

**Minutes of 1298th Meeting of the**  
**Town Planning Board held on 7.7.2023**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K. L. Wong

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

Chief Engineer/Traffic Survey and Support  
Transport Department  
Mr Patrick K.P. Cheng (before 12:50 p.m.)

Chief Engineer/New Territories West  
Transport Department  
Mr Carrie K.Y. Leung (after 12:50 p.m.)

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

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**

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

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

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

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms M.L. Leung (a.m.)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (p.m.)

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1297th Meeting held on 16.6.2023

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1297th meeting held on 16.6.2023 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plan

2. The Secretary reported that on 27.6.2023, the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) referred the Approved Ngau Chi Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K12/18, the Approved Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/31 and the Approved South Lantau Coast OZP No. S/SLC/21 to the Town Planning Board (the Board) for amendment under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The reference back of the said OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 7.7.2023.

(ii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments on Draft OZPs

3. The Secretary reported that the item was to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations and comments in respect of three OZPs including (i) draft Tai Tong OZP No. S/YL-TT/19; (ii) draft Yuen Long OZP No. S/YL/26; and (iii) draft Kam Tin North OZP No. S/YL-KTN/10.

4. The Secretary reported that the amendments of the draft Tai Tong OZP mainly involved a public housing development to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority

(HKHA), of which the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm, and supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Andrew C.W. Lai<br><i>(as Director of Lands)</i>                                | - being a member of HKHA;   |
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au<br><i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),<br/>Home Affairs Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA; |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;  |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong  | - having current business dealings with HKHA;   |
| Dr C.H. Hau  | - conducting contract research projects with CEDD;  |
| Mr Timothy K.W. Ma   | - being a member of the Supervisory Board of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;     |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau<br>Ms Lilian S.K. Law   | ] being a member of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues; and  |
| Mr K.L. Wong   | - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues.  |

5. The Secretary reported that the amendments of the draft Yuen Long OZP mainly involved (i) a public housing development to be developed by the HKHA, of which HD was the executive arm, and supported by an EFS conducted by CEDD; and (ii) taking forward two

agreed s.12A applications (No. Y/YL/16 and Y/YL/18), in that application No. Y/YL/18 was submitted by Winpo Development Limited, which was a subsidiary of New World Development Company Limited (NWD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Andrew C.W. Lai<br><i>(as Director of Lands)</i>                                | - being a member of HKHA;   |
| Mr Paul Y.K. Au<br><i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),<br/>Home Affairs Department)</i> | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;   |
| Mr Franklin Yu   | - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;  |
| Dr Conrad T.C. Wong  | - having current business dealings with HKHA;   |
| Dr C.H. Hau  | - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; and being an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) and K11 Concept Limited of NWD has been sponsoring his student learning projects in HKU since 2009;   |
| Mr Vincent K. Y. Ho  | - being a member of the Advisory Committee of New World Build for Good which was founded by NWD;  |
| Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu   | - being the Director and Chief Executive Officer of Light Be (Social Realty) Co. Ltd. which had received donations from Chow Tai Fook Charity Foundation (related to NWD) and would rent a piece of land from NWD for social housing development project; |

- 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 Daniel K.S. Lau ] being a member of HKHS which currently had  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] discussion with HD on housing development issues;  
and
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues.

6. The Secretary reported that the amendments of the draft Kam Tin North OZP mainly involved a public housing development to be developed by the HKHA, of which HD was the executive arm, and supported by an EFS conducted by CEDD. A representation had been submitted by Supreme Management Services Limited (R5). 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  
(*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department*) Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA and Supreme Management Services Limited (R5);
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;

- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD;
- 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 Daniel K.S. Lau ] being a member of HKHS which currently had  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] discussion with HD on housing development issues;  
and
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues.

7. As the item for agreement on hearing arrangement was procedural in nature, all Members who had declared interests should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong had tendered apologies for being not able to attend the meeting and Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

8. The Secretary introduced that:

- (a) on 6.1.2023, the draft Tai Tong OZP involving mainly (i) rezoning of a site to the southwest of Chuk San Tsuen from “Agriculture” (“AGR”) to “Residential (Group A)1” for a proposed public housing development; and (ii) rezoning of a site to the northeast of Kong Tau San Tsuen from “AGR” to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) for a proposed primary school was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, one representation was received. The valid representation was subsequently published for three weeks and one comment was received;
- (b) on 6.1.2023, the draft Yuen Long OZP involving mainly (i) rezoning of a site at Tai Kei Leng from “Open Space” and “Residential (Group B)” to “Residential (Group A)6” for a proposed public housing development; (ii) rezoning of a site



at Lam Hi Road from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Art Storage and Public Open Space” to “Residential (Group A)7” for a proposed private residential development; (iii) rezoning of a site at Wang Yip Street East from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” to “Residential (Group E)2” for a proposed private residential development; and (iv) other amendments to reflect the current uses and as-built conditions of various sites was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, one representation was received. The representation was subsequently published for three weeks and one comment was received; and

- (c) on 6.1.2023, the draft Kam Tin North OZP involving mainly (i) rezoning of two sites at Mo Fan Heung and Fung Kat Heung from “Industrial (Group D)” (“I(D)”) and “AGR” to “Residential (Group A)” for proposed public housing development; (ii) rezoning of a site to the south of Fung Kat Heung Road from “I(D)” to “G/IC” for provision of government, institution and community facilities; and (iii) rezoning of a site at Fung Kat Heung from “I(D)” to “Residential (Group C)3” to reflect the current use and as-built condition of an existing building was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the two-month exhibition period, five representations were received. The representations were subsequently published for three weeks and two comments were received.

9. The Secretary reported that the hearings of the three OZPs would be held separately. In view of the similar nature of the representations and comments of each OZP, the hearing of all representations and comments for each OZP was 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 for each OZP in the respective hearing sessions. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board of the three OZPs was tentatively scheduled for September 2023.

10. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the respective hearing arrangements in paragraph 9 above.

[Mr Franklin Yu joined the meeting at this point.]

**Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-ST/626

Proposed Temporary Field Education with Ancillary Shop and Services for a Period of 3 Years in “Conservation Area” Zone, Lot 1808 in D.D. 96, Lok Ma Chau, San Tin, Yuen Long (TPB Paper No. 10908)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

**Presentation and Question Sessions**

11. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Mr Anthony K.O. Luk      | - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE) |
| Ms Christine C.M. Cheung | - Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)       |

12. The Chairperson extended a welcome and informed Members that the applicant and his representative had indicated not to attend the meeting. She then invited PlanD’s representatives to brief Members on the review application.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Christine C.M. Cheung, STP/FSYLE, PlanD, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site), the proposed use, the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10908 (the Paper). PlanD maintained its previous view of not supporting the application.

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

15. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that there were existing structures/farm structures within the subject "Conservation Area" ("CA") zone as shown on aerial photo R-3 of the Paper, whether the erection of such structures was in line with the planning intention of the "CA" zone;
- (b) noting that to the further northwest of the application site (the Site), an area sandwiched by Sham Chun River and the Loop was zoned "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Ecological Area" ("OU(Ecological Area)") ("OU(EA)"), whether such area would be developed in future; and
- (c) noting that the "OU(EA)" zone was in close proximity to the Loop area, whether the planning intention of the zone was similar to that of the "CA" zone, i.e. no structures were permitted in general.

16. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

- (a) as shown on the said aerial photo, the structures were located along the kerbs of the fish ponds and fish farming could be found in two fish ponds near the Site. According to the Notes of the "CA" zone, while the planning intention was to conserve the ecological value of wetland and fish ponds which formed an integral part of the wetland ecosystem in the Deep Bay Area, 'Agricultural Use (Fish Pond Culture Only)' and 'On-Farm Domestic Structure' were always permitted;
- (b) the Loop was located to the northwest of the Wetland Conservation Area, forming part of the proposed San Tin Technopole in future. Immediate south of the Loop was the "OU(EA)" zone, where there were clusters of fish ponds with minimal structures related to fish ponds or storage of fishing gears which

would be retained at the current juncture; and

- (c) the zoning of “OU(EA)” was intended to provide/reserve land for the creation of areas of reedbed for compensating the habitat loss due to the development in the Loop and providing movement corridor for birds and wildlife connecting with the ecologically important areas to the east and west of the Loop. While the development intensity in the part of the Loop adjoining the “OU(EA)” zone was restricted to low-rise scale, any development/structures within the “OU(EA)” zone should be minimised.

17. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Chairperson thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

#### Deliberation Session

18. The Chairperson invited views from Members on the review application. Members generally agreed with the decision of the RNTPC, and that the review application should be rejected. A Member expressed that the review application was not justifiable having considered that (i) no detailed information was provided in the written submission for the review application; (ii) no sufficient supplementary information was provided on the operational arrangement of the proposed development; and (iii) no further information nor evidence was provided to substantiate that the proposed development was a non-profit-making field education centre in collaboration with green groups as the proposed main component was more akin to a commercial use, i.e. a souvenir shop selling gifts and pamphlets.

19. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “CA” zone, which is primarily to conserve the ecological value of wetland and fish ponds which form an integral part of the wetland ecosystem in the

Deep Bay Area and discourage new development unless it is required to support the conservation of the ecological integrity of the wetland ecosystem or the development is an essential infrastructure project with overriding public interest. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis; and

- (b) the proposed development is not in line with TPB PG-No. 12C in that the applicant fails to demonstrate how the proposed temporary use could facilitate the environmental education.”

[The meeting was adjourned for a 20-minute break.]

### **Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/31  
(TPB Paper No. 10909)

---

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

20. The Secretary reported that the amendment items of the draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (the OZP) involved a proposed public housing development to be developed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), of which the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm of HKHA, and supported by an Engineering Feasibility Study (EFS) conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). Also, a site was proposed for public columbarium development under Item C. Representations had been submitted by the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R7/C1), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R8/C2) and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R860). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- Mr Andrew Lai  
(*as Director of Lands*) - being a member of HKHA; and his spouse owning a flat in Kwai Chung;
- Mr Paul Y.K. Au  
(*as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department*) - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL;
- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL;
- Mr K.W. Leung - being a member of the executive board of HKBWS and the chairman of Crested Bulbul Club Committee of HKBWS;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau  
Ms Lilian S.K. Law ] being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society (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; and a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS, which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;

- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; being a member of HKBWS, a life member of the CA and his spouse being the Vice Chairman of the Board of Directors of the CA;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - being a member of the Private Columbaria Appeal Board; and
- Mr Stanley T.S. Choi - being a supervisor of a primary school in Kwai Chung.

21. Members noted that Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Messrs Stanley T.S. Choi and K.W. Leung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai, Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members agreed that as the interest of Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang was indirect, and as Dr C.H. Hau, Messrs Daniel K.S. Lau, Timothy K.W. Ma and K. L. Wong and Ms Lilian S.K. Law had no involvement in the amendment items of the OZP and/or submission of the relevant representation/comment, they could stay in the meeting.

[Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai, Paul Y.K. Au and Franklin Yu and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

Comment No. 816 (C816)

22. The Secretary reported that C816 was submitted by Chung Chau Yung as shown in the TPB Paper No. 10894 (the Paper). On 4.7.2023, the Secretariat of the Town Planning Board (the Board) received an email from Chung Chau Yung (same name as the commenter of C816) (“the claimant”) indicating that he had not submitted C816 in respect of the draft OZP to the Board. The claimant also stated that he was not a resident of Kwai Chung and had no knowledge of the OZP, suspected if there was any leakage of personal information and reserved the rights to follow up and requested the Board to seriously review his case. To follow up, the Secretariat had sent emails to the claimant on three occasions since the receipt of his email on 4.7.2023, inviting him to contact the Secretariat and provide information of his Hong Kong Identity (HKID) Card number for identity verification purpose, and advising that the Board

would continue to process comment C816 should there be no further information to be provided by the claimant. Up to the time of the meeting, no response had been received from the claimant. In the absence of further information to determine the identity of the claimant against the commenter of C816, it was suggested that the Board would continue to process the comment C816, which was made in compliance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on “Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance” (TPB PG-No. 29B). The Chairperson then invited views from Members on the arrangement.

23. A Member recalled that there was a similar case in respect of the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area OZP No. S/FSSE/1 and that the Board’s discussion of the case in the respective hearing was reported by the press the following day. In the current case, there was a possibility that one might take advantage of the press reporting and make fraudulent claim to the Board with an intent to undermine the credibility of the hearing through the media coverage on the Board’s discussion of the case. The Chairperson responded that though the two cases happened within a short timespan, they appeared to be isolated cases and the Secretariat of the Board had been handling them in a cautious manner. For the current case, in the absence of evidence proving whether the claimant was or was not the individual filing C816, there was a case to err on the conservative side by not taking away the right of C816 to be heard. Hence, it was proposed to keep processing the said comment. In so recommending, the credibility of the Board would not be compromised.

24. In response to a Member’s question about the current mechanism for verifying the validity of representations and comments, the Secretary said that TPB PG-No. 29B required that the persons making representations or comments should provide their full name, HKID number (only the first four alphanumeric characters) and contact details. Based on that information provided, the Secretariat would inform the representers and commenters of the hearing arrangement and check against their identity when they attended the hearing. If a claim against fraudulent representation or comment was received, the Secretariat would request further information from the claimant to ascertain the validity of the claim and, if necessary, solicit legal advice. Members agreed to the arrangement set out in paragraph 22 above.



## Presentation and Question Sessions

25. 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.

