Mun) to continue their operations. There was no official survey of those who might have moved to private industrial premises;
- (c) there would be 34 to 35 storeys for domestic use and a podium with at most four storeys in the proposed public housing development. The domestic plot ratio (PR) under the indicative scheme, which was approximate to the maximum of 7.5 permitted under the "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") zone, could be accommodated under the BHR of 120mPD;
- (d) a new footbridge system across Wai Yip Street and along Sheung Yee Road would be built by the Highways Department and the Civil Engineering and Development Department outside the Item B site. A pedestrian access point at the future footbridge at Wai Yip Street had been reserved for the residents of the Item B site. For members of the public visiting the non-domestic and GIC facilities in the Item B site, they could use the future footbridge system to go to the ground level to enter these facilities within the podiums;
- (e) the new footbridge system would link up the Item B site with the Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA). Residents/visitors of the proposed public housing development and users of the GIC facilities could access the waterfront through the KBAA;

- (f) transport facilities including parking spaces and loading/unloading bays would be provided at the Item B site via Wang Hoi Road for the users of the GIC facilities located at the podium of Block C (at the northwest of the site) and the kindergarten located at the podium of Block A (at the northeast of the site). For the users taking MTR, they could access the said facilities by the footbridge system and at-grade pedestrian footpaths. Separate pedestrian accesses and routings for residents and non-residents needed to be provided for better estate management;
- (g) the residents of the proposed housing development could access the Item B site by passing through the said residential access from the future footbridge and then go to the ground level and walk through the covered walkway to the various residential blocks; and
- (h) taking into account the air ventilation and building separation requirements, the podiums below the domestic blocks were not proposed to be connected. The provision of footbridges to connect the podiums could be explored at the detailed design stage.

The Item A1 and A2 Sites – POSPDs

70. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the proportion of at-grade and elevated POSPDs;
- (b) the implementation programme and the number of implementation agents of the POSPDs;
- (c) the arrangement of the design review panel;
- (d) whether design principles would be formulated to guide the Landscape Master Plan (LMP) submission; and

- (e) whether software such as activities to make the POSPDs more lively would be considered.

71. In response, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM(P), EKEO, DEVB made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the proportion of at-grade and elevated POSPDs were 70% and 30% respectively. The total area of elevated POSPDs was about 5,300 m²;
- (b) the POSPDs would be implemented by individual developer(s) of Lot 2 and Lot 4 and should be completed together with the commercial developments;
- (c) the submission of LMP would be included as a requirement under the lease. To ensure a coherent design of the POSPDs by different developers and the connectivity of the POSPDs, the LMP submissions would be vetted by a design review panel formed by relevant bureaux/departments;
- (d) a technical schedule would be formulated to guide the design of the POSPDs and attached to the lease; and
- (e) diverse activities would be encouraged in the POSPDs to enhance connectivity and promote vibrancy in the area.

KBAA – Building Height (BH) Profile

72. In response to a Member's question on how the BH profile of KBAA and the Item B site was determined, Ms Vivian M. F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD and Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM(P), EKEO, DEVB said that the Item B site and the KBAA were located in the southern part of Kowloon Bay. The highest buildings in the KBAA were Manhattan Place and Enterprise Square which were subject to BHR of 170mPD. A stepped BH profile from the highest point towards the waterfront and its surroundings was adopted. In this connection, a three-tier height bands of 150mPD, 135mPD and 120mPD descending from the hinterland to the waterfront was adopted in the KBAA, and an area subject to 35mPD was intended as a building gap to allow wind penetration between the at-grade POSPD at Lot 4 and the hinterland.

KBAA – Pedestrian and Road Traffic

73. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the connectivity of the KBBA and specifically the KBAA therein to the surrounding areas;
- (b) implementation programme of the footbridge system;
- (c) the possibility to extend the footbridge over Siu Yip Street for a more direct and comprehensive system between MTR Kowloon Bay Station and the KBAA;
- (d) for the long-term planning and enhancement of the connectivity in the business area, the possibility of extending the footbridge system to link up major developments, including Enterprise Square, MegaBox, Zero Carbon Building and Exchange Tower;
- (e) the key pedestrian flow in the area; and
- (f) the measures to tackle the increase in traffic flow.

