

**Minutes of 1303rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 3.10.2023, 5.10.2023 and 6.10.2023**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mrs Vivian K.F. Cheung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr K.L. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

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

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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairperson

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Dr Conrad T.C. Wong

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

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

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Caroline T.Y. Tang

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Josephine Y.M. Lo (3.10.2023 a.m. and 6.10.2023 a.m.)

Ms Johanna W.Y. Cheng (3.10.2023 p.m., 5.10.2023 a.m. and 6.10.2023 p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Kelvin K.H. Chan (3.10.2023 a.m.)

Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (3.10.2023 p.m.)

Mr L.K. Wong (5.10.2023 a.m.)

Ms M.L. Leung (6.10.2023 a.m.)

Mr Edward H.C. Leung (6.10.2023 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 3.10.2023:

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

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

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

Director of Lands
Mr Andrew C.W. Lai

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Further Representations on the Proposed Amendment arising from the Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/FSSE/1

(TPB Paper No. 10928)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

2. The Secretary reported that the draft Fanling/Sheung Shui Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP) was to take forward the recommendations of the Task Force of Land Supply (TFLS) regarding the Fanling Golf Course (FGC) and the findings of the Technical Study on Partial Development of Fanling Golf Course Site – Feasibility Study (the Technical Study), which was commissioned by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The draft OZP covered mainly part of the Old Course of FGC to the east of Fan Kam Road (the Area), including a site for proposed public housing development by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), of which the Housing Department (HD) was the executive arm. Representations and comments in respect of the draft OZP had been submitted by Li Man Kiu Adrian David (R498) being the Committee Chairman of the Community Chest Bank of East Asia (BEA) Charity Golf Day, Hong Kong Countryside Foundation (HKCF) (R499), Hong Kong Football Club (HKFC) (R6696) and The Conservancy Association (CA) (R6783/C45). The proposed amendment to the draft OZP mainly involved rezoning of 9.5 hectares (ha) of land in Sub-Area 1 (the Site) at the northernmost portion of the Area from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “Undetermined” (“U”) with revisions to the corresponding parts in the Notes of the draft OZP (the Proposed Amendment) to partially meet 78 representations. 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
*(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;
- Mr Franklin Yu - being a member of the Building Committee and Tender Committee of HKHA;
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - being an adviser and ex-director of HKCF;
- Dr Conrad T.C. Wong - having current business dealings with HKHA, BEA and HKFC;
- Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang - having past business dealings with HKCF;
- Dr C.H. Hau - conducting contract research projects with CEDD; being a member of the Urban Forestry and Biodiversity Focus Group of CEDD on the study related to the Kau Yi Chau Artificial Islands; being an honorary professional adviser on wetland conservation and biodiversity enhancement associated with the development of New Territories North of CEDD; being a life member of the CA; and his spouse being the Vice-chairman of the Board of Directors of the CA;
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau] being a member of Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) which currently had discussion with HD
Ms Lilian S.K. Law] on housing development issues;
- Mr K.L. Wong - being a member and ex-employee of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues;
- Mr Timothy K.W. Ma - being a member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS which currently had discussion with HD on housing development issues; and
- Professor Roger C.K. Chan - being a member of HKFC.

3. Members noted that as the interests of Messrs Andrew C.W. Lai, Paul Y.K. Au and

Franklin Yu, Dr Conrad T.C. Wong and Professor John C.Y. Ng were direct, Mr Andrew C.W. Lai should be invited to leave the meeting while other Members had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. For those Members who had no direct interests or involvement in the proposed public housing development and/or the submissions of the representations, comments and/or further representations, Members agreed that they should be allowed to join the meeting.

4. Members also noted that as agreed in the hearing for representations and comments in June 2023, Members did not need to declare interest if they knew any representers, commenters or further representers but had no discussion with them regarding the draft OZP, the Proposed Amendment or the related representations, comments or further representations.

[Mr Andrew C.W. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

5. The Secretary reported that on 21.9.2023, Members agreed by circulation that four further representations, upon verification of the submitted personal particulars, were considered not complied with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 29B on 'Submission and Publication of Representations, Comments on Representations and Further Representations under the Town Planning Ordinance' (the Ordinance) and treated as not having been made in accordance with section 6D(3)(b) of the pre-amended Town Planning Ordinance (the pre-amended Ordinance). 1,903 valid further representations would be submitted to the Town Planning Board (TPB/the Board) for consideration.