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

### **Government Representatives**

#### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

- |                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
| Mr Derek P.K. Tse | - District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (DPO/TWK) |
| Mr W.C. Lui       | - Senior Town Planner/Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon (STP/TWK)       |

#### *CEDD*

- |             |  |
|-------------|--|
| Mr K.W. Lee | - Chief Engineer/Special Duties (Works)<br>(CE/SD (Works)) |
| Mr S.M. Tam | - Senior Engineer (SE)                                     |

#### *HD*

- |                    |                                 |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mr Alvin L.C. Chan | - Senior Planning Officer (SPO) |
| Miss Carol F. Ty   | ] Senior Architect (SA)         |
| Ms Polly K.Y. Wong | ]                               |
| Ms Winky W.K. Lam  | - Civil Engineer/2 (CE/2)       |

#### *Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)*

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Eric Y.H. Wong | - Senior Nature Conservation Officer (SNCO) |
|-------------------|---|

<i>Atkins China Limited</i>	]
Mr Louis Lau	]
Mr Henry Chung	] Consultant
Mr Enoch Cheung	]
Ms Yang Yao	]

### **Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

#### R7/C1 – The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society

Ms Woo Ming Chuan - Representer's and Commenter's  
Representative

#### R8/C2 – The Conservancy Association

##### R11 – Greenpeace

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

#### R9/C4 – 北葵涌交通關注組

##### R716/C1778 – 劉加揚

Mr Lau Ka Yeung - Representer, Commenter, Representer's and  
Commenter's Representative

#### R10/C1811 – Green Sense

Mr Lau Ka Yeung - Representer's and Commenter's  
Representative

#### R12 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

Mr Nip Hin Ming - Representer's Representative

##### R13/C5 – 林紹輝

##### R718/C6 – 劉貴梅

Mr Lam Siu Fai - Representer, Commenter and Representer's  
and Commenter's Representative

R15/C3 – Designing Hong Kong

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

R125/C225 – Yau Kit Sze

Ms Yau Kit Sze - Representer and Commenter

R340/C142 – Chan Long Fung

Mr Chan Long Fung - Representer and Commenter

R684/C1364 – 黃思略

Mr Wong Sze Leuk - Representer and Commenter

R809/C34 – 陳婉思R811 – 陳婉瑩

Ms Chan Yuen Sze - Representer, Commenter and Representer's  
Representative

R831/C1785 – 張嘉麟

Mr Chang Ka Lun - Representer and Commenter

R857/C1787 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

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

direct their questions to the government representatives or the representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the representers, commenters and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would then deliberate on the representations and comments in their absence and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr W.C. Lui, STP/TWK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments to the 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 Paper. The amendments were:

(a) Items A1 to A3

rezoning of a site from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Residential (Group A)3" ("R(A)3") for a proposed public housing development subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 6.62 and a maximum building height (BH) of 260 meters above Principal Datum (mPD) (Item A1), and two pieces of land from "GB" to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") for a proposed 24-classroom primary school (Item A2) and a relocated fresh water pump house (Item A3);

(b) Item B

rezoning of a site from "Industrial" ("I") to "Residential (Group A)4" ("R(A)4") subject to a maximum PR of 6.5 and a maximum BH of 125mPD to facilitate the redevelopment of Kwai On Factory Estate for a proposed public housing development;

(c) Item C

rezoning of a site from "G/IC" to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Columbarium (2)" ("OU(Columbarium)(2)") subject to a maximum BH of 35mPD to facilitate a proposed public columbarium development; and

(d) Item D

rezoning of a site from “Open Space” to “OU” annotated “Buildings with Historical and Architectural Interest Preserved for Social Welfare Facility Use” (“OU(BHAI)”), subject to a maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 8,767m<sup>2</sup>, a maximum BH of five storeys and the provision of a public open space of not less than 1,270m<sup>2</sup>, for the proposed development of residential care home for the elderly with in-situ preservation of the graded buildings under a conservation-cum-development approach, which was to take forward the decision of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board on agreeing to the s.12A application No. Y/KC/15 on 23.10.2020.

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

R13/C5 – 林紹輝

R718/C6 – 劉貴梅

31. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Lam Siu Fai, a Kwai Tsing District Council Member of Shek Lei North Constituency and a resident of Shek Lei, made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) public housing developments in Northeast Kwai Chung first took place in the 1960s and had undergone redevelopment by phase since the 1980s. Up to date, there were five public housing estates in the area including Shek Lei (I) Estate, Shek Lei (II) Estate, Shek Yam Estate, Shek Yam East Estate, On Yam Estate and six Home Ownership Schemes blocks, totalling about 24,000 households living in some 40 public housing blocks. Private residential developments mainly lined along Wo Yi Hop Road. In total, there was a population of about 200,000 living in Northeast Kwai Chung;
- (c) in 2000, in pursuance of the Government’s policy initiative for provision of more elderly housing, some sites in the area originally reserved for open spaces

had been developed as public housing blocks (i.e. Shek Hei House and Shek Fu House). The provision of open space was insufficient in the locality, but was now said to be sufficient according to PlanD. In 2005, in face of shortage of public housing, a site in Kwai Chung Area 9H originally reserved for the provision of an indoor recreation centre by the then Regional Council was re-purposed for public housing development (i.e. now Shek Foon House). When the local residents counter-proposed to develop public housing on the then Shek Lei Interim Housing (SLIH) site in lieu of Kwai Chung Area 9H, the local residents were then informed that the redevelopment of the SLIH would not take place in the near future. However, the SLIH site was subsequently re-planned for public housing (now known as Shek Li Street redevelopment) amidst strong public objection;

- (d) some roads were not wide enough to accommodate manoeuvres of long bus, particularly Lei Pui Street, Shek Pai Street and On Chuk Street. The Transport Department (TD) expressed on several occasions, including district council meetings, that the scope of road widening was very slim since these roads were flanked by steep slopes and existing developments. To overcome the difficulty, the bus company had to deploy the shortest bus to serve the area which in turn limited the number of passengers that could be accommodated per bus trip. Now that the sites on both sides of Shek Pai Street (i.e. the SLIH site and Shek Lei Hang Village) were proposed for public housing developments, to which TD had no objection. Without any road widening proposal, it was doubted how the additional traffic arising from the proposed public housing developments could be accommodated. Moreover, there were conflicts between pedestrians and vehicular traffic at some major pedestrian signalised crossings (e.g. near Shek Lei St. John's Catholic Primary School). The Government was urged to solve the traffic problems first before further pursuing any housing development in the area;
- (e) many underground water mains in the area were laid many years ago and had become aged, deteriorated and ripe for replacement. For replacement of underground water mains, the concerned roads would need to be closed for months according to the Water Supplies Department (WSD). As it was

considered impracticable to have roads closed and bus re-routed for months in an already overloaded road network, there was nearly no opportunity for replacing or upgrading the old water mains;

- (f) there were black spots of frequent bursts of underground water mains in the area. The occurrence of such incidents at these black spots had increased over the past two years. Every time when there was a burst, the concerned road(s) would need to be closed for emergency repair works and bus re-routing would be necessary, giving rise to severe traffic jams, serious delays and hence grievances among the local residents. It was not sure how the current road network which was prone to water mains bursts could accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed public housing development;
- (g) the provision of GIC facilities was insufficient as some of the previous GIC sites had gradually been re-allocated for public housing developments. For instance, the previous community centre in Shek Yam Estate had been demolished and redeveloped as the existing Lai Shek House. The sites currently occupied by elderly housing and Shek Foon House were previously reserved for open spaces and an indoor recreation centre respectively. The Northeast Kwai Chung neighbourhood had been accommodating additional public housing developments over the years at the expense of GIC facilities. It was unfair to the community; and
- (h) the woodland in the Item A1 to A3 sites (Item A sites) was a backyard garden for the local residents and a home to many monkeys. Bulldozing the woodland would affect the ecology and destroy a breathing space for the community which could not be replaced by nearby pocket open spaces.

R8/C2 – The Conservancy Association

R11 – Greenpeace

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

- (a) both The Conservancy Association and Greenpeace objected to the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site;

*The Principles of GB Review*

- (b) much of the Item A sites was well-wooded, replete with trees of local species, with some trees growing up to about 9m or 10m in height. The development of Item A sites was not in line with the principles of GB Review conducted by the Government in the past few years in the following aspects:
- (i) against the principle of the GB Review Stage 1 involving devegetated, deserted or formed land only, the Item A sites were in fact well-vegetated;
  - (ii) against the principle of the GB Review Stage 2 involving sites of insignificant buffering effect and relatively low conservation value in close proximity to developed areas or public roads, the Item A sites were:
    - not without buffering effect as they consisted of secondary woodland and plantation woodland, and were in close vicinity of the country park;
    - not of relatively low conservation value as the habitats of the secondary woodland, plantation woodland and watercourse therein were rated “moderate” to “high” according to the EFS and studies by allied green groups; and
    - despite being served by a public road (i.e. Shek Pei Street), additional transport infrastructures were still required to serve the proposed development due to significant level difference within the site;
- (c) the rezoning proposal would set an undesirable precedent for rezoning of similar GB sites for development;



Tree Felling and Tree Compensation

- (d) the substantial level difference within the Item A sites ranging from 86mPD to 148mPD would result in large-scale site formation and extensive retaining wall structures (about 60% of the site area). That would reduce the scope of minimising tree felling;
- (e) trees of particular interest (TPIs) were defined with reference to multiple criteria, one of which was the diameter at breast height (DBH), according to the relevant Development Bureau (DEVB)'s technical circular. However, in the EFS, only DBH was adopted and 51 TPIs were identified, of which a small number of seven TPIs were proposed for retention. Such deficiency in the assessment methodology might lead to under-recording of TPIs and hence underestimating the impact on trees;
- (f) the compensatory planting recommended in the EFS was not a full compensation. Against the 2,140 trees to be felled, the proposed number of 1,620 compensatory trees was not sufficient to compensate for the loss;
- (g) according to the MPC Paper No. 13/22 on Proposed Amendments to the Approved Kwai Chung OZP No. S/KC/30 dated 28.10.2022 (the MPC Paper), the 1,620 compensatory trees would be provided in three locations, including Item A1 site (about 350 trees), along the proposed public access road (about 277 trees) and in areas between Kam Shan Country Park and the Item A1 site in the form of plantation enrichment planting (about 1,000 trees). For the 350 trees to be compensated in the Item A1 site, they were counted as compensatory in the Paper but not so counted in the outline landscape plan attached to the MPC Paper. If the latter case was valid, the total compensatory planting would be fewer. For the 277 trees to be compensated along the proposed public access road, only one single species *Sterculia lanceolata* (假蘋婆) was proposed. Such monotonous roadside tree planting would not re-create a woodland habitat which the felled trees came from. The compensatory tree species should be diversified. For the 1,000 trees to be compensated in the form of plantation enrichment planting, it was unsure if removal of existing trees therein would be involved and had been counted towards the number of trees to be felled. There

was also a lack of details about the planting scheme, e.g. tree species, soil condition, etc.;

Ecological Impact

- (h) Kam Shan Country Park was surrounded by various housing developments, with the proposed public housing development being the closest (about 100m away), comparing with the existing On Yam Estate and Shek Lei Estate (about 330m to 470m away respectively). Allowing a housing development in such short distance from the country park would create an undesirable precedent; and
- (i) according to some representations and a research conducted by the University of Hong Kong, a considerable amount of *Euploea spp.* (紫斑蝶) was found in winter near Kam Shan Country Park, only about 150m away from the Item A sites. In the Paper, it was merely stated that AFCD had no comment on the methodology of collecting wet season data only and the findings of no interruption on the flight path of overwintering butterflies. However, the explanation of excluding dry season from the survey was not convincing and, without the dry season data, the assessment on the overwintering butterflies was premature and the accuracy of the findings was sceptical.

R7/C1 – The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Woo Ming Chuan made the following main points:

- (a) Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) the ecological baseline survey conducted under CEDD's Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) (including the two-month verification surveys) covered the period from May to October only, missing out the winter migrant visiting period from November to April during which Hong Kong was a favourable place for winter migratory birds. Such omission was a major flaw. According to the relevant guideline for conducting ecological baseline survey under the

Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), bird species appearing in different seasons should be captured. HKBWS had conducted a bird survey in Item A sites from December 2022 to March 2023 by way of recording bird sounds and identified about 77 bird species (including about 18 species of conservation interest), which doubled the number of those recorded in the EcoIA;

- (c) the Item A sites consisting of a secondary woodland was of “moderate” ecological value as suggested in the EcoIA, and had a strong ecological connectivity with Kam Shan Country Park. Such “moderate” ecological value was manifested by the appearance of a variety of forest bird species, including bird species under Class II protection in China (e.g. Fujian Niltava (棕腹大仙鷄), Collared Scops Owl (領角鴞), etc.) and bird species of Local Concern (e.g. Speckled Piculet (斑姬啄木鳥), Ashy Drongo (灰卷尾), etc.). Along the major perennial stream (S1) within the Item A sites, some water birds (e.g. little egret (小白鷺), striated heron (綠鷺), Pygmy wren-babbler (小鷓鴣), etc.) were also found. The existence of diverse bird species suggested that the woodland and the stream courses constituted an elaborated ecological system that deserved a recognition of relatively high ecological value; and
- (d) the loss of “GB” zone in the Item A sites would lead to direct loss of valuable woodland habitats, weaken the buffering function between the urbanised and rural areas, undermine the ecological integrity of the stream and woodland habitats, reduce the passive recreational space for public enjoyment and create an undesirable precedent of rezoning GB sites on the periphery of country park.

#### R10/C1811 – Green Sense

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

- (a) Green Sense objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;

- (b) under the annual prevailing northeasterly wind and the summer prevailing southerly wind (based on the Air Ventilation Assessments by Expert Evaluation (AVA(EE)s) conducted by PlanD in 2012 for Tsuen Wan Area (AVR/G/65) and Kwai Chung Area (AVR/G/68)), both Wo Yip Hop Road and Shek Lei (II) Estate would be most affected by the proposed public housing development in the following way:
- (i) Wo Yi Hop Road was lined with high-rise buildings on both sides of the road. There was an existing air path channelling the downhill easterly wind from Kam Shan Country Park down to Wo Yi Hop Road. The proposed public housing development would block this air path and create urban canyon effect on the road;
  - (ii) the AVA(EE)s recommended in 2012 that upon redevelopment of Shek Lei (II) Estate, the existing air path therein should be maintained (or even improved in scale) so as to enhance the air ventilation of the area. However, based on the wind velocity data provided in the EFS, the proposed public housing development would obstruct the downhill easterly wind from reaching the downstream area (e.g. Shek Lei (II) Estate, Shek Lei Catholic Primary School and Shek Pai Street (a major wind channel)), rendering poor wind performance at pedestrian level with near-zero wind. This would undermine the air ventilation benefit brought about by the future redevelopment of Shek Lei (II) Estate. As opposed to the above, the Paper responded that although the proposed development would inevitably affect the ventilation performance of the downstream area, the wind environment in some areas (e.g. Shek Lei Catholic Primary School) would be improved; and
- (c) on assessment of light pollution, according to the International Commission on Illumination standard, four light zones were adopted, including E1 (intrinsically dark), E2 (low district brightness), E3 (medium district brightness) and E4 (high district brightness). The proposed public housing development would cause major change to the environmental brightness of Kam Shan Country Park from

E1 to E2/E3, significantly impacting on the living things thereat. For example, when the background light was intensified to a certain extent, firefly would stop glowing to attract mates, finally leading to possible extinction of the species.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting during the presentation of Mr Lau Ka Yeung.]