74. In response, Ms Vivian M. F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD, Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM(P) EKEO, DEVB and Mr Tommy Chan, SE, ARUP made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) for the connectivity between the hinterland and the KBBA/KBAA, currently, there were two footbridges connecting the KBBA to Telford Garden across Wai Yip Street and another between Sunshine Kowloon Bay Cargo Centre and Capital Tower. In future, an all-weather pedestrian routing connecting MTR Kowloon Bay Station and the KBAA was planned including a new footbridge across Wai Yip Street (connecting to Siu Yip Street), an elevated walkway with traveller along Sheung Yee Road and a public passage

within the proposed commercial development at Lot 2. Within the KBAA, there would also be an elevated walkway over Wang Chiu Road that would lead to an amenity area with pedestrian footpath underneath Kwun Tong Bypass. From the amenity area, there would be another footbridge connecting to the landscaped deck of the proposed New Acute Hospital leading to the waterfront. Alternatively, an at-grade pedestrian routing via the proposed pedestrian precinct along Cheung Yip Street to the waterfront was planned;

- (b) the new footbridges across Wai Yip Street (connecting to Siu Yip Street) and along Sheung Yee Road to the south of the Item B site were gazetted in July 2022 and were tentatively scheduled for completion in 2027, which would precede the tentative completion of the commercial development at Lot 2;
- (c) the benefit of building a more direct and comprehensive footbridge system connecting to the MTR station was noted. The possibility to provide a public passage through the “G/IC” site at the corner of Wai Yip Street and Siu Yip Street could be explored when there were redevelopment plans for the said “G/IC” site in future;
- (d) the extension of the footbridge system in the KBBA would involve connections with/through private developments. EKEO would continue to liaise with the land owners and their property management agents to explore such possibilities. In that regard, the Government had measures to provide incentives to encourage developers to provide footbridge connections with adjacent buildings upon redevelopment;
- (e) it was anticipated that the busiest section of the future footbridge system was the one over Wai Yip Street connecting to Siu Yip Street. The estimated peak flow would be about 6,000 pedestrians per hour. The footbridge was under detailed design and the width would be designed to cater for the demand; and

- (f) road improvement works were proposed for six road junctions including Hoi Bun Road/Shun Yip Street (J4), Hoi Bun Road/Cheung Yip Street (J5), Wang Chiu Road/Sheung Yee Road (J6), Sheung Yuet Road/Wang Chiu Road (J9), Lam Hing Street/Wang Chiu Road (J10) and Kai Cheung Road/Wang Chiu Road (J11). There would not be any insurmountable traffic problem with the concerned road network upon the implementation of the improvement measures.

75. Concerning the capacity of the new footbridge system during the peak hours, a Member enquired on whether the section over Sheung Yee Road could be widened to cater for the future demand. Ms Carol Y.M. Cheuk, SPMM(P), EKEO, DEVB said that the width of the footbridge would be subject to the detailed design. Member's concern on the width of the footbridge would be conveyed to the project team for consideration.

76. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the presentation had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations and comments and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representer/commenter and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

Deliberation Session

77. The Chairperson invited views from Members. Members generally considered that the OZP amendments were appropriate and two Members raised particular concern and reservation on the pedestrian connection arrangements near the Item B site. The major views of Members were as below.