Presentation and Question Sessions

6. The Chairperson said that notifications had been given to the further representers and the related representers 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 further representers and the related representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the further representations and related representations in their absence.

7. The following government representatives, further representers and their

representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mr Anthony K.O. Luk | - District Planning Officer/ Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE) |
| Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung | - Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE) |
| Ms Anny P.K. Tang | - STP/FSYLE |
| Ms Lily H. Lau | - Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East |

CEDD

- | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Mr Gavin C.P. Wong | - Chief Engineer/North (CE/N) |
| Mr Daniel T.L. Lau | - Senior Engineer/North (SE/N) |

WSP (Asia) Limited

- | | |
|---------------------|--------------|
| Mr Dennis C.H. Chan | - Consultant |
|---------------------|--------------|

Ecosystems Limited

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------|
| Mr Kilnsmann K.L. Cheung | - Consultant |
|--------------------------|--------------|

Further Representers and their Representatives

F26 – Hong Kong Golf Club (香港哥爾夫球會)

F30 – Famous Palace Limited

F31 – Rich Comfort Limited

F41 – Chau Chin Hung (周展雄)

- F44 – Cheung Wai Kwok Gary (張為國)
- F45 – Lau Ting Yin Anthony (劉鼎言)
- F52 – Cheung Wong Michelle Man Ying (張黃敏瑩)
- F53 – Cheung Bo Tim Jonathan
- F54 – Lau Kwok Kit (劉國傑)
- F61 – Chang Jacinta Yeung Cheong (張林元莊)
- F62 – Chau Michael Dayan (周德仁)
- F64 – Chang Davina Twan-gia (張傳佳)
- F65 – Cheng Albert Shu Lok (鄭樹樂)
- F66 – Mulchandani Narayan Phatu
- F67 – Cheng Se Hym Wilson (鄭世謙)
- F68 – Shrogg Noshir Nariman
- F75 – Roberts Mark Jonathan
- F78 – Shih Jonathan Hung Yee (石鴻毅)
- F81 – Yeomans Charles Margrave
- F85 – Lo Della (黎鳳姿)
- F87 – Compagnon Marc Robert
- F88 – Jojo Camille
- F89 – Yung Li Fong Frances (榮麗芳)
- F92 – Leung Filipe Ka Po (梁嘉保)
- F99 – Clements Andrew Timothy Michael
- F100 – Chan Yin Bing Jena (陳賢冰)
- F107 – Kwan Tit On Daniel (關秩安)
- F108 – Cheng Chung Ching Raymond (鄭中正)
- F112 – Linton Timothy Robert
- F114 – Ip Chi Shing (葉志成)
- F115 – Leung Bih Yu (梁碧瑜)
- F117 – Wong Tse Kay Michael (黃子基)
- F194 – Cheng Kai Ho David (鄭啟豪)
- F196 – Hobson Michael Hamilton (賀百新)
- F207 – Scales Michael William

- F208 – Chu Kai-yang (朱凱揚)
- F224 – Wong Chi Hang (黃志恆)
- F230 – Chang David Thy Way (張大惠)
- F232 – Chan Yu Hin Daniel (陳宇騫)
- F234 – Wai Rosaline (韋令然)
- F235 – Kong Roanna P (江寶瑩)
- F236 – Wai Sik Yin Felicia (韋哲然)
- F238 – Kwok Chun Hei Archie (郭晉熹)
- F239 – Wong Siu Yin Flora (黃兆賢)
- F242 – Lam Chai Fung (林才峯)
- F250 – Koon Yat Ching (官一青)
- F251 – Faulkner Justin Craig
- F252 – Fung Wing Chung (馮咏聰)
- F255 – Hyun Jun John (玄竣)
- F256 – Hinchcliffe Leung Suet Mui Yoko (梁雪梅)
- F257 – Bye Ferris Charles
- F258 – Leung Kwok Kan Davina (梁幗芹)
- F259 – Murray Stuart Craig
- F266 – Leung Yuk Fun (梁玉芬)
- F267 – Hui Suk Han Angeli (許淑嫻)
- F268 – Fung Mun Sin Monica (馮敏先)
- F269 – Lau Chun Kay (劉振麒)
- F273 – Kendrick Roger Clive
- F277 – Wu Tsung Sung Otto (吳順升)
- F278 – Yau Sheung Kwan (尤湘君)
- F279 – Wu Nai Tsen Katherine (吳柰曾)
- F283 – Cheng Mo Kit Katherine (鄭慕潔)
- F290 – Lam Ming Aminah Khattak (林明)
- F291 – Mak Kam Hung (麥錦鴻)
- F293 – Leung Yuen Sheung (梁婉嫦)