### R12 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden

35. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following main points:

- (a) Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG) objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) KFBG had been advocating the principle of developing brownfield sites first. No doubt, brownfield operations had been making economic contribution to Hong Kong. However, the current brownfield developments were not a proper use of Hong Kong's scarce land resources. It usually involved proliferation of land-intensive polluting activities operating on haphazardly-distributed land parcels and posing adverse environmental impacts (e.g. soil contamination, stream course pollution, etc.). To better regularise the brownfield developments, consideration should be given to accommodating them within multi-storey buildings so as to allow more efficient use of land resource and contain the related environmental impacts in a controlled manner. On another front, some land patches had been found left vacant, underutilised or lacking work programme to implement the committed development, for a long period of time. Priority should be accorded to better tapping the land resources from brownfield or underutilised sites;
- (c) the Item A sites were as natural as a country park and should be treated as a country park extension. The sites were collectively a place rich in biodiversity where many forest birds which could only be found in mature woodland could also be observed therein, and a home to various wildlife and many mature trees. The sites also offered an outlet for recreational respite for the locals. In terms

of ecological value and recreational value, the Item A sites in fact had effectively performed the function of a country park, more than serving as a buffer. The proposed public housing development would totally destroy this natural environment;

- (d) the EcoIA conducted on streams was not reasonable. On the ecological value of perennial stream S1, the EcoIA scored “moderate to high” for the upper section of the stream (outside the Item A sites) despite a lack of any species of conservation interest but “low to moderate” for the middle and lower sections (within the Item A sites) where there was presence of some species of conservation interest. Such assessment was doubtful. On stream enhancement, the EcoIA recommended that to mitigate the permanent loss of a section of the perennial stream S1 (about 140m long), two ephemeral streams (about 200m long combined) were identified for enhancement work to improve the physical condition and floral diversity. However, enhancement on ephemeral streams was considered not a commensurate compensation for the loss of a perennial stream;
- (e) ecological civilisation as a national developmental goal advocating the protection of natural environment and ecology was enshrined in China’s constitution in 2018. The Board should consider whether the destruction of the natural environment in Item A sites would be at odds with the said national development goal of ecological civilisation; and
- (f) KFBG held that there was a need to review whether rezoning of well-wooded “GB” zones was in line with the ecological civilisation under the national development goal; and to review both the rezoning proposal and the EcoIA findings in respect of the Item A sites.

### R15/C3 – Designing Hong Kong

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

- (a) Designing Hong Kong objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;

On-going Public Housing Projects

- (b) the need to utilise the Item A1 site for public housing development was not justified given that a considerable number of public housing projects were underway within a distance of 2km from the site. These projects would provide a total of about 10,500 flats for a population of about 30,000 upon completion, including:
- (i) Tsuen Wan No. 2 Fresh Water Service Reservoir
    - rezoning completed a few years ago, capable of producing five residential towers for a population of about 11,200;
  - (ii) Ex-Kwai Chung Public School
    - a few-minute walk from Tai Wo Hau MTR Station, capable of producing three residential towers for a population of about 5,000;
  - (iii) Tai Wo Hau Road near Yan Kwai House and Kwai Shing Circuit
    - rezoning of both sites completed a few years ago, with PR and BH restrictions relaxed under a planning application (No. A/KC/500) approved on 13.1.2023, capable of producing one 35-storey residential tower for a population of about 1,200 in the former and one 38-storey residential tower for a population of about 1,300 in the latter;
  - (iv) Kwai On Factory Estate (i.e. Amendment Item B)
    - capable of accommodating a population of about 1,620;
  - (v) San Kwai Street
    - near Kwai Fong MTR Station, rezoning completed a few years ago with PR and BH restrictions relaxed under a planning application (No. A/KC/499) approved on 9.12.2022, capable of producing about 798 flats for a population of about 2,106;

## (vi) Lai Yiu Estate

- an infilled block near completion, with PR and BH restrictions relaxed under a planning application (No. A/KC/445) approved in 2017, capable of producing about 819 flats for a population of about 4,300; and

## (vii) Shek Li Street Redevelopment

- soon to be demolished for public housing development, capable of producing about 1,700 flats in two residential towers for a population of about 4,300.

- (c) the Board should note that none of the above was rezoned from “GB”. There were other means to boost public housing production without encroaching on “GB” zones, e.g. rezoning from non-“GB” (e.g. “G/IC”, “I”, etc.), intensification of on-going public housing development by way of planning application, etc.;

*Potential Public Housing Sites in Kwai Chung*

- (d) based on his research, there were other potential sites in Kwai Chung suitable for public housing development, including:
- (i) Kwai Hei Street (1.05 ha) and Hing Fong Road (0.46 ha)
    - zoned “I”;
  - (ii) Kwai Wo Street (2.37 ha)
    - zoned “OU (Sewage Treatment Works)”;
  - (iii) Container Port Road (2 ha)
    - zoned “OU (Container Related Uses)”. The site had been identified for public housing purpose since 2014, according to a District Council paper, but not yet been developed for the intended purpose. The site coupled with the above Kwai Wo Street site would have a total area of about 4 ha, equivalent to the Item A1 site (about 4 ha (net site area));



- (iv) Tai Lin Pai Road/Wing Yip Road (0.99 ha)
    - zoned “I”; and
  - (v) Cheung Wing Road/Yau Ma Hom Road (0.4 ha)
    - zoned “Open Space” (“O”), with transitional housing on-site from 2022 to 2027;
- (e) based on the principle of developing brownfield sites first, the above brownfield sites were considered suitable for public housing development. These sites were flat land being occupied by temporary uses (e.g. temporary car park, temporary structures, etc.), totalling about 7.27 ha. They were conveniently located close to MTR Stations or well-served by public transport, and supported by various government, institution and community (GIC) facilities nearby; and
- (f) in general, development on “GB” zone had never been the best option nor the only one option for boosting housing supply. In particular, the Item A1 site was still subject to various difficulties and uncertainties, as presented by allied green groups, to be further clarified by the Government. Given that the presence of alternative sites in Kwai Chung which were spade-ready for public housing developments, there was no need to destroy the natural environment in the Item A1 site.

R9/C4 – 北葵涌交通關注組 (North Kwai Chung Transport Concern Group)

R716/C1778 – Lau Ka Yeung 劉加揚

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

- (a) North Kwai Chung Transport Concern Group (the Concern Group) and he objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;

- (b) Northeast Kwai Chung was a predominant public housing neighbourhood with a population of about 133,000, supported by various GIC facilities including nine kindergartens, eight primary schools, six secondary schools, 26 elderly homes, etc. Industrial developments were located along Wo Yip Hop Road, generating logistics traffic in the residential neighbourhood. Peak hours for road traffic and pedestrian movement were generally 7:15 – 8:15 a.m. and 7:15 – 9:00 a.m. respectively in the morning, and 5:45 – 6:45 p.m. and 3:45 – 8 p.m. respectively in the evening;
- (c) the current major traffic problems in the district were: intense commuting needs and hence overloading the already insufficient public transport services during the peak hours; unacceptable long journey time between home and workplaces; frequent disruption to emergency rescue services due to traffic jams; overtaxed local road network in particular for some major junctions; pedestrian safety problems due to insufficient pedestrian facilities and poor road design; and inconvenient location in respect of the nearest MTR Station (being 1km afar and 100m downhill) that connection to which relied much on the limited feeder services. In some extreme cases of traffic congestions, the locals even needed to walk back home from Tsuen Wan and Cheung Sha Wan;
- (d) the peak demand for public transport services to MTR station was about 5,000 trips during peak hours. The Bus Route No. 31M, the only public bus service between Northeast Kwai Chung and the nearest MTR Station, took about 30 minutes downhill through a lengthy winding road (4km long) despite that the MTR station was located only about 1km away. The long journey time was mainly attributable to the location of Northeast Kwai Chung being on uphill area, the deployment of smaller bus to cope with the sharp bends of the road, and traffic congestion in industrial areas along Wo Yip Hop Road and Kwai Chung Road, etc. Also, it was not uncommon to find delays in bus service and buses running overloaded;
- (e) the local road network had remained unchanged since it was first laid down in the 1960s as there was no room for substantial expansion amid the increasingly compact neighbourhood. The proposed Kwai Chung Circumferential Road

(KCCR) was intended to share out the traffic load on Wo Yip Hop Road and Kwai Chung Road. It was first proposed in 1983 and incorporated in the OZP in 1989. However, this road had yet to be built and was found unnecessary before 2037, according to CEDD's Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (PTTIA);

- (f) according to the established practice, traffic volume was measured by passenger car unit/hour (pcu/hr) ratio, instead of the vehicles/hour ratio adopted in the PTTIA. For instance, a bus was counted as two pcu under the pcu/hr ratio while being counted as one vehicle only under the vehicle/hr ratio and that would lead to underestimation of the traffic condition. Also, when the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio went beyond 85%, traffic improvement measures would normally be recommended to mitigate potential adverse traffic impact. However, based on the PTTIA, when some roads reached a V/C ratio beyond 85% in 2037, the KCCR was still considered not necessary;
- (g) as there were about 26 residential care homes for the elderly (RCHEs) in the district, the provision of swift ambulance service to these RCHEs was of particular concern;
- (h) due to poor road design, there were several traffic accident black spots, particularly the bus terminus at Tai Loong Street, the junction at Wai Kek Street, etc.;
- (i) the traffic impact was underestimated in the PTTIA as the assessment was prepared during the time of pandemic and based on traffic data collected in 2017. Regarding the average annual daily traffic data (AADT), the annual growth rate of traffic was estimated at about -1.06% (2014 to 2020) in the PTTIA, but it would be +4.23% (2016 to 2021) based on his estimation with focus more on Northeast Kwai Chung and data of the recent few years;
- (j) the PTTIA revealed that only two junctions, J2 (Lei Muk Road/Wo Yi Hop Road) and J8 (Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street), would be running over-capacity in 2024, without any assessment on three other important road junctions along

Tai Loong Street. The Concern Group had the following observations and comments on PTTIA's recommended junction improvements:

- at J2 (Lei Muk Road/Wo Yi Hop Road), the proposed road widening of Wo Yi Hop Road should be extended to merge with the nearby bus bay to obviate the need for bus changing lanes again soon after leaving the bus bay;
  - at J5 (Shek Pai Street/On Chit Lane/Tai Pak Tin Street/Shek Li Street), the proposed traffic diversion would divert traffic to On Chit Street/On Chit Lane, aggravating the existing conflict between pedestrians and vehicles at that junction. It was suggested widening Shek Pai Street instead;
  - at J8 (Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street), the performance of this junction was much worse with longer traffic queue up to 420m based on the Concern Group's traffic count on 5.7.2023. It was suggested widening the full length of Shek Pai Street from the existing two lanes to four lanes as a partial implementation of the proposed KCCR;
  - at J9 (Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street), the traffic queue was about 50m to 120m based on the Concern Group's traffic count on 5.7.2023, longer than the PTTIA's finding; and
  - at J10 (Castle Peak Road/Wo Yi Hop Road/Tai Loong Street), the traffic queue at the junction of Wo Yi Hop Road/Tai Loong Street was about 250m based on the Concern Group's traffic count on 5.7.2023, tailing back to the already busy Castle Peak Road;
- (k) irrespective of whether or not the proposed development would proceed, all the traffic mitigation measures recommended under the PTTIA should be implemented in conjunction with regular updating of the traffic data and more use of smart traffic light;

- (l) the discrepancy in the findings conducted by the Concern Group and in the PTTIA mainly lied in the definition of peak hours, where the Concern Group adopted a busier period (7:15 – 8:15 a.m.) than that in the PTTIA (8:30 – 9:30a.m.);
- (m) the problem of underground water mains bursts had lasted for more than ten years but still remained unresolved, seriously affecting the local road traffic and the livelihood of the local residents. The underground water mains which were installed many years ago had deteriorated and could not cope with the demand of the increasing population;
- (n) the provision of open space in Kwai Chung had all along been insufficient. Although a large piece of land (previously a landfill site) had been earmarked for the proposed Kwai Chung Park, there was no definite implementation programme in the past 20 years, citing the long-lasting landfill gas issue. On the provision of sports facilities, Kwai Chung Area 9H was previously reserved for an indoor recreation centre but subsequently developed as a public housing block (Shek Foon House), with only minimal and fee-charging sports facilities provided. The location of the other four existing indoor recreation centres were inconvenient to the local residents; and
- (o) the Board was requested to make a decision on the representations and comments related to the proposed public housing development in Fanling Golf Course, for which the hearing had commenced earlier, before concluding the current hearing in respect of the draft OZP.

R809/C34 – 陳婉思

R811 – 陳婉瑩

38. Ms Chan Yuen Sze made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;

- (b) she concurred with other representers that there were alternative sites in Kwai Chung more suitable for public housing development;
- (c) many residents of the area were elderly who did not know how to make representations/comments, otherwise there would be far more representations/comments objecting to the proposed public housing development;
- (d) the woodland in the Item A sites was close to the nearby residential area and easily accessible. Very often, the local residents paid visits to that piece of woodland for leisure so as to seek relief and recover from the busy everyday life. To the local residents, that piece of woodland was a precious breathing space and was considered even more important than the less-frequented Kam Shan Country Park; and
- (e) the impacts generated from the construction works of the proposed public housing development would deteriorate the living environment and affect mental health of the local residents nearby.