The Connectivity of the Item B Site

78. Some Members pointed out that it appeared inconvenient and undesirable to only reserve one pedestrian access point for residents to connect the proposed public housing development under Item B with the new footbridge system to be built outside the eastern and

southern boundaries of the Item B site. The access point could not cater for the high pedestrian flow to and from MTR Kowloon Bay Station during the peak hours. Furthermore, not providing a direct access from the footbridge for visitors to the non-domestic facilities in the Item B site was not user friendly as the users, many being elderly, had to pass through multi-level pedestrian facilities. The needed improvements could not be dealt merely through the detailed design of the housing development since it was related to the interface of the new footbridge system outside the Item B site. The Members said that it was a crucial planning matter and the Board should make a clear remark that the project proponent of the housing development and the implementation agents of the footbridge system should jointly enhance the pedestrian connectivity in this particular area.

79. Two Members also raised concern that the connectivity among different blocks within the proposed public housing development should be improved as well. The podiums should be connected say by footbridges which would unlikely cause air ventilation impacts as claimed by HD's representatives.

POSPDs in KBAA

80. A Member was of view that while a design review panel would oversee the design of the POSPDs, more attention should be paid to the management of the POSPDs. Developers might allow some of the POSPDs for retail uses to enhance the vibrancy but it should be ensured that the community could enjoy the POSs freely. A balance should be struck between making the POSPDs lively with commercial activities and at the same time creating a pleasant environment for public enjoyment.

Traffic Impact

81. A Member remarked that the traffic impact would be addressed with the implementation of the proposed road improvement measures. Since the traffic volume would largely increase due to the proposed public housing development, the traffic condition of the local roads in the vicinity of the Item B site should be vigilantly monitored by the Transport Department.

BH of Item B

82. A Member expressed that the layout of the proposed public housing development could allow wind penetration horizontally and there would unlikely be adverse air ventilation impact. That said, the vertical permeability might be further improved if more flexibility was provided by a slightly taller BHR, especially considering that the BHR at the KBAA in the south was up to 150mPD.

83. Having regard to the large number of pedestrians generated by the proposed housing development in the Item B site and commercial developments in the KBAA, some Members considered that the connectivity of the KBAA to the hinterland, especially more direct connection to the MTR Kowloon Bay Station, should be explored and the footbridge system should be more comprehensive. Further efforts should be made to build up a footbridge system to connect various developments in the business area as far as possible.

84. The Chairperson remarked that Members generally agreed with the OZP amendments but there were concerns on the external and internal connectivity of the proposed public housing development under Item B and the overall connectivity between the KBAA and its surroundings. The Chairperson further said that there should be room to enhance the accessibility to the Item B site and the non-domestic and GIC facilities therein while balancing the estate management concerns.

85. At the Chairperson's invitation, Mr Ivan M.K. Chung, the Director of Planning (D of Plan), explained that the amendment to the OZP for the proposed public housing development involved the rezoning of the site to "R(A)". Given that road works (including footbridges) or public works coordinated or implemented by Government was always permitted under the OZP, Members' concerns on the need for enhancement of pedestrian connectivity would not hinge on the zonings on the OZP. The concerns on the connectivity of the proposed public housing development and the overall connectivity of the KBAA and the business area would be documented in the minutes of the subject meeting. The Government would review the scheme in the detailed design stage to address Members' concerns accordingly and relevant requirements would be incorporated into the planning brief. In addition, if Members considered it appropriate, the respective paragraphs of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP could be revised as appropriate to clearly set out the aforementioned intention of enhancing the pedestrian connectivity in the area. In that connection, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed that relevant parts of the ES should be revised accordingly.

Conclusion

86. Members generally agreed that there was no need to amend the draft OZP to meet the adverse representations and that all grounds and proposals of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10857 and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

87. After deliberation, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided not to uphold Representations No. **R1 to R7**, and agreed that the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“Items A1 and A2

- (a) the proposed public open spaces (POSs) at podium deck level within the Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA), which are easily accessible to the public via planned footbridges and vertical linkages, can be included in the calculation towards open space standards according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). The design of the proposed POSs would be vetted by a design review panel formed by relevant bureaux/departments during the submission of the Landscape Master Plans of which the requirement would be imposed under the lease. The underground retail uses and the comprehensive pedestrian linkages, which will be integrated with the proposed POSs, will enhance the accessibility, attractiveness and vibrancy of the POSs (**R6**);
- (b) convenient all-weather pedestrian routes (mainly via elevated walkways) and at-grade pedestrian connections have been planned to provide access among the MTR Kowloon Bay Station, KBAA and the waterfront (**R6**);