F294 – Luk Ka Po Janet (陸嘉寶)
F297 – Newnam John Russell
F710 – Ho Gloria (何妍菁)
F718 – Wong Yuen Ling (王婉玲)
F719 – Tse Chi Fung (謝子峰)
F721 – Chan Siu Tong (陳少堂)
F755 – Yeung Yin Chau (楊燕秋)
F757 – Lo Pik Wan (盧碧雲)
F758 – Leung Siu King (梁少琼)
F759 – Hung Wing Kuk (洪泳菊)
F760 – Chan Yi Lan (陳依蘭)
F761 – Chan Siew Ki (陳秀琪)
F762 – Wong Sze Ming (黃思銘)
F764 – Cho Wai Kin Jonathan (曹偉堅)
F765 – Tsang Kin Keung (曾建強)
F895 – Yeung Cheuk Ying (楊綽凝)
F937 – Lam Chun Ming Pearl (林晉明)
F967 – Tse Yan Hei Patrick (謝焯熹)
F1110 – Fishwick Peter James
F1140 – Wong Cheryl Angela
F1150 – Chui Chai Nam (崔濟南)
F1152 – Liang Genhe (梁艮河)
F1159 – Cheung Wai Yu Wendy (張慧瑜)
F1177 – De Guzman Gemma Amis
F1178 – Yuni-Novitamaji
F1180 – Jumik-Srinani
F1246 – Siu Shui Man Salina (蕭瑞文)
F1247 – Yeung Hok Man (楊學文)
F1250 – Chow Shiu Lun (周兆麟)
F1253 – Yuen Kam Ho George (袁金浩)

F1289 – Lam Yu Tat Derek (林雨達)

F1291 – Yeung Nicholas Wai Shing (楊偉成)

F1293 – Hung Hak Fu (洪克孚)

F1294 – Chang Francine Alison (張雅淳)

F1296 – Ching Wing Ying (程詠盈)

F1299 – Wan Tan Fung (尹丹楓)

F1301 – Wong Kok Sun (黃覺新)

F1309 – Tham Seng Yum Ronald (譚承蔭)

F1315 – Ng Sau Ling Selene (吳秀玲)

F1317 – Chan How Weng Wynne (陳巧穎)

F1320 – Lee Ching Kwok Rin (李正國)

F1322 – Chan Sze Ki Carol (陳思琪)

F1325 – Fung Ho Wang (馮浩泓)

F1328 – Hau Yee Man (侯綺雯)

F1331 – Ko Man Kee Gary (高萬基)

F1333 – Lo Wing Yin (羅詠然)

F1335 – He Junmei (賀俊梅)

F1337 – Lim Heng Poh (林興波)

F1339 – Cheng Robert Shu Chi (鄭樹志)

F1350 – Fung Kuen Kei (馮權基)

F1352 – Chu Kin Wah (朱健華)

F1355 – Chan Ching Yin Yolanda (陳靜妍)

F1362 – Leung Oi (梁愛)

F1363 – Ho Sze Kin (何思健)

F1364 – Mai Quanda (麥權達)

F1365 – Lee Kwok Lin (李國連)

F1366 – Chan Man Lung (陳文龍)

F1367 – Chik Chi Fai (植志輝)

F1368 – Wong Wai Chun (黃偉俊)