R125/C225 – Yau Kit Sze

39. Ms Yau Kit Sze made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) the farming history of Shek Lei Hang Village could be dated back to the 1950s/60s. This backyard farming helped promote self-sufficiency and reduce carbon emission. One could also learn how to make fertiliser from kitchen waste. If these cultivation fields were bulldozed by the proposed development, there would be no more chance for people to experience this way of living and backyard farming;
- (c) the woodland in the Item A sites was of ecological value. The practice of eco-farming and regenerative farming could co-exist with the nature in harmony and

maintain the ecological value of the woodland;

- (d) the global trend was taking a turn to community-supported agriculture which was operated on a small-business basis. There was a need to revisit whether the gain of a few residential towers was worth the loss of a large piece of woodland; and
- (e) the rural revitalisation being advocated by the Government should not cover only the indigenous villages (e.g. Lai Chi Wo), but also non-indigenous villages like Shek Lei Hang Village.

R340/C142 – Chan Long Fung

40. Mr Chan Long Fung, a resident of Northeast Kwai Chung with in-laws living in Shek Lei Hang Village, made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) his workshop was located in an industrial building along Tai Lin Pei Road. To escape from the hustle and bustle of the industrial area, he enjoyed taking respite in the rural environment of Shek Lei Hang Village;
- (c) he needed to travel from home to Kowloon Tong every day, heavily relying on Shek Pei Street and Castle Peak Road. According to his own experience, traffic jams and road accidents always happened on Shek Pei Street, due to the undulating topography, insufficient road space, etc. This had caused further delays in bus services and hence public grievance; and
- (d) he raised concerns on the potential traffic and noise impacts from the construction works of the proposed public housing development. The PTTIA which was prepared based on the traffic condition during the pandemic was not desirable. Also, there was not much information about the future traffic and transport arrangement, e.g. the future pedestrian connection with the MTR Station, implementation programme of the proposed traffic improvements, etc.

Instead of approving the housing project amid significant public concerns, the Government should put the public at ease by disclosing full details of the future traffic and transport arrangement before proceeding with the proposed development.

R684/C1364 – 黃思略

41. Mr Wong Sze Leuk made the following main points:

- (a) he lived in Wong Tai Sin and would like to compare Shek Lei Hang Village with Wong Tai Sin;
- (b) the Fung Tak Park in Wong Tai Sin was a landscaped garden depicting the Chinese novel “Journey to the West” (“The Journey”) about the “Monkey King”. In the woodland of the Item A sites, the human settlement of Shek Lei Hang Village and some Chinese temples nestled at the foothill area surrounded by woodlands with vibrant wildlife (e.g. monkeys and birds). Compared with Fung Tak Park which was a man-made miniature of The Journey, the Item A sites looked like a place where The Journey unfolded in real life. In terms of Chinese cultural heritage, both the Lion Rock (the backdrop of Fung Tak Park) and the Kam Shan (the backdrop of Shek Lei Hang Village) bore resemblance;
- (c) a place like Shek Lei Hang Village was a perfect venue for environmental education;
- (d) Hong Kong should be a place that offered a variety of housing types for people to choose from. Modelled on Shek Lei Hang Village, similar village communities could be promoted in the rural areas of Hong Kong; and
- (e) Shek Lei Hang Village and the temples nearby, both rich in Chinese culture and religious values, were compatible with the natural setting of Kam Shan Country Park. They should be preserved to showcase to the world how a harmonious relationship between human settlement and the nature could be maintained.



[Ms Bernadette W.S. Tsui left the meeting at this point.]

R831/C1785 – 張嘉麟

42. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chang Ka Lun, a resident of On Yam Estate, made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to the proposed public housing development in the Item A1 site;
- (b) the overhead transmission lines were only about 60m away from the proposed public housing development which might pose safety concerns to the future residents;
- (c) the main road connecting Northeast Kwai Chung with the Kwai Chung proper was a winding road. The external traffic of the area mainly headed in two directions: one southbound to Kowloon and one to Kwai Fong MTR station in the southwest. For the southbound route, the Bus Route No. 35A took a relatively long trip, up to 30 minutes, to leave Northeast Kwai Chung as it needed to wind through all the five public housing estates (i.e. On Yam Estate, Shek Yam East Estate, Shek Yam Estate, Shek Lei (II) Estate and Shek Lei (I) Estate) before heading to Kowloon. For the route between Northeast Kwai Chung and Kwai Fong MTR Station, the Bus Route No. 235M also took a relatively long trip of 30 minutes. If a population of 20,000 arising from the proposed public housing development was added to the area, it was envisaged that the time for the bus rides would increase to about 45 minutes or more, and other public transport services (e.g. minibus) were infrequent and expensive;
- (d) the occurrence of underground water mains bursts was common in the area, causing serious disruption to road traffic, damages to road surface and inconvenience to the public. Last year, the number of days for road closure due to water mains bursts was 13 days (non-consecutive), resulting in serious disruption to the traffic, even with long queues tailing back to the heavily trafficked Castle Peak Road. Northeast Kwai Chung was in dire need of better external road connection whereas the access road serving the proposed public

housing development as proposed by CEDD was merely a dead end;

- (e) sites within “R(A)” zone should be fully utilised first. Given that some proposed housing sites in the area had already been rezoned but were left idle for some time, it was unsure why there was a need to develop the Item A1 site. The Tsuen Wan No. 2 Fresh Water Service Reservoir site had been rezoned to “R(A)20” but no construction works had commenced. Another example was the “R(A)” zone of the slope to the immediate northwest of Shek Yam East Estate. The said slope and the nearby Wo Yi Hop Road Sports Ground were located on both sides of the proposed KCCR, and could be amalgamated to form a larger site for a large-scale residential development atop podium with the KCCR running underneath, similar to Sceneway Garden in Lam Tin; and
- (f) underutilised flat land could be made readily available for public housing development at a relatively low cost. Options should be explored to utilising this type of land, e.g. the site currently occupied by transitional housing at the junction of Cheung Wing Road and Yau Ma Hom Road.

#### R2/C1 – Mary Mulvihill

43. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

##### Item A1

- (a) she objected to the proposed development as there were other land supply alternatives (i.e. degraded brownfield sites and Tso/Tang land);
- (b) with reference to a recent massive landslide and flooding incident in Chongqing, the proposed development on slopes would defeat the objective of “GB” zoning in combating climate change. Besides, the public should raise the awareness on the important role played by “GB” zone in combating climate change in order to align with the international focus;
- (c) the damage to the “GB” site as a buffer zone and the impact on flora and fauna thereat would be irreversible. People living in the low-lying area would be at

risk of natural hazard given the loss of woodland. Information on cumulative loss of trees due to rezoning of “GB” sites for housing development should be provided in the interest of the public;

- (d) there was doubt on how those compensated trees could duly mitigate the adverse impact on the wildlife and ecosystem as a whole;
- (e) hiking trails connecting to Kam Shan Country Park would be affected by the proposed development;
- (f) adverse visual impact and obstruction of air ventilation were anticipated. The effectiveness of the mitigation measures of providing a 15m-wide separation between buildings was questionable;
- (g) in face of unwilling displacement due to the proposed development, the affected households would possibly encounter hardships such as segregation from their neighbourhood and uncertainty in future living environment;

Item A2

- (h) the lack of BH restriction for the “G/IC” site (i.e. a primary school use) was clearly making way to allow more land use options and taller buildings to take place;

Item A3

- (i) rezoning the “GB” site for relocating the fresh water pump house would cause additional loss of “GB” zone;

Item B

- (j) the rezoning from “I” to “R(A)4” would induce loss of employment opportunities for low-income households and aggravate traffic issue as people would need to commute to other districts for job opportunities;

Item C

- (k) the number of niches to be accommodated in the proposed columbarium was much less than those of private operations. Utilisation of public resources should be optimised as far as practicable; and

Item D

- (l) the planning intention to protect the graded historic buildings was generally supported, provided that relevant conditions for preservation were incorporated into the development proposal. Nevertheless, it was considered unsuitable to rezone the entire “O” zone, including the slopes and tree groups, to “OU(BHAI)” which in turn would make the concerned area ready for further development, compromising the function of the concerned part of “O” zone.

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

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 2:10 p.m.]

44. The meeting was resumed at 3:10 p.m.
45. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)  
Ms Doris P.L. Ho

Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr K.L. Wong

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

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

Director of Planning  
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

## Tsuen Wan and West Kowloon District

### Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Kwai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/KC/31

(TPB Paper No. 10909)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

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

#### **Government Representatives**

##### *PlanD*

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - DPO/TWK

Mr W.C. Lui - STP/TWK

##### *CEDD*

Mr K.W. Lee - CE/SD (Works)

Mr S.M. Tam - SE

##### *HD*

Mr Alvin L.C. Chan - SPO

Miss Carol F. Ty ] SA

Ms Polly K.Y. Wong ]

Ms Winky W.K. Lam - CE

##### *AFCD*

Mr Eric Y.H. Wong - SNCO

*Atkins China Limited* ]  
Mr Louis Lau ]  
Mr Henry Chung ] Consultants  
Mr Enoch Cheung ]  
Ms Yang Yao ]

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R78/C19 – Cheng Kwok Fan

R97/C8 – Ms Chow Oi Chuen

R101 – 葉卓蓮

R120/C203 – Yip Ching

R123/C1017 – Yeung Sze Hau

R129/C232 – Xu Miao Jian

R138/C366 – Wong Siu Yin

R145 – Wan Lai

R147/C107 – Tse Yat Long Anson

R174/C1789 – Chan Chi Wing

R176/C129 – Chan Ka Tat

R201/C503 – Ling Wai Sum

R204/C732 – Yeung Yat Fai

R232/C60 – Yip Fu Wing

R241 – Wong Yuk Hong

R243/C7 – Yip Man (葉雯)

R262 – Leung Yuk Chun

R272/C25 – Leung Ka Wan

R282/C48 – Lee Hiu Lam

R300 – Lai Chun Yin

R303/C682 – Kwok Long Yin

R305/C1071 – Kwan Wing Sze

R333/C451 – Chang Kin Wai

R342 – Chan Kam Kong

R345/C214 – Wa Ka Cheong

R404 – Wong Hiu Lam

R406/C15 – Wong Ching Lam Iris (王靖琳)

R431 – Sin Wing Sing

R434/C26 – Shiu Kwan Ling

R465/C925 – Chan Ka Fung (陳嘉鋒)

R503/C86 – Ma Nga Ping

R513/C930 – Yip Mau Wah Dino

R516/C1777 – 郭志傑

R570/C488 – 黃慧心

R576 – 林木粼

R582/C603 – Yip Sui Yu

R587/C931 – Wong Siu Bing

R620/C242 – Leung Wing Ka

R696/C45 – 黎麗玲

R708/C1795 – Wong Yu Ling

R715/C246 – Wong Tsun Wai

R719 – Cheuk Ming Chu Pearl

R728/C1806 – Yip Kiu (葉蕎)

R733 – Chan Siu Kuen

R736/C234 – Sung Wai Yan

R740/C1131 – To Yat Nga (杜逸雅)

R790/C133 – Chow Oi Ki (周藹棋)

R796/C1493 – 何家豪

R802/C96 – Lui Sze Nga

R813 – Hung Yat Lan

R822 – 葉熙嵐

R829/C1779 – Kong Tin Long

R847/C498 – To Yat Man (杜逸民)

R852/C52 – Wong Foon

C21 – Yeung Hiu Man

C22 – Mang Hiu Ying Maggie

C39 – Lam Kwo Wai

C40 – Leung Yee Tak



C50 – Lu Ying Ting  
C65 – Ng Kwan Yu  
C175 – Cheung Hui Yuet Celeste  
C187 – Hong Ho Wan  
C202 – Wan Shuk Yee  
C233 – Lo Tin Long  
C241 – Poon Sing Chau  
C261 – Tang Hoi Shan  
C272 – Lau Pak Shing  
C291 – Chai Chung Ming Tony  
C304 – Lai Chi Yuen  
C320 – 黃盛恆  
C339 – Yiu Tung Wing  
C349 – Lee Yin Ting  
C367 – Luk Wing Tung  
C474 – Ng Kim Fung  
C535 – Liu Nan Xi  
C597 – Chen Yue Meng  
C644 – Lum Mo Ching  
C739 – Poon Po Yan  
C776 – Cheung Ting Hoi  
C810 – Chow I Man  
C853 – Yau Pui Chung  
C880 – Poon Ching Yee  
C904 – Li Yuk Ming Sylvia  
C915 – Ng Wai Kwan  
C945 – Lam Ka Ho  
C954 – Cheung Hui Ching Charmaine  
C993 – Cheung Suet Ying  
C1042 – Wong Pui Yi  
C1090 – Leung Ho Nam Banson  
C1094 – Ma Chi Hong Andrew  
C1126 – Wong Pui Ying

C1788 – Lau Ching Yan

C1792 – Wong Chun Man

Shek Lei Communities Concern Group

(SLCCG) (石籬改建關注組) –

- |                         |   |                               |
|-------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| - Ms Chow Oi Chuen      | ] | Representers, Commenters, and |
| - Ms Yip Cheuk Lin Iris | ] | Representers' and Commenters' |
| - Ms Yip Man            | ] | Representatives               |
| - Ms Yip Ching          | ] |                               |
| - Ms To Yat Nga         | ] |                               |
| - Mr Yip Mau Wah Dino   | ] |                               |
| - Ms Wong Siu Ping      | ] |                               |
| - Ms Yip Kiu            | ] |                               |
| - Ms Li Liling          | ] |                               |
| - Ms Chen Yue Meng      | ] |                               |

R217 – Ng Cheuk Hang

- |                    |   |             |
|--------------------|---|-------------|
| - Mr Ng Cheuk Hang | - | Representer |
|--------------------|---|-------------|

47. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

48. With the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Ms Chow Oi Chuen, R97/C8, SLCCG, made the following main points in respect of public engagement of the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site and history of the Shek Lei Hang Village (the Village):