Item B

- (c) the Government has been adopting a multi-pronged approach to increase housing land supply in meeting the pressing housing demand. The Yip On Factory Estate (YOFE) site is considered suitable for public housing development to enhance housing supply in the urban area. The development is not incompatible with the surrounding context. The technical feasibility and land use compatibility of redeveloping YOFE have been ascertained by relevant technical studies (**R1 to R6**);

- (d) the industrial floor spaces in Kowloon East (KE) area are sufficient despite the redevelopment of YOFE for residential use, given the additional floor spaces in Kowloon East area from the “Revitalisation Scheme 2.0” in the short-to-medium term, which would bring employment opportunities to the local community (**R1 to R7**);

- (e) retail shops will be suitably provided in the public housing development at YOFE to address the basic need of future residents. In addition, the existing and planned provision of community facilities are generally adequate to meet the demand of the overall planned population in Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay Planning Scheme Area in accordance with the requirements of the HKPSG and concerned bureau/department’s assessment, except for some facilities. As advised by relevant bureaux/departments, the projected service demand of hospital beds in the Kowloon East Cluster will be catered for in the First and Second Ten-year Hospital Development Plans, whereas Social Welfare Department will consider the provision of social welfare facilities in the planning and development process as appropriate, with a view to meeting the demand and long-term goal (**R1 to R3 and R6**);

- (f) there are no insurmountable traffic, environmental and air ventilation impacts arising from the public housing development with the implementation of suitable mitigation/improvement measures at the detailed design stage (**R1, R5 and R6**);

- (g) clearance, decanting and related land matters are outside the scope of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) and hence the ambit of the Town Planning Board (**R1 to R3 and R6**); and

Others

- (h) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The draft OZP has been exhibited under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) for public inspection for a period of two months. There is no provision under the Ordinance to extend the public inspection period (**R4**).”

88. The Board also agreed to amend the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP to reflect Members’ views as follows:

Paragraph 9.1.4 of the ES for “Commercial” (“C”) Zone

- (a) to add a new sentence after the last sentence to read as “The “C(1)” and “C(2)” zones are located at the heart of the Kowloon Bay Action Area (KBAA) which is envisioned to become a hub primarily for commercial uses providing office, hotel, retail and other ancillary facilities, open spaces and public transport facilities... Out of the maximum GFA of 201,400m² for the “C(2)” zone, a maximum GFA of 201,000m² is for the commercial development to the south of Kai Fuk Road Flyover and a built-over area of about 400m² is for arts, cultural and creative uses which is encouraged to be provided mainly underneath Kai Fuk Road Flyover. ***To enhance pedestrian connectivity, a convenient and direct pedestrian network comprising pedestrian streets, walkways, footbridges, open space network and lifts, should be provided to connect the KBAA with other parts of the KBAA, the MTR Kowloon Bay Station and the waterfront promenade in Kai Tak Development.***”; and

Paragraph 9.2.6 of the ES for “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) Zone

- (b) to add a new sentence after the last sentence to read as “A Planning Brief setting out the planning parameters and special design requirements (including the building separation requirement) will be prepared to guide the development. *Appropriate and convenient pedestrian connection and passageway should be provided as far as practicable to connect the podium of the development with the elevated footbridge system along Wai Yip Street and Sheung Yee Road for the use of the residents, users of the GIC/retail facilities and members of the public.*”.

89. The Board also agreed that the draft Ngau Tau Kok and Kowloon Bay OZP, together with its Notes and updated ES, was suitable for submission under section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

Agenda Item 5

Any Other Business

[Open Meeting] [The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

90. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 2:25 p.m.