- F1369 – Yim Ka Lok (嚴家樂)
F1370 – Lau Chu Kwan (劉柱均)
F1371 – Lam Chun Yip (林駿業)
F1372 – Wong Shing Tong (王勝棠)
F1373 – Lui Chun Kong (呂震剛)
F1374 – Huang Ka Wo (黃家和)
F1378 – Ma Ching Lung Harold (馬青龍)
F1381 – Chau Kwok Chun Sandy (周國珍)
F1385 – Li On Keung (李安強)
F1386 – Cheung Woon Chuen (張煥轉)
F1387 – Yuen Kwong Cheung Lube (袁廣祥)
F1388 – Devkota Chandrawati
F1390 – Limbu Kabita
F1391 – Sun Po (孫波)
F1393 – Yeung Hin Tung (楊顯東)
F1394 – Lo Ming Fai (盧銘輝)
F1395 – Tang Wai Ming (鄧衛明)
F1396 – Lee Swee Keong (李瑞強)
F1397 – Chan Hon Kit (陳翰杰)
F1398 – Lai Kin Man (黎建文)
F1399 – Chan Mei Kam (陳美琴)
F1400 – Liao Xiaoting (廖曉婷)
F1401 – Ho Foon Hee (何歡喜)
F1402 – Mak Chi Ping (麥志平)
F1403 – Rai Dinesh Kumar
F1404 – Tsui Yuk Ling (徐玉玲)
F1405 – Tsoi Kim Ping (蔡劍萍)
F1406 – Fong Tak On (方德安)
F1407 – Kwong Yan Tak (鄺仁德)
F1408 – Zhong Guochi (鍾國池)

- F1409 – Cheng Kar Chun (鄭家俊)
F1410 – Chan Ngai Chi (陳毅志)
F1411 – Wong Hing Wa (黃興華)
F1412 – Fung Kwai Fa (馮桂花)
F1413 – Fung Tung Mui (馮冬妹)
F1414 – Chan Hung Leung (陳洪亮)
F1416 – Lai Wai Fun (黎慧歡)
F1417 – Leung Woon Mei (梁煥美)
F1418 – Li Yin Ling Serina (李燕鈴)
F1419 – Szeto Sin Ching (司徒倩澄)
F1420 – Lau Ka Yan (劉嘉欣)
F1421 – Lau Fu In Ada (劉富妍)
F1422 – Ching So Tsang (程素增)
F1423 – Ouyang Huiya (歐陽慧雅)
F1424 – Tang Chiu Kuen (鄧肖娟)
F1425 – Chan Jink Chou Eric (陳正秋)
F1447 – Yeung Sai Kwong James (楊世光)
F1449 – Au Yang Cheong Yan Peter (歐陽長恩)
F1454 – De Lacy Staunton David Charles H.
F1460 – Ho Kwan Tat (何君達)
F1462 – Li Siu Leung (李紹良)
F1463 – Cheung Cho Yiu (張祖堯)
F1464 – Cheang Tak Hong (鄭德雄)
F1465 – Chen Zhifeng (陳志鋒)
F1466 – Tang Yam Tong (曾任棠)
F1467 – Fung Wing Por (馮永波)
F1468 – Fung Chi Fung (馮志峰)
F1469 – Ng Chin Pang (吳展鵬)
F1484 – Ma Kin Gay Michael (馬健基)
F1492 – Yau Yuk Ling Estalla (游玉玲)

- F1493 – Tang Mei Lin (鄧美蓮)
F1494 – Li Yin Ling Wendy (李燕玲)
F1498 – Wong Man Chun Connie (黃文真)
F1499 – Wong Mei Yan (黃美恩)
F1500 – Wong Yuk Yee (黃玉儀)
F1507 – So Chu (蘇珠)
F1509 – Wong Choi Ying (王彩英)
F1510 – Chau Kuk Mui (周菊梅)
F1518 – Lee Ka Kit William (利家傑)
F1520 – Kwong Yui Wa (鄺銳華)
F1521 – Ma Ka Man Carmen (馬嘉文)
F1522 – Ip Chi Hei (葉智義)
F1523 – Choi Wai Fuk (蔡偉福)
F1524 – Mo Pui Han (巫佩嫻)
F1525 – Hung Man Ying (洪文英)
F1527 – Yeung Hok Man (楊學文)
F1539 – Chan Hiu Lam (陳曉琳)
F1540 – Chong Yik Lam (莊亦琳)
F1550 – Chang Irving (張恩惠)
F1552 – Chang Preston Twan Yee (張傳義)
F1556 – Dai Pui Wa Dora (戴佩華)
F1559 – Li Hongxia (李洪峽)
F1560 – Chan Ka Shing Wilson (陳家誠)
F1561 – Chung Wai Lan (鍾惠蘭)
F1571 – Fung Tak Hong David (馮德康)
F1645 – Chang Iris Carrie (張凱淳)
F1690 – Lau Wing Yee Ingrid (劉頰儀)
F1748 – Tse Kwok Chuen (謝國泉)
F1749 – Chan Victoria (陳慰慈)