- (a) she was a villager of the Village and one of the organisers of SLCCG;
- (b) there was a lack of public engagement and communication between the Government and the villagers of the Village during the planning process of the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site. The villagers were only aware of the rezoning proposal when the proposal was submitted to Kwai Tsing District Council (KTDC) nine months ago, and they had to approach KTDC members for details of the rezoning proposal. Furthermore,

the concerns raised by KTDC on the rezoning proposal had not been addressed by the Government;

- (c) the social and cultural value of the Village as well as different public voices on the rezoning proposal had not been reflected in the assessment reports submitted by relevant government departments;
- (d) over the decades, the Village had played an important role in witnessing the transformation of Northeast Kwai Chung from squatter settlements, resettlement estates to public housing estates such as On Yam Estate, Shek Foon House of Shek Lei (II) Estate;
- (e) the history of the Village could be traced back to 1875. At that time, land was acquired through granting to the village representative with the lease as indicated in the land document. Migrants from the Mainland moved to the Village during the period from the 1900s to 1950s, particularly before and after World War II and the Chinese Civil War;
- (f) in the 1950s, the Village was named as Shek Lei Hang Village. In the 1950s and 1960s, due to topographical constraint, the Village was developed along the hillside with dwellings built on both sides of the stream. Farming activities were carried out on terraced fields and fresh farm produce was delivered to a retail outlet in a nearby wet market (i.e. 石籬園) or even Sham Shui Po. Besides, there were beekeeping activities and poultry farms in the Village;
- (g) the Village had gradually become more well-established with the grant of government licences. As indicated in paragraph 4.1.1 of the Paper, two Government Land Licences (GLLs), which were first issued in 1972, were granted to some structures in the Village. The GLLs allowed licencees to use the concerned land for temporary structures and cultivation purposes;
- (h) in the 1970s and 1980s, the Mutual Aid Committee was founded by the village representative (i.e. Mr Yip Shue Kai) with a view to leveraging on the

community channel between the Government and villagers and striving for infrastructural improvement. Since then, supporting facilities including water and electricity supplies had been provided and the scale of the Village had expanded up to more than 300 households (i.e. about 2,000 villagers). Mail boxes and temporary toilets were erected at the village entrance with concerted efforts of the villagers. A local access road leading to the Village was also provided between 1978 and 1980. In addition, the villagers were dedicated to community services and charitable fund-raising activities (i.e. Tung Wah Group of Hospitals, Pok Oi Hospital and establishment of scholarship) when their living standard had improved. Leisure activities such as booth games and dancing were organized by the villagers and nearby residents; and

- (i) in the 2000s, in view of the gradual decline of agricultural activities, young villagers began to move to urban areas (i.e. Kwai Chung) for job opportunities while elderly villagers stayed in the Village for domestic farming.

49. Ms To Yat Nga, R740/C1131 and representative of R262, R847 and C498, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a fourth-generation villager and grew up in a house built by her grandparents who migrated to Hong Kong after World War II. She witnessed the evolution of the Kwai Chung area. In the early days, there was a lack of water and electricity supplies in the Village;
- (b) she had deep affection with the Village. Her 78-year-old mother and siblings were also living in the Village. Despite residing at the uphill part of the Village, she was unwilling to move out because she needed to take care of her mother. She had concern on whether her brother's mental health would deteriorate if they had to move to a new living environment;
- (c) the number of households in the Village gradually decreased due to fire hazard of squatters and the affected villagers had been rehoused in public rental housing;

- (d) given that a considerable amount of public fund would be required for extensive site formation works and land clearance, and the implementation of the proposed public housing development would take a long time of about ten years, the Government should first consider developing other easily accessible sites for public housing development;
- (e) upon completion of the public housing development, tree planting along the new public road/sitting-out areas would be different from that of the existing natural woodland with abundance of wildlife; and
- (f) the public was not engaged in the planning process. The villagers were only informed of the land clearance via LandsD's clearance notices. There was no information of rehousing and compensation arrangements.

50. Ms Yip Cheuk Lin, R101 and representative of R204 and C732, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in the Village for 56 years and was a third-generation villager. Should there be rehousing in the same district, she had no objection to squatter clearance for the proposed public housing development;
- (b) her house was built by her grandfather with stones and timber in 1956, which was unlikely to withstand typhoons;
- (c) her childhood was different from other children who grew up in urban area. She carried out farm work including sowing, irrigation and operating soil tractor since childhood. She had a strong bonding with the Village and community network with other villagers;
- (d) the living environment in the Village had recently been improved by implementation of district minor works programme, i.e. provision of cemented footpaths and public lighting poles along footpaths. The new

supporting facilities would be demolished should the Government proceed with the proposed public housing development;

- (e) she expressed concerns on adapting to a new living environment, rehousing arrangement, technical feasibility of the proposed public housing development due to site constraints of steep topography and overhead power lines running parallel to the Item A1 site to the east, huge construction cost and lengthy implementation programme;
- (f) she queried whether there was scope to retain the Village prior to detailed surveying. Without a detailed surveying, it was premature to ascertain the exact boundary of the proposed public housing development, and the Village or part of the Village could be preserved;
- (g) the villagers could hardly comprehend the content of the assessment reports which was presented in English; and
- (h) she urged the Board to reconsider the OZP amendments.

51. Ms Chow Oi Chuen, R97/C8, SLCCG, played an audio recording of a villager (Ms Chow Oi Ki (R790/C133, SLCCG)) who was unable to make her representation in person, which covered the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in the Village for 22 years and was a fourth-generation villager. She had strong bonding with the existing neighbourhood where she grew up and received her education;
- (b) with her spiritual connection with the Village, she did not want to move out to start a new life, albeit being the young generation. It would also be difficult for her family to visit her grandfather living in a nearby residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) if the Village was cleared;
- (c) although the need for housing land supply was not arguable, the infrastructural capacity including public transport facilities and water mains

might be inadequate. Further increase in population (i.e. about 20,000) would inevitably exacerbate the capacity of current infrastructures while there were insufficient new public transport facilities/water mains to support the additional demand; and

- (d) given the unique history of the Village, strong attachment of villagers to the Village and harmonious neighbourhood relationship, the Village should be preserved since such elements could not be found elsewhere in urban areas.

52. Ms Yip Man, R243/C7, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a freelancer in art and cultural sector and was a fourth-generation villager. Her grandfather was the village representative (Mr Yip Shue Kai);
- (b) the Village possessed unique cultural and rural character such as a community farm (金山田園). She queried how such a popular recreational outlet could be reprovisioned for the villagers as well as the nearby residents in Shek Yam and On Yam Estates;
- (c) there were shortfalls in the provision of GIC facilities to meet the genuine need of the local residents. A playground near Shek Lei Interim Housing Blocks 10 and 11, which was the venue for holding temporary bamboo theatre activity, had been demolished for Shek Li Street redevelopment. Besides, the proposal of developing an indoor recreation centre at the Kwai Chung Area 9H site at Tai Pak Tin Street had been abandoned to make way for a public housing development. Local aspiration for a proper recreational venue had never been realized;
- (d) she queried why the three temples adjacent to the Item A sites could be retained while the Village had to be cleared, and whether religious justification was a relevant consideration for preserving the temples;
- (e) smoke and noise from the three temples would cause adverse impact on the future residents of the proposed public housing development;

- (f) traffic capacity of the area, in particular the road network between the Village and Tai Wo Hau, had already been overstrained. There was always traffic congestion associated with car accidents, resulting in chaos and causing inconvenience to local residents. A holistic approach should be adopted in land use planning to take into account infrastructural capacity and the number of population;
- (g) rehousing arrangement was of great concern. While the Government had put efforts to resolve the issue of sub-divided units, the 60 households affected would possibly move into sub-divided units as a result of displacement; and
- (h) the villagers were not consulted during the planning process. Relevant information was mainly collected by young villagers for dissemination and translation.

53. Ms Yip Kiu, R728/C1806, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a fourth-generation villager, and a younger sister of Ms Yip Man (R243/C7). She was grateful for experiencing a memorable childhood in the Village. As a sports player, she was concerned about the provision of GIC facilities in the district;
- (b) there were shortfalls in the provision of GIC facilities such as sports grounds, swimming pools and multi-purpose rooms for dancing in the district. Most of the recreational venues were booked by six secondary schools and eight primary schools in Kwai Chung. Only late-hour sessions would be available for booking and there were always long waiting queues during weekends. Although there was a training pool in North Kwai Chung Tang Shiu Kin Sports Centre, it was substandard. She questioned how the existing provision of GIC facilities could promote sports development and nurture talented athletes in the long term;



- (c) the natural setting in the Village was the best way for individuals to pursue physical and mental wellness, which was also a precious asset for promoting tourism development. Demolition of the Village would cause irreversible damage to the natural environment and its function as a recreational outlet for local residents. The Government should identify alternative sites for public housing development; and
- (d) there were a number of variables which would affect demographic projection in the coming ten years (e.g. low birth rate and emigration). The demand for public housing could not be ascertained at the current juncture.

54. Ms Yip Ching, R120/C203, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a fourth-generation villager;
- (b) she enjoyed her childhood in the Village because of the natural setting with various kinds of flora and fauna. She often played with her close friends who lived in Shek Lei (II) Estate and swam in the streams. The opportunities for general public and pets to enjoy the spacious recreational outlet would be lost upon implementation of the proposed public housing development. She had developed connection with the nature and lived harmoniously with wildlife and other villagers. At present, she was still impressed with the strong bonding among the villagers, such as exchange of fruits;
- (c) the proposed public housing development near Kam Shan Country Park would affect a number of natural habitats which were important for supporting diversified biomass, and would put some wildlife at risk (e.g. monkeys and boars);
- (d) there was frequent burst of underground water mains. Although the damaged water mains had been repaired, there was no holistic planning on replacement of all aged water mains in the area;

- (e) the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site and the Shek Li Street redevelopment would bring a total of 20,000 population. The existing traffic problem would be worsened by the additional population; and
- (f) the housing demand might be overestimated as there was a trend of slower population growth and emigration. As an alternative to rezoning the “GB” area, other vacant land should be utilized efficiently for public housing development.

55. Mr Yip Mau Wah Dino, R513/C930, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) he was a third-generation villager and had been living in the Village for 53 years;
- (b) the function of “GB” zone as a buffer between the developed areas and the rural area should be preserved. The green environment was a breathing space which was essential to the well-being of individuals;
- (c) the road capacity of Castle Peak Road-Kwai Chung and Shek Pai Street would be saturated and there was difficulty in widening the existing roads. With additional population in the area, there would be more frequent traffic congestion and water mains burst cases due to additional traffic generated by heavy goods vehicles during the construction stage and resultant land subsidence;
- (d) to address housing and development needs, it was considered acceptable to utilize land resources, provided that a comprehensive planning approach would be adopted. Instead of emphasizing on the number of flats to be provided, the Government should accord priority to achieving better planning. It was doubted whether the proposed mitigation measures would be implemented to address traffic/infrastructural concerns; and
- (e) the criteria adopted in delineating the site boundary for the proposed development were questionable. Interface issue was anticipated as the three

temples, with a buffer distance of only about 50m to 100m from the Item A1 site, would generate environmental nuisances to future residents of the proposed public housing development.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during Mr Yip Mau Wah Dino (R513/C930)'s presentation.]

56. Ms Wong Siu Ping, R587/C931 and representative of R138/C366 and R300, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in the Village for 32 years. The three other representers (i.e. Ms Yip Man (R243/C7), Ms Yip Kiu (R728/C1806) and Ms Yip Ching (R120/C203)) were her daughters;
- (b) her family was involved in cultivation of vegetables in the Village for more than 30 years and she also assisted her mother-in-law in selling vegetables in the market;
- (c) she enjoyed her life in the natural setting such as swimming and catching fish in the streams. She treasured the symbiotic relationship with the nature;
- (d) she had established social network with other villagers in the past few decades. Similar to other elderly villagers, she opted for 'ageing-in-place' in a familiar living environment. She expressed concerns on difficulties in adapting to a new living environment in other districts;
- (e) the majority of the villagers were elderly who did not understand town planning matters. They were only informed of the land clearance when LandsD's staff conducted the freezing survey in November 2022, which aroused grave concerns among the villagers. Whilst the Item A1 site was needed to meet the shortfall in housing land supply, there was a lack of public consultation to engage the villagers in the planning process. LandsD only posted clearance notices indicating the timetable for clearance (i.e. August

2025). The Government should conduct site visits and initiate a dialogue with the villagers to ensure that their views would be duly considered;

- (f) other elderly villagers, who could not attend today's meeting, reiterated their aspirations for local rehousing and adequate compensation if the Village was cleared to facilitate the proposed public housing development;
- (g) she expressed concerns on inadequate public transport services and open space in the area; and
- (h) the Village should be retained and the living environment in public housing estate was not comparable to the green setting in the Village.

57. Ms Li Liling, R696/C45, SLCCG, made the following main points:

- (a) while having no objection to clear the Village for making land readily available for the proposed public housing development, she expressed concerns on rehousing arrangements and the loss of an enjoyable and peaceful environment;
- (b) her children valued the chance to interact with nature in the Village. There were also other benefits to them, including mental relief and daily interaction;
- (c) there was a range of issues associated with clearance of the Village, for instance, difficulties in transferring her children to new schools and rental burden;
- (d) there was a lack of public consultation for the proposed public housing development. She learnt about the land clearance (i.e. clearance in 2025 the earliest and not later than 2029) only from other villagers; and
- (e) in view of the existing transport issue (i.e. long waiting time for public transport), some vacant sites such as factory buildings and markets in the area should be considered for the proposed public housing development.

58. Ms Chow Oi Chuen, R97/C8, SLCCG, played an audio recording of a villager (Ms Cheng Kwok Fan (R78/C19, SLCCG)) who was unable to make her representation in person, which covered the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in the Village for more than 30 years and was a third-generation villager;
- (b) her family had settled in the Village for a long time. The community network would disintegrate if the Village was cleared; and
- (c) while the Government strived to resolve the issue of sub-divided units, the affected villagers should be rehoused in the same district to maintain the family bonding. It would also facilitate family members to take good care of the elderly and avoid interruption to children's studies.

59. Ms Chow Oi Chuen, R97/C8, SLCCG, went on to play a video clip named 'the Urban Oasis under Kam Shan Country Park narrated by Ms Chow Oi Chuen' showing the history and living environment of the Village, which covered the following main points:

- (a) a brief account of the history of the Village with the largest number of population reaching to about 200 households (about 2,000 villagers) in the 1970s;
- (b) she had a memorable childhood. Her grandfather was the village representative in the 1970s, who liaised with the relevant government departments for provision of water pumping facility and access road;
- (c) the Village was a buffer area to Kam Shan Country Park where a number of natural features such as old White Jade Orchid Tree was found and an architecturally-aesthetic overhanging drain pipe was located. The Village provided open space for public enjoyment and interaction. Its function was similar to an oasis to help relieve the stress of visitors and the villagers, and was accessible within a few minutes from the densely-populated urban areas.

Some villagers who had moved out to public housing estates also participated in the community farm programme for reminiscing the rural lifestyle in their childhood;

- (d) the proposed public housing development would affect the buffering function of the “GB” zone and the natural habitat of wildlife. The ecological impact was underestimated since there was missing data in winter season in the EcoIA;
- (e) there were concerns on lack of public engagement, air ventilation and visual impacts arising from the high-density development and inadequate public transport services in the area; and
- (f) the Government should explore alternative sites for housing development. The villagers should be rehoused in the same district if the Government decided to implement the development proposal.

60. Ms Chow Oi Chuen, R97/C8, SLCCG, continued to make the following main points in respect of the impacts of rezoning the “GB” area on the overall planning of the Shek Lei Community:

- (a) there was a lack of comprehensive planning. Residential development proposals in the area were put forward by the Government in a piecemeal manner. The Shek Li Street redevelopment for two 43-storey residential blocks with 1,700 public housing units would bring 5,100 population. The proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site with five residential blocks would bring 15,000 population. The two development proposals would lead to an increase of about 20,000 population in the area, and the additional population would put extra burden on the already overloaded infrastructural capacity;
- (b) according to the 2021 Population Census, the current population of Kwai Tsing District was about 100,000, in which the population in Shek Lei (I) Estate, Shek Lei (II) Estate, On Yam Estate, Shek Yam Estate, Shek Yam

East Estate and Ning Fung Court was about 70,000. The total population of Kwai Tsing District would increase to about 120,000 with the additional 20,000 population. It was queried whether the infrastructural capacity and GIC facilities in the area could cater for the needs of the huge population;

- (c) there were inadequate open space and GIC facilities in the area. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the table on the provision of major community facilities and open space in Kwai Chung OZP at Annex VII of the Paper, 1 m<sup>2</sup> for district open space (DOS) should be provided for every person, and one sports centre should be provided for every 50,000 to 65,000 persons. However, there would be a deficit of 2.37 ha for DOS and a shortfall of one sports centre in the area, and the additional 20,000 population would further exacerbate the inadequacy. Currently, there was only one larger open space, i.e. Shek Yam Lei Muk Road Park, in the area. Others were pocket-sized sitting-out areas at roadsides with inadequate facilities and in undesirable setting. Besides, there was only one sports centre, i.e. North Kwai Chung Tang Shiu Kin Sports Centre, and two swimming pools in the area. The shortfall of one sports centre was due to public housing development at the Kwai Chung Area 9H site which was originally planned for a sports centre;
- (d) the loss of the “GB” area would further exacerbate the problem of insufficient open space in the area. The Village and the “GB” area currently served as the natural open space for local residents. Based on her on-site observation, local residents went for a stroll, walked the dogs and did exercises/outdoor activities in the “GB” area. It was also a popular resting place for hikers who travelled to Kam Shan Country Park. The “GB” area was a breathing space for the local residents amid the crowded urban area;
- (e) on traffic and transport aspects, the existing traffic capacity in the area had already been overloaded. Traffic congestion was very serious in peak hours and residents needed to spend much time on commuting. There were insufficient public transport services, and long queues waiting for buses/minibuses were often observed. Additional 20,000 population would

overstrain the existing transport infrastructure and public transport services. The traffic condition was further worsened when underground water mains burst;

- (f) the burst of underground water mains occurred frequently in Kwai Tsing District, causing road subsidence and affecting road traffic and daily lives of the residents. For example, on the day before the meeting, an underground water main near North Kwai Chung Clinic burst, leading to suspension of flush/fresh water supply for North Kwai Chung Clinic, On Yam Estate and Lai Shek Block of Shek Yam Estate where RCHEs were located. Healthcare/elderly services of the clinic and RCHEs were seriously affected;
- (g) on air ventilation aspect, it was noted that the Shek Li Street redevelopment site had not been taken into account in the AVA report. The proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site would block the wind from Kam Shan Country Park, leading to a rise in temperature in the inland area, particularly Shek Lei (II) Estate, and affecting the health of the residents;
- (h) on ecological aspect, the ecological survey conducted by the Government only covered the summer season and did not cover the winter season. The Government under-estimated the ecological value of the “GB” area. According to the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society’s survey, there were at least 77 kinds of birds in the area including Fujian Niltava (棕腹大仙鷓) which was under Class II Protection Status in China. The Global Change and Tropical Conservation Lab of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) had discovered more than 600 overwintering danaid butterflies in November/December 2022. The proposed public housing development would affect the migration of birds and butterflies and their natural habitats. The proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site would cause adverse ecological impact;
- (i) according to the vacant school sites reviewed under the Central Clearing House Mechanism by PlanD, there were 10 vacant school sites in Kwai Tsing District, seven of which were planned/had been redeveloped for residential



use. It was contradictory to rezoning vacant school sites for residential use while rezoning the “GB” area for a new primary school. Although PlanD responded that the proposed primary school at the Item A2 site was to meet the demand arising from the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site, it was queried whether a primary school was required when population intake of the proposed public housing development would only be in 2034/35, and there would be changing circumstances such as the number of school-aged children in the coming ten years;

- (j) learning from the undesirable precedent of rehousing the affected residents of the Shek Li Street redevelopment far away to Po Tin Interim Housing in Tuen Mun, the villagers were worried about their rehousing arrangement;
- (k) the “GB” area should be preserved and alternative uses could be explored. The “GB” area could be used as community farms for local residents to experience leisure farming which was very popular nowadays. Besides, SLCCG had organised a number of guided tours and more than 220 people joined the guided tours as at July 2023. Views collected from the participants of the guided tours reflected that they loved the “GB” area because it was a breathing space amid the hustle and bustle, and the “GB” area should not be destroyed for housing development. According to a report named ‘Backyard Trails Pilot Project’ published by Parks and Trails Limited, “GB” areas were located mainly in the backyard of our residences and they had become the recreational area of the local residents/villagers. These “GB” areas were not properly managed by the Government. The concept of 「認養後山」 should be explored. It meant that villagers/residents who loved/were familiar with the “GB” areas could be responsible for the design, management and maintenance of the “GB” areas, creating a sense of place and a harmonious recreational area for them to enjoy;
- (l) the Government claimed that rezoning the “GB” area was necessary with a view to increasing land supply to meet the housing needs. However, according to the progress report of Long Term Housing Strategy announced in 2022, the Government had identified sufficient land for providing about

360,000 public housing units in the coming 10-year period which could meet the estimated public housing demand. The provision of 30,000 light public housing units had even not been counted in the estimated figure of 360,000 public housing units. It was queried why the “GB” area would still need to be rezoned for housing development. It was also questionable whether it was worth destroying the “GB” area in lieu of a public housing development with about 60% of its site area being used for retaining wall structures; and

- (m) the affected villagers were not properly informed of the housing proposal and the related matters. No briefing had been conducted by the Government to explain to the affected villagers about the zoning amendment, squatter clearance and rehousing issues. The affected villagers were only notified in November 2022 when LandsD’s staff conducted freezing survey and posted a clearance notice on their doors, and the unfriendly attitude of LandsD’s staff also frightened the villagers. Besides, it was very difficult for the not so well-educated villagers to participate in the town planning procedures because all the documents were very technical and in English which were not easy to comprehend. Hence, it was hoped that the Government could send representatives to the Village to brief the affected villagers about the housing development in order to ease the villagers’ worries.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong and Dr C.H. Hau left the meeting during Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8)’s presentation.]

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

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

Items A1 to A3 – Proposed Public Housing Development at Shek Pai Street and Ancillary GIC Developments

*Traffic and Pedestrian Connectivity Aspects*

62. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the traffic capacity in the area could accommodate the additional 20,000 population arising from the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site and the Shek Li Street redevelopment, and whether the Kwai Chung Circumferential Road (KCCR) would be constructed; and
- (b) whether the future population of the proposed public housing development would need to rely on public transport services for access to MTR station or other areas; and details of the existing and planned pedestrian connections between the uphill and downhill areas.

63. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr K.W. Lee, CE/SD (Works), CEDD, said that a PTTIA was conducted. 12 key road junctions which might be affected by the proposed developments were assessed in the PTTIA. Road improvement measures at four major road junctions were proposed, including (i) at the junction of Lei Muk Road/Wo Yi Hop Road (J2), an additional traffic lane would be constructed for the left-turn traffic movement at the eastbound section of Wo Yi Hop Road; (ii) at the junction of Shek Pai Street/On Chit Lane/Tai Pak Tin Street/Shek Li Street (J5), the Method-of-Control of the signal junction would be re-arranged; (iii) at the junction of Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street (J8), an additional traffic lane at the westbound section of Shek Pai Street and the southbound section of Wai Kek Street would be provided and the Method-of-Control of the signal junction would be modified; and (iv) at the junction of Castle Peak Road – Kwai Chung/Shek Pai Street (J9), the carriageway of the southbound section of Shek Pai Street would be widened. According to the PTTIA, with the implementation of the above-mentioned road improvement works, the traffic condition of the area would be at an acceptable level. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, supplemented that there was no implementation programme for KCCR. It was anticipated that, with the implementation of the above-mentioned road improvement works, there would be no insurmountable traffic problem arising from the proposed developments up to 2037 (i.e.

3 years after the anticipated completion year of the proposed public housing development), and KCCR was considered not necessary before 2037.

64. With regard to the provision of public transport services and pedestrian connections, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that the Item A1 site was located at an uphill area and about 1 km from MTR Kwai Hing Station. It took at least 20 minutes walking from/to MTR Kwai Hing Station through the public footpaths and footbridges, as well as the pedestrian accesses within the public housing estates above Wo Yi Hop Road. Hence, it was anticipated that future population of the public housing development would mainly rely on feeder services such as buses/minibuses to get to MTR station or other areas. A public transport interchange (PTI) with bus bays and minibus bays would be provided in the public housing development to cater for the future additional demand for public transport. The proposed public transport services in the area would be reviewed holistically by TD at around two years before population intake of the proposed public housing development to suit local demand. Besides, most of the public housing estates and their retail and GIC facilities in the area were currently linked up with covered walkways on the podium levels, and an elevated walkway between the Item A1 site and the Shek Li Street redevelopment site was proposed to enhance pedestrian connectivity in the area.

65. A Member asked the representers/commenters/their representatives whether their concerns had been addressed and their worries relieved after listening to the explanations of PlanD and CEDD on the proposed road improvement measures and pedestrian connections and if not, what their concerns/doubts were.

66. Mr Lau Ka Yeung (R716/C1778), Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8), Ms Yip Man (R243/C7), Mr Chang Ka Lun (R831/C1785) and Mr Chan Long Fung (R340/C142) made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed road improvement measures mainly involved adding/lengthening the 'pocket areas' (i.e. the areas for vehicles waiting for the change of traffic signals) at some road junctions, and they could not genuinely solve the traffic problems in the area. For example, there was currently a long traffic queue at the eastbound of Shek Pai Street. During peak hours, about 80% of the traffic was at the eastbound section of Shek Pai

Street heading to the uphill area while only about 20% of the traffic was at the westbound section of Shek Pai Street heading to the downhill area. The proposed junction improvement work at Shek Pai Street might marginally relieve the undesirable traffic condition at the westbound section of Shek Pai Street;

- (b) there were inherent problems with the road network design in Kwai Chung. The roads were narrow and there was no room for road widening. Many roads were single-lane or dual two-lane, and buses needed to detour within the district. For example, the bus journey from the uphill area to MTR Kwai Fong Station took at least 30 minutes;
- (c) the capacity of bus termini such as Shek Lei (Lei Pui Street) Bus Terminus was saturated and could not accommodate more buses;
- (d) there was no comprehensive transport planning. Without strategic infrastructure such as KCCR and/or new railway station at Northeast Kwai Chung, the proposed road improvement measures of localised road widening and traffic signal modification might only solve some of the existing traffic congestion problems, and could not address the potential traffic problems generated by the additional 20,000 population;
- (e) the Government wrongly interpreted the periods of peak hours in Northeast Kwai Chung. Peak hours in Northeast Kwai Chung span a longer time from 5/6 p.m. to 8/9 p.m. Traffic congestion was often observed at 8/9 p.m.;
- (f) there was a considerable number of elderly living in Northeast Kwai Chung. Elderly residents seldom used the footbridges as they were physically weak to walk up and down, and they relied much on public transport services for their daily travel. However, the public transport services in the area were inadequate to support the travel demand;
- (g) with regard to pedestrian connections, although there were currently two lifts linking Shek Foon House with On Yam Estate, they were always fully loaded

and residents needed to wait several rounds to get into the lifts. Besides, there was currently no pedestrian connection between On Yam Estate, Shek Yam Estate and Shek Lei Estate. In addition, although a footbridge was constructed between Shek Lei (I) Estate and the industrial area at Tai Lin Pai Road to facilitate pedestrian movement from Shek Lei (I) Estate to MTR Kwai Hing Station via the industrial area, narrow pavements and heavy vehicular traffic in the industrial area made the pedestrian environment unpleasant; and

- (h) a simulation model, similar to the one adopted in the AVA report, should be prepared to demonstrate the potential traffic impact generated by the proposed public housing development.