F1753 – Yao Che Li Miriam (姚潔莉)

F1755 – Fung Jason (馮子成)

F1759 – Lo Chang Grace (羅張惠惠)

F1762 – Cheung Cheng Fook Lee Frances (張陳福珮)

F1764 – Yum Stephanie Carrie (任加怡)

F1765 – Tse Roger Lai Ming (謝禮明)

F1766 – Leung Kwok Ming Edli (梁國明)

F1767 – Cheng Sidney (鄭兆能)

F1786 – Murray Barbara June

F1789 – Ng Yue Kiang (吳耀強)

F1793 – Karlberg Henrik Hans Petter

F1800 – O'brien Ian Charles

F1804 – Wong Kar Chit (黃家哲)

F1805 – Young Mar Lene (楊曼玲)

F1806 – Wong Ying Rebecca (黃盈)

F1810 – Pe Hong Teng (白鴻滕)

F1811 – Pe May (白梁秀美)

F1832 – Wong Wai Fun (黃慧芬)

F1848 – Keatley Lisa Joy

F1849 – Cheng Yim Leung (鄭炎亮)

F1854 – Yip Sandra Chor Sheung (葉楚瓊)

F1858 – Lee Tin Chak Daniel (李天澤)

F1870 – Singh Shailendra

F1871 – Chan Yam Ping (陳任萍)

F1872 – Chan Yuk Ha Joe (陳玉霞)

F1873 – Lin Jianhu (林建湖)

F1874 – Ng Yat Shing (吳逸成)

F1875 – Chan Chun Pong (陳振邦)

F1860 – Ng Siu Lung Teresa (伍小龍)

F1876 – Ngan Yiu San (顏耀新)

F1877 – Chan Yiu Hoi Caesar (陳耀海)

F1878 – Li Hiu Chak (李曉澤)

F1879 – Chow Ka Wing (周嘉詠)

F1883 – Chan Siu Fong Fanny (陳少芳)

F1896 – Lam Poon Wah (林本華)

F1901 – Wu Tsing Why Laurence (吳清淮)

The Hong Kong Golf Club (HKGC)

- Further Representer and Further
Representers' Representative

– *HKGC*

Mr Andy Kwok Wing Leung

Captain

Mr Bryant Lu Hing Yiu

Vice Captain

Mr Ian Paul Gardner

General Manager

Mr Jeffrey Cheung Shee Chee

Legal & General Convenor

Mr Fred Neal Brown

Mr Lee Cheuk Shing

Ms Yeung Sau Wah

– *KTA Planning Limited*

Mr Kenneth To Lap Kee

Ms Veronica Luk Yin Sheung

F27 – Heung Yee Kuk New Territories (新界鄉議局)

Mr Yau Wing Kwong

] Further Representer's

Ms Julia Lau Man Kwan

] Representatives

F28 – Executive Counsel (Hong Kong) Limited

F244 – Alexander Main Duggie

Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith

] Further Representatives'

Ms Hui Cheuk Nam

] Representatives

F34 – Victor Ma Wai Tak

Mr Wang Chao Feng (王超鋒)

] Further Representer's

Mr Danny Lai Yee June

] Representatives

8. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the further representations at this session of the hearing, and reminded that PlanD's presentation should focus on the Proposed Amendment, i.e. the rezoning of the Site from "R(A)" to "U". PlanD's presentation would be uploaded to the Board's website for viewing by the further representers and the related representers. The same presentation would not be made on other sessions of the hearing. After PlanD's presentation, the further representers, related representers and their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each further representer/related representer and/or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a time device to alert the further representers/related representers and/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 for each morning and afternoon session after the further representers/related representers and/or their representatives had completed their oral submissions in the respective session on the day. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives and/or the further representers/related representers and/or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, further representers, related representers and their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After the hearing of all the oral submissions from the further representers, the related representers and their representatives, the Board would deliberate on the further representations in closed meeting and would inform the further representers and the related representers of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the further representations.

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung, STP/FSYLE, PlanD, briefed Members on the further representations, including the background of the draft OZP, the Proposed Amendment, the grounds/views/proposals of the further representers, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the further representations as detailed in TPB

Paper No. 10928 (the Paper).

11. The Chairperson then invited the further representers and their representatives to elaborate on their further representations. She also reminded the further representers and/or their representatives that their oral submissions should be related to whether they supported or opposed the Proposed Amendment, i.e. the proposed rezoning of the Site from “R(A)” to “U”, and the rationales behind.

F26 – The Hong Kong Golf Club (香港哥爾夫球會)

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Andy Kwok Wing Leung made the following main points:

- (a) Mr Taichi Kho just won Hong Kong’s first gold medal in golf and Hong Kong National Team won bronze medal in men’s golf in the 19th Asian Games. While the National Team was celebrating their excellent performance with members of the public, he was at the current meeting talking about that part of the Old Course had been reverted to the Government only for a passive public park. He was puzzled why the remaining 10 holes of the Old Course could be retained for playing golf, but not the 8 holes that had been reverted to the Government. He urged the Board to maintain the status quo of the Old Course as a living heritage of more than 100 years and restore its function as a golf course;
- (b) HKGC applied for a judicial review (JR) on the decision of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) to approve the relevant Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) report under the Technical Study (the Decision), as HKGC was committed to protecting the Site with rich historical and ecological values. The interim stay granted by the Court of First Instance (CFI) represented a green light for preserving the status quo of the Area, including its landscape and environment as well as golf course function, which would be of the greatest benefit to the society of Hong Kong;
- (c) with HKGC’s support, such as providing training venue for golfers and

hosting major tournaments, the golf athletes had achieved great results over the past few years. Golf sport had been qualified as a Tier A sport supported by the Hong Kong Sports Institute starting from 2025. With the increasing number of young golfers in Hong Kong, more training facilities would be required. However, unlike other sports such as fencing and cycling for which the Government would step up support including expansion of facilities to create good training environment for athletes after medals had been attained, the Government did not develop any new facilities for the golf athletes and even took away 8 holes in the Old Course, turning it into a public park where playing golf was prohibited. Such an arrangement would render the Site underutilised and had already caused a decline of golf event days and elite training time for Hong Kong Golf Association and Hong Kong squad team for more than 20%, which would affect the development of golf sport in Hong Kong;

- (d) the percentage of golf rounds played by the public in FGC was about 40% in the past 10 years. After the 8 holes in the Area were reverted to the Government, the usage was reduced to 30%. The arrangement of local villagers' free golf plays was also affected as they could no longer play golf in the Area. Villagers also urged the Government to restore the Area as a golf course for public use;
- (e) having a world-class golf course for hosting major tournaments was a unique advantage of Hong Kong, and the golf course could be used as an ecological park at the same time. In the past, HKGC held many golf and non-golf events such as ecological trails and charity events for public enjoyment, which demonstrated that the Area could be used as a golf course in the morning and as a park in the afternoon. However, the Area was being used solely as a park with passive recreational activities, and the public could not fully appreciate the Area;
- (f) HKGC had maintained the Area in good conditions over the years. In the days of typhoon and extreme weather conditions last month, only a few trees had been destroyed and fallen. The flooding in the Area had been dealt with

very quickly so that the groups of Chinese Swamp Cypress (CSC) were not affected;

- (g) some trees in the Area had been nominated to be considered for listing in the Register of Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) (the Register). If the trees were subsequently listed in the Register, they could not be removed in accordance with the government policy;
- (h) he noted that, in response to the CFI's decision, the Notes and the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP had been amended by stating that development of public housing at the Site was only an intention of the Government. As pointed out in the Paper and the judgment on interim stay handed down by CFI (the Judgment), the Board should not assume that the Decision was sacrosanct and not potentially subject to being quashed. He hoped Members would be open-minded to the option of reinstating the golf course function of the Area;
- (i) the international golf events being or to be hosted in FGC such as Aramco Team Series Championship (ARAMCO), Hong Kong Open (HKO) and LIV Golf League Tournament (LIV Golf) could help tell good stories of Hong Kong. The ARAMCO – Greater Bay Area Junior Golf Tour was being held today for which all 18 holes of the Old Course were needed to be deployed. Hosting such large-scale events was not only in line with the Government's policy on enhancing Hong Kong's image through mega sports events but would also attract visitors from other countries. The political and business sectors of Saudi Arabia and international top golfers would come and experience Hong Kong as an international super-connector of different sectors and parties;
- (j) the Old Course should maintain its status quo as a golf course. That would generate more economic and social values, contributing to the Government's policy of promoting sports in the community, maintaining Hong Kong as a centre for major international sports events, supporting elite sports, enhancing professionalism in the sports sector and developing sports as an

industry; and

- (k) during the interim period before the CFI made a decision on the JR, maintaining the status quo of the Old Course, including its historical and ecological environment, the maintenance and management arrangement of it as a golf course for public enjoyment, was in the best interest of Hong Kong.

13. The Chairperson remarked that the Area had been reverted to the Government since 1.9.2023 and the Government had already announced publicly the use of the Area. The oral submissions by the further representers or their representatives should focus on the proposed “U” zone of the Site. She then invited representatives of HKGC to continue with their oral submissions.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu joined the meeting during F26’s presentation.]

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Kenneth To Lap Kee made the following main points:

- (a) the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Conservation cum Recreation” (“OU(CR)”) was the best land use zoning for the entire 32 ha of land in the OZP, i.e. the Area;
- (b) he noted that the Notes and ES of the draft OZP had been revised without the presumption of public housing development at the Site, which could better reflect the actual circumstance associated with the Site and the Judgment, pending court decision and CEDD’s review;
- (c) as revealed in a review on all the 13 sites designated as “U” zone on OZPs, the “U” zoning for most of the sites was intended to provide interim planning control subject to further study. Those sites were zoned “U” between the 1980s and 2010s, and for some of those sites, the envisaged uses were specified in the respective ES. It was also noted that most of those sites were vacant or occupied by temporary uses;

- (d) unlike other “U” sites which were mostly vacant or occupied by temporary uses, the Site formed part of the 100-year-old golf course with conservation value in terms of heritage, ecology and landscape and was still in active operation. Hence, special consideration was warranted regarding the planning control under the “U” zone for the Site, and the standard formulation of the covering Notes for “U” zone in general might not be adequate (paragraphs (7)(a) to (c) and (9) of the covering Notes of the OZP referred);
- (e) besides, the Antiquities Advisory Board (AAB) had already indicated the intention to assess the heritage value of FGC. In the Judgment, the CFI also took into account whether there was a real risk of serious, potentially irreversible damage to the Site. In view of the conservation value of the Site, the Notes and ES of the “U” zone should be revised to ensure that the existing use could be continued and there would be no damage to the Site;
- (f) it was proposed to revise the covering Notes for the “U” zone so that all uses or development except maintenance or repair of watercourse and grave (as specified in paragraph (7)(c) of the covering Notes), golf course, public convenience and public vehicle park (except container vehicle) (as specified in paragraph (9) of the covering Notes) would require planning permission from the Board. Developments or uses, including ‘Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture’ and government works such as road works, geotechnical works, sewerage works, as allowed within the “U” zone under the paragraphs (7)(a), (7)(b) and (9) in the covering Notes, could bring along adverse impacts and thus should require planning permission from the Board;
- (g) as for the ES of the “U” zone, it was proposed to state that the Site was part of the Old Course with paramount heritage, ecological and social values worthy of protection. Except for some maintenance and repair works implemented or coordinated by the Government, all public works should require planning permission from the Board. Although the Board was not in the position to advise the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) regarding the use of the Site after it was reverted to the Government,

it was proposed to specify in the ES that sports, recreation and educational activities that had previously been held at the Site were encouraged to continue. That could provide some references to LCSD in deciding the use of the Site in the interim period; and

- (h) the previous planning consideration of the Site was based on the assumption of providing 12,000 public housing units by 2029, and the Board might consider that such benefits could outweigh the golf course use of the Site. However, with the need to fulfil the approval conditions of the Decision and the ongoing JR, the proposed public housing development could hardly be completed by 2029 and the scale of which would likely be reduced, and subsequently there might even be a need of comprehensive planning review for the Site. The description of the “U” zone in the ES should be revised accordingly to reflect such circumstances.

[Dr Venus Y.H. Lun left this session of the meeting at this point.]

F34 – Victor Ma Wai Tak

15. Mr Danny Lai Yee June made the following main points:

- (a) he was a golf enthusiast and had been playing golf in Hong Kong several times a week in the past few decades. However, the tee times in FGC were often fully booked since the Area had been reverted to the Government on 1.9.2023, and therefore he had to play golf in the Mainland; and
- (b) the Mainland had become one of the fastest growing golf regions. He then invited Mr Wang Chao Feng, the Vice-chairperson of Guangdong Province Golf Association, to express his views.

16. Mr Wang Chao Feng made the following main points:

- (a) the unique integrity of FGC formed an integral part of Hong Kong as an

international financial centre in its economic and social developments;

- (b) many golfers in Guangdong had been longing to play golf at FGC. He was astonished and considered it a pity that the Government would destroy the integrity of the oldest golf course in the country;
- (c) the golf competition of the 15th National Games in 2025 would be held at FGC. It would be an opportunity for the people in the Mainland to gain a better understanding of the local history and development of Hong Kong, which in turn might help boost tourism and business co-operation between the two regions; and
- (d) HKO was first held 60 years ago at FGC, which had a longer history than the oldest golf tournament held in the Mainland (i.e. China Amateur Golf Open with a history of 37 years). Moreover, a reputed golf course could help attract golf talents from all over the world. Considering its heritage value with more than 100 years of history and functions, the entire FGC should be retained.

F28 – Executive Counsel (Hong Kong) Limited

F244 – Alexander Main Duggie

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith conveyed the following main views of F244 who opposed the proposed “U” zoning of the Site:

- (a) Mr Alexander Main Duggie was a registered landscape architect and a fellow of the Hong Kong Institute of Landscape Architects. He had been practising landscape architecture in Hong Kong in the past 38 years;
- (b) as the Area was currently unleased government land upon reversion to the Government on 1.9.2023, the potential OVTs therein became eligible to be considered for listing in the Register. Hence, he submitted nominations to the Greening, Landscape and Tree Management Section (GLTMS) of the

Development Bureau (DEVB) for the potential OVTs in the Area. GLTMS had forwarded the nomination forms to the LCSD for undertaking a review and assessment. According to the DEVB Technical Circular (Works) No. 5/2020 on Registration and Preservation of Old and Valuable Trees (the TC), GLTMS should set up an OVT Vetting Panel and process the nomination within 42 days;

- (c) the nominations, involving a total of 222 trees of 24 species in the Area, were based strictly on the five criteria as set out in the TC. It was worth noting that Sub-Area 1 had the largest number of species within the Area, which supported the view that Sub-Area 1 was not ecologically less valuable than the other Sub-Areas, despite assertions to the contrary in the EIA;
- (d) to ensure trees of suitable quality and merit would be selected for nomination as OVTs, a comparison had been undertaken to benchmark the minimum quality required for nomination. However, the benchmarking process could only be undertaken for those species already listed in the Register. In Sub-Area 1, only eight of the 16 species being nominated were currently listed in the Register, while the other eight new species were represented by specimens of the highest quality that could be found in Hong Kong. According to the EIA, majority of those potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1 were proposed to be felled if the Site would be developed for public housing;
- (e) it could be seen from the comparison of the nominated potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1 and the existing OVTs of the same species or a related sub-species (including *Corymbia citriodora*, *Ficus virens*, *Melaleuca cajuputi subsp. cumingiana*, *Ficus microcarpa*, *Cinnamomum camphora*, *Dimocarpus longan*, *Pterocarpus indicus