67. In response to the concerns on the traffic condition in Northeast Kwai Chung, Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories West, Transport Department (CTE/NTW, TD), at the request of the Chairperson, made the following main points:

- (a) as for the assumptions adopted in the PTTIA, there were queries/concerns on the validity of adopting the 2017-surveyed traffic data in the PTTIA. TD had no objection to the assumptions adopted in the PTTIA in which CEDD's consultants had taken into account the 2017-surveyed traffic data, and reasonable adjustment factors had been applied to calibrate the travel demand to reflect a more realistic picture on travel pattern. Besides, the PTTIA had adopted 2037 (i.e. 3 years after the anticipated completion year of the proposed public housing development) as the design year for assessment, and the traffic flow generated by the planned/committed developments in the area before 2037 (including the Shek Li Street redevelopment) had been taken into account in the PTTIA. With the above-mentioned road improvement measures, TD had no objection in principle to the PTTIA. Furthermore, as revealed in the PTTIA, the current performance of some road junctions was undesirable, e.g. the reserve capacity of Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street (J8) was less than 10%. However, with the proposed road improvement measures, the junction performance at Shek Pai Street/Wai Kek Street would be improved. Since some of the proposed road improvement works would

be carried out earlier in conjunction with the Shek Li Street redevelopment, it was anticipated that the traffic condition in the area would soon be improved. In addition, when CEDD's consultants conducted a detailed traffic and transport assessment impact at the investigation and detailed design stages, up-to-date traffic data would be adopted and the periods of peak hours would be revisited;

- (b) as regards KCCR, according to the PTTIA, with the implementation of the above-mentioned road improvement measures, it was anticipated that there would be no insurmountable traffic problem arising from the proposed developments, and KCCR was considered not necessary before 2037;
- (c) representers'/commenters'/their representatives' concerns on public transport services, such as frequency of bus services and difficulties for bus manoeuvring at some road sections, would be conveyed to her colleagues of the public transport section of TD for necessary follow-up actions; and
- (d) in respect of railway development, the Transport and Logistics Bureau (TLB) together with the Highways Department (HyD) and TD launched the public consultation exercise for the preliminary findings of the Strategic Studies on Railways and Major Roads beyond 2030 (the Studies) in December 2022. The public consultation period ended on 31.3.2023. The Studies recommended three major railway proposals and three major road proposals including the Central Rail Link (CRL). As indicated in the Studies, the preliminary alignment of CRL would stretch from Kam Tin in Yuen Long, passing through Northeast Tsuen Wan/Northeast Kwai Chung, and link to the existing Kowloon Tong Station. Full consideration would be given to the public views received during the public consultation, and the Government would soon formulate Hong Kong's Future Major Transport Infrastructure Development Blueprint.

### *Ecological Aspect*

68. The Vice-chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) why the ecological survey under the EFS only covered the wet/summer season and did not cover the dry/winter season;
- (b) noting that no ecological survey was conducted in the dry/winter season, it was questionable how the streams identified in the study area could be categorised as 'perennial' and 'ephemeral';
- (c) whether the proposed developments would affect the habitat of overwintering danaid butterflies;
- (d) noting that stream enhancement measures were proposed to compensate the loss of stream habitat, it was queried how the stream habitat could be enhanced as some sections of the streams had already been destroyed; what the purposes of stream enhancement measures were; and whether there was any calculation on the stream/habitat capacity that could be increased through the implementation of the stream enhancement measures;
- (e) noting that woodland compensation sites were proposed to compensate the loss of woodland yet those proposed sites were already well-wooded, how effectiveness the proposed woodland compensation sites would be; and
- (f) viewing from the aerial photo, as no grassland was observed in the study area in the EcoIA under the EFS, why some parts of the study area were classified as 'Shrubland-Grassland Mosaic'.

69. In response, Mr Eric Y.H. Wong, SNCO, AFCD, said that the baseline ecological profile of the study area had been collated from literature review and findings of the ecological survey. With respect to the habitat types within the study area and seasonality pattern of the target taxa groups, a 6-month ecological survey during the wet season, when the target taxa groups were more active, was considered appropriate. Generally speaking, when there were existing records that a concerned study area was an important breeding or roosting site of particular faunal species of conservation interest during the dry season, the consultants would be requested to conduct the ecological survey during the dry season. However, there was no



such record in the study area, and hence a 6-month ecological survey during the wet season was considered appropriate.

70. Ms Yang Yao, the Consultant, made the following main points:

- (a) as regards the categorisation of ‘perennial’ and ‘ephemeral’ streams, according to the 6-month ecological survey, there was no obvious water flow in the upper/middle course of four streams in the study area in September/October. However, water flow was observed in the streams at the early stage of the study. Hence, the four streams were categorised as ‘ephemeral’ streams;
- (b) concerning the overwintering danaid butterflies, HKU’s survey was conducted in November/December 2022 and it was the first time that such overwintering ground for butterflies had been recorded in the area. Although overwintering danaid butterflies were not recorded in the ecological survey under the EFS, it was noted that the overwintering danaid butterflies spotted by HKU was in Kam Shan Country Park which was distant from the Item A sites, and adverse impact on the habitat of the overwintering danaid butterflies was not anticipated;
- (c) with regard to stream enhancement measures, according to the Technical Memorandum on Environmental Impact Assessment Process, habitat loss could be compensated through habitat creation or habitat enhancement. Stream enhancement measures were proposed for one section of the perennial stream and two sections of two ephemeral streams. These sections of the streams were selected for enhancement because the riparian zones had been disturbed/cleared for cultivation purposes such as orchard and dominant floral species were lychee trees, jackfruit trees and banana trees, and faunal species of conservation interest such as freshwater crabs and the Lesser Spiny Frog (小棘蛙) were found in the streams. The purposes of stream enhancement measures were (i) to improve the physical conditions of the streams, including clearance of the refuse dumped within or alongside the streams, removal of any undesired fabricated structures/concrete slab, and vegetation that

obstructed the water flow of the streams; (ii) to modify the streams to increase the diversity of micro-habitats and hence the ecological niche available to aquatic fauna; and (iii) to restore the habitat of the riparian zones. Although there was no universally-agreed methodology on calculation of habitat/stream capacity, a Stream Habitat Enhancement Plan including ecological monitoring would be prepared and submitted to AFCD at the detailed design stage. If necessary, an ecological monitoring programme could be proposed in the Stream Habitat Enhancement Plan to assess whether the biodiversity of the streams of concern would be increased through the stream enhancement measures;

- (d) as for the proposed woodland compensation sites, three potential sites for afforestation and three potential sites for plantation enrichment planting were recommended in the EcoIA. These potential sites were currently mainly cultivation fields/orchards or covered by a mix of fruit trees, crops and weedy plants and the structural complexity of the habitat was relatively low. The proposed afforestation and plantation enrichment planting would increase floral diversity by planting a mix of native trees, shrubs and herbaceous ground cover as well as climbing plants (wherever practicable) to increase the future woodland's structural complexity and also make reference to similar planting scheme implemented by AFCD in the nearby country park to increase the ecological value of the woodland in the area holistically. A Woodland Compensatory Planting and Enrichment Planting Plan would be prepared and submitted to AFCD at the detailed design stage; and
- (e) regarding the classification of 'Shrubland-Grassland Mosaic', habitat survey by means of aerial photograph interpretation and ground truthing on foot had been conducted to delineate and describe the distribution of ecological habitats within the study area. During the ground truthing, apart from shrubs such as *Melastoma candidum* (野牡丹) and *Rhodomyrtus tomentosa* (山捻), some typical plants growing on hillside grassland such as *Dicranopteris pedata* (芒萁) was also found in a high abundance, and hence those areas were classified as 'Shrubland-Grassland Mosaic'.

71. A Member asked Mr Nip Hin Ming, representative of Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (R12) whether his concerns had been addressed after listening to the explanation of CEDD's consultant on the proposed stream enhancement and if not, what his concerns/doubts were.

72. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he had past experience on providing comments on various government projects on river enhancement and had conducted various researches on stream habitat and fish;
- (b) although the Government proposed to enhance one section of the upper course of the affected perennial stream as well as two sections of two ephemeral streams with a total length of 288m, only a section (88m) of the 140m-long perennial stream would be enhanced. It would lead to a permanent loss of the perennial stream where was the habitat/breeding ground of various kinds of fish, dragonflies and tadpole;
- (c) the effectiveness of enhancing the ephemeral streams was questionable because ephemeral streams with no water flow could not be the habitat/breeding ground of aquatic fauna;
- (d) only stream enhancement measures were proposed, no stream compensation/preservation would be provided;
- (e) if the lower course of the streams were heavily polluted as indicated in the EcoIA, it was queried why fish such as Parazacco spiluru (異鱧) which was susceptible to polluted water could be found in the streams; and
- (f) it was queried why the ecological value of the perennial stream was considered to be low to moderate in the EcoIA. The ecological value of the perennial stream should at least be moderate.

*Air Ventilation*

73. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) the source of the relevant wind rose for the assessment area adopted in the AVA report;
- (b) as shown on the diagrams on the average velocity ratio under annual and summer prevailing wind conditions for existing condition (i.e. without the proposed developments) and optimal scheme (i.e. with the proposed developments) on the PowerPoint slides (the Diagrams), why there were significant changes in wind environment for those distant areas such as the areas located to the further northeast of the Item A sites (at the upper right-hand corner of the Diagrams) under existing condition and optimal scheme; and
- (c) noting that there were more blue areas (i.e. the areas with weaker wind performance) under the optimal scheme than the existing condition as shown on the Diagrams, the reason why the AVA report concluded that the ventilation impact of the proposed developments on the surrounding areas would not be significant.

74. In response, with the aid of a visualizer and some PowerPoint slides, Mr Henry Chung, the Consultant, made the following main points:

- (a) the relevant wind rose was obtained from Site Wind Availability Data at PlanD's website database. The Item A sites were located exactly within 'Grid X74; Y53' on the grid plan of Site Wind Availability Data;
- (b) as regards the wind performance in the further northeast areas under the existing condition and optimal scheme, under annual wind conditions, the dominant prevailing winds came from the east, northeast and southeast directions from Kam Shan Country Park. The Item A sites were in elongated configuration and the proposed building blocks thereat were

perpendicular to the easterly wind. Accordingly, the proposed building blocks would divert part of the easterly incoming winds to the further northeast areas. Hence, there was stronger wind performance in the further northeast areas under the optimal scheme. Under summer wind conditions, the dominant prevailing winds came from the south-southwest and southwest directions. The Item A sites were at downwind location and the proposed building blocks thereat would block some south-westerly winds. Hence, there was weaker wind performance in the further northeast areas under the optimal scheme; and

- (c) regarding the air ventilation impact of the proposed developments on the surrounding areas, under annual wind conditions, deterioration on the overall ventilation performance was anticipated since the proposed developments were located at the upwind location for the majority of annual prevailing winds, including those from the east and east-northeast directions. Although the proposed developments would inevitably affect the overall ventilation performance of some frequently accessed pedestrian areas at the downstream area, the wind environment in some areas remained unchanged or even improved (e.g. On Yam Estate) by employing a series of wind enhancement features in the notional layout. Under summer wind conditions, the overall ventilation performance of the proposed developments were relatively more similar to the existing condition since the dominant prevailing winds came from the south-southwest and southwest directions and the ventilation impact of the proposed developments on the surrounding areas would be relatively insignificant in summer in general. In addition, a series of wind enhancement features had been adopted in the optimal scheme including 15m-wide building separations and a 20m-wide separation between the proposed GIC block and Block 1.

75. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, supplemented that a quantitative AVA would be carried out by HD at the detailed design stage. Design measures identified in the AVA would also be incorporated in the planning brief for implementation.

*Layout Design and Site Formation Works*

76. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether stream preservation had been taken into account in devising the scheme; and if the streams would need to be preserved within the proposed public housing site, what the implications would be;
- (b) the rationale for providing a considerable size of podium structure for accommodating car parking spaces and placing a GIC block in the northern part of the proposed public housing site;
- (c) whether there was possibility of refining the layout design, such as adjusting the configuration of Block 1, reducing the bulk/height of the podium structure and preserving the streams/natural habitats within the proposed public housing site, with a view to enhancing air ventilation, achieving better site utilisation and striking a balance between development and conservation;
- (d) whether there was possibility of minimising the extent of site formation and retaining wall structures/the soil-nailed areas;
- (e) whether there was a need to widen Shek Pai Street and the rationale for constructing a new public road which was long and extensive; and
- (f) whether there was any collaboration between HD and CEDD in working out layout design and site formation plan; and whether design requirements would be incorporated in the planning brief.

77. With regard to the layout design, Miss Carol F. Ty, SA and Mr Alvin L.C. Chan, SPO, HD, made the following main points:

- (a) the layout presented at the meeting was a notional scheme. The layout design would be refined and enhanced at the detailed design stage;

- (b) having considered the constraints of narrow and elongated site configuration, existing sloping terrain and the need of providing appropriate number of units to meet the housing need, the streams traversing the Item A1 site would unavoidably be affected. Due regard would be given to incorporating the design element of stream/river channel in the layout/landscaping at the detailed design stage. However, if the streams needed to be preserved, it was preliminarily estimated that one residential block would need to be forfeited;
- (c) the sloping terrain with significant level difference between Shek Pai Street and the new public road had already been adapted for the design of podium structure. The podium structure to be built along the hillside would minimise air ventilation impact. In respect of the car parking provision, high-end car parking provision under HKPSG was assumed in the PPTIA for the proposed public housing development in order to provide more car parking spaces, and hence a considerable size of podium structure for accommodating car parking facilities was proposed in the notional layout. Nevertheless, consideration would be given to lowering/minimising the podium structure at the detailed design stage;
- (d) regarding the proposed GIC block, under the latest policy initiative, gross floor area (GFA) equivalent to 5% of domestic GFA of new public housing projects would be set aside for the provision of social welfare facilities, and hence a GIC block of considerable GFA for social welfare facilities was proposed in the notional layout. Nevertheless, consideration would be given to incorporating welfare facilities in the non-domestic podium of the residential blocks in order to achieve better site utilisation; and
- (e) refinement to the configuration of residential blocks such as Block 1 and podium structure, provision of more than 15m-wide building separations and adoption of more permeable design in the podium structure would be considered at the detailed design stage to enhance air ventilation.

78. As regards the extent of site formation, retaining wall structures and soil-nailed areas, with the aid of a visualizer, Mr K.W. Lee, CE/SD (Works), CEDD, said that, the majority of the site area to be formed would be used for public housing development and the construction of a new public road. Considering the constraints of the sloping terrain at the hillside and significant level difference between the Item A sites and the immediate downhill area, retaining wall structures and a soil-nailed area would be provided along the proposed public road, and some strips of man-made slopes would be provided at the western boundary of or within the public housing site. Mr Alvin L.C. Chan, SPO, HD, supplemented that the retaining wall structures would fall outside the public housing site in order to avoid passing the responsibility and cost of managing and maintaining the retaining walls to the future residents of the proposed public housing development.

79. Concerning the need for widening Shek Pai Street and constructing a new public road, Mr K.W. Lee, CE/SD (Works), CEDD, said that according to the PTTIA, the traffic flow generated by the proposed public housing development on Shek Pai Street was not significant, and hence it was considered not necessary to widen Shek Pai Street. In the initial scheme formulation stage, it was considered more sustainable to form the public housing site along the hillside rather than adopting substantial cut and fill works which would generate a lot of debris and soil waste. Besides, as there was a significant level difference between the downhill area and the uphill area, a new public road branching off from On Chuk Street at 76mPD, routing along the hillside, and reaching the uphill area at 106mPD, would need to be constructed. The new public road would serve both the public housing development and the proposed primary school.

80. Miss Carol F. Ty, SA, HD, said that HD and CEDD had been working collaboratively and interactively in preparing/reviewing the layout design and site formation plan to optimise site utilisation. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, supplemented that a planning brief setting out the planning parameters and design requirements would be prepared to guide the public housing development.

#### *Hiking Trails to Kam Shan Country Park*

81. Two Members enquired whether the existing accesses to the hiking trails in Kam Shan Country Park would be affected, and details of the access arrangement during the



construction period. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that among the four existing walking trails in the area connecting to Kam Shan Country Park, a short section each of the two within the Item A1 site would be affected. Trail users might gain access to the upper unaffected sections through the pavement of the new public road along the eastern boundary of the proposed public housing development or via the new pedestrian facilities such as lifts and passageways within the proposed public housing development for access from Shek Pai Street. Temporary access would be provided during the construction period. Improvements to the entrance of the walking trails leading to Kam Shan Country Park would also be carried out with suitable signage provided.

*Provision of Open Spaces and GIC Facilities*

82. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting from the table on provision of major community facilities and open space in Kwai Chung OZP at Annex VII of the Paper, there would be a shortfall of 2.37 ha for DOS while a surplus of 37.81 ha for local open space (LOS), and a shortfall of one sports centre while a surplus of one sports ground, whether there was detailed information on the provision of such open space and facilities in the area; and whether Kam Shan Country Park had been taken into account in the provision of DOS; and
- (b) noting from the presentations of the representers/commenters/their representatives that there was a fee-charging recreational facility in one of the public housing estates, where the said recreational facility was and why the use of the recreational facility needed to be charged.

83. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) DOS referred to open space of usually more than 1 ha to serve the district while LOS referred to smaller open space to serve local residents. There were two major DOS in the Shek Lei area, i.e. Shek Yam Lei Muk Road Park and Shek Pei Street Park. In view of the characteristics of the district with many public housing estates, in which at least 1 m<sup>2</sup> of LOS for every person

would be provided in the public housing estates according to the requirements of the HKPSG, there would be a surplus of 37.81 ha of LOS. Hence, the overall provision was considered not unacceptable despite the deficit of 2.37 ha of DOS. Kam Shan Country Park was a country park and not counted in the DOS provision; and

- (b) a sports centre referred to an indoor recreation hall providing sports facilities such as basketball courts and badminton courts, while a sports ground contained facilities for athletic track and field events in an in-field grassed area. There were four sports centres in areas covered by the Kwai Chung OZP, with one in Northeast Kwai Chung, i.e. North Kwai Chung Tang Shiu Kin Sports Centre, and the other three in other parts of the district. There were two sports grounds in areas covered by the Kwai Chung OZP including Kwai Chung Sports Ground next to MTR Kwai Fong Station and Wo Yip Hop Road Sports Ground in Northeast Kwai Chung. Although the running track in Wo Yip Hop Road Sports Ground was sub-standard with only 300m-long tracks, the utilization rate of Wo Yip Hop Road Sports Ground was quite high. The above-mentioned sports centres and sports grounds were operated and managed by LCSD.

84. Mr Alvin L.C. Chan, SPO, HD, said that the said fee-charging recreational facility referred to the indoor recreation centre on the ground floor of Shek Foon House (i.e. the Kwai Chung Area 9H site) constructed and managed by HD. The said indoor recreation centre, like those recreational and sports facilities provided by LCSD, was rented to the public or some schools to hold their activities. With regard to the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site, adequate recreational facilities would be provided for residents' use. According to HD's survey, the majority of the public housing residents were satisfied with the recreational facilities provided in the public housing estates while some opined that there was room to improve recreational facilities in old public housing estates. HD would continue to provide appropriate and quality recreational facilities in the public housing estates.

### *Local Consultation*

85. Noting from Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8)'s presentation that no briefing/consultation had been conducted with the affected villagers, a Member asked the details of the consultations that had been carried out by the Government. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that the administrative and statutory procedures in consulting the public on the OZP amendments had been duly followed. Prior to the submission of the OZP amendments for consideration by Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board, PlanD together with other relevant government departments, including CEDD and HD, jointly consulted KTDC on 13.9.2022 on the OZP amendments, and the views received were duly relayed to MPC in considering the OZP amendments. The exhibition of the OZP for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments to the Board also formed part of the statutory consultation process.

### *Land Status of Shek Lei Hang Village and Compensation and Relhousing Arrangements*

86. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting from Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8)'s presentation that the Village was covered by two GLLs, details of the land status of the Village;
- (b) noting from Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8)'s presentation that the affected villagers were only notified of the rezoning when LandsD conducted the freezing survey and the attitude of LandsD's staff was unfriendly, details of the freezing survey; and
- (c) noting that SLCCG had grave concerns on rehousing, details of compensation and rehousing arrangements and whether rehousing in the same district would be arranged for the affected villagers and whether social worker teams would be arranged to help the affected villagers.

87. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that the Item A sites were all government land. According to LandsD, there was no recognized village within the Item A sites. There were some squatters on government land

and some structures under two GLLs issued in the 1970s. The boundaries of the two GLLs were shown in green lines on Plan H-2a of the Paper. The two GLLs allowed the licencees to use the concerned land for temporary structures and cultivation purposes including accommodation and might be cancelled by the Government with three months' notice. The clearance, compensation and rehousing of the affected structures and occupiers would be handled separately by the Government in accordance with prevailing policies and established mechanism.

88. Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, continued to say that the freezing survey was conducted by LandsD on 18.11.2022, i.e. the date of the draft OZP exhibited for public inspection. According to LandsD, the purpose of the freezing survey was to capture the current occupation and status of existing structures within the development area. The information obtained would serve as a basis for assessment of eligibility for rehousing and/or ex-gratia allowances. Given the nature of the freezing survey, LandsD would not give prior notification before visiting individual structures.

89. The Chairperson supplemented that, after conducting the freezing survey, LandsD would in due course visit the squatter occupants to collect supporting documents to establish their eligibility for rehousing or receiving ex-gratia allowances. Generally speaking, for those squatter domestic occupants, whose squatter structures were recorded as 1980s-surveyed squatter structures (i.e. the ones marked with 'red numbers') and who had a proof of at least two-year residence before the freezing survey and satisfied the income and asset tests, they could be allotted with a HKHA's public rental housing unit. In May 2018, the Development Bureau announced measures to improve the ex-gratia compensation and rehousing arrangements for domestic occupants in squatter structures. For those squatter domestic occupants in 1980s-surveyed squatter structures who had a proof of at least seven-year residence but did not want to go through the income and asset tests, they could choose to buy or rent a housing unit in HKHS's Dedicated Rehousing Estate (DRE). If the affected squatter occupiers met the eligibility criteria, they could also opt for ex-gratia allowances. It was understood that villagers of the Village hoped to be rehoused in the same district, yet rehousing in the same district might not be easily arranged in reality subject to practical considerations. Nevertheless, the DRE in Kai Tak, which was conveniently located next to MTR station, would be a good option for rehousing. Besides, it was noted that the affected villagers would have doubts and worries about squatter clearance. Regarding the ways in conducting the freezing

survey, the Chairperson would follow up with LandsD and requested their officers to pay attention to the villagers' feelings when conducting surveys and to explain more to help villagers better understand the programme and progress of the project as well as the compensation and rehousing arrangements.

### *Burst of Underground Water Mains*

90. Two Members asked whether improvement measures had been carried out to solve the problem of frequent burst of underground water mains and whether the burst was particularly serious in Kwai Tsing District. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that starting from 2000, WSD had implemented a territory-wide comprehensive and systematic management programme for the water supply networks, involving the replacement and rehabilitation (R&R) of about 3,000 km of aged water mains in four stages to rejuvenate the water supply network in Hong Kong. The programme had been completed in 2015, and the number of water mains burst cases in Kwai Tsing District had dropped significantly from 102 in 2000 to 3 in 2022. In respect of Kwai Tsing and Tsuen Wan Districts, based on a risk management approach, WSD confirmed that about 20 km of water mains needed to be replaced or rehabilitated. As of today, R&R works for 6 km of water mains had commenced and those for another 2 km of water mains would commence by end 2023. For the remaining 12 km of water mains, the design work was in progress and R&R works were anticipated for commencement in 2024. There was currently no information on whether the burst of underground water mains in Kwai Tsing District was more serious than other districts.

### *Cultural Heritage*

91. Noting from Ms Yip Man (R243/C7)'s presentation that a temporary bamboo theatre was erected to hold activities during religious festivals at a playground next to Shek Lei Interim Housing Blocks 10 and 11, a Member asked the relationship between the historical development of the Village and the cultural heritage of the bamboo theatre activity. In response, with the aid of a visualizer, Ms Yip Man (R243/C7) and Ms Chow Oi Chuen (R97/C8) said that a letter was written by Ms Yip's great-grandfather Mr Yip Wing on 9.3.1981 to the then Tsuen Wan District Office indicating that villagers had no objection to build the temple 「淳風仙觀」 next to the Village as proposed by the then local residents. Besides, the three temples next to the

Village, i.e. 「淳風仙觀」、「白雲洞」 and 「七聖洞」 were currently popular gathering places of the local residents. In addition, villagers had lived in harmony with the temples and they had actively participated in the religious celebrations and activities organised by the temples. With regard to the bamboo theatre activity, it was mainly organized and held by another temple, i.e. 「福德古廟」 which was located next to the Shek Li Street redevelopment site. Currently, alternative places for holding bamboo theatre activity had not been identified.

92. Mr Alvin L.C. Chan, SPO, HD, supplemented that the bamboo theatre activity was previously held at the playground next to Shek Lei Interim Housing Blocks 10 and 11, and the playground had been demolished for the redevelopment project. The organiser of the bamboo theatre activity had sought assistance from HD to identify a replacement venue in the public housing estates for holding the said activity. Although no suitable site could be identified within public housing estates, HD had liaised with LCSD which suggested that the organiser could apply for using Shek Pai Street Park, which was large in size with football court and basketball courts, for holding the bamboo theatre activity.

#### *Land Supply Options*

93. Noting from the presentations of Mr Nip Hin Ming, representative of Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (R12), and Mr Wong Wan Kei Samuel, representative of Designing Hong Kong (R15/C3) that the Government should first develop the brownfield sites and there were a number of government sites in Kwai Tsing District which had long been used for car parking under short term tenancies (STTs), a Member asked the reasons for not using those government sites for housing development and the estimated construction cost of the proposed public housing development at the Item A1 site, and whether construction cost was a major consideration in developing the hillside area rather than the government sites under STTs.

94. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply to meet the housing needs. The Government was studying/had preliminarily assessed the feasibility of those government sites currently used for car parking under STTs as suggested by the representers/commenters for alternative uses. For example, a study was being carried out to assess the feasibility of a site at Container Port Road near MTR Kwai Fong Station for alternative uses. For those sites

along Tsuen Wan Road, they might not be suitable for residential use because they were small in size and susceptible to traffic noise. For the site near Kwai Chung Park (i.e. the restored landfill of Gin Drinkers Bay), it might not be suitable for residential use as it was enclosed by highways and roads and in close proximity to industrial buildings, and was subject to traffic noise, industrial/residential interface problem and the potential environmental impact of the restored landfill.

95. As regards the construction cost of the proposed public housing development, Mr Alvin L.C. Chan, SPO, HD, said that the notional scheme presented at the meeting was only a preliminary proposal. The site formation plan and layout design would be further reviewed and adjusted at the detailed design stage with a view to reducing the construction cost as far as possible. There was currently no information on the estimated construction cost. In general, the construction cost of developing public housing on sloping areas would be higher than developing on flat land.

Item C – Proposed Public Columbarium Development at Kwai Yue Street

96. Noting that the proposed public columbarium at the Item C site would offer 68,500 niches, a Member enquired whether more niches could be provided to meet the strong public demand for burial facilities. In response, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, DPO/TWK, PlanD, said that relevant technical assessments including traffic impact assessment had been conducted by the Architectural Services Department to confirm the technical feasibility of the proposed public columbarium development with 68,500 niches. Traffic was a major consideration in determining the number of niches that could be provided in the columbarium. Having reviewed and assessed the existing and planned traffic capacity in the area and the estimated traffic flow generated by grave-sweepers during the Ching Ming Festival and Chung Yeung Festival periods, it was considered that 68,500 niches was the maximum number of niches that could be provided. In future, should there be new road improvement works/traffic management measures in the area, there might be scope of providing more niches or other green burial facilities in the proposed public columbarium.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

97. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations and comments in closed session in the next meeting to be held two weeks later and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

**Agenda Item 5**

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

Any Other Business

98. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 9:15 p.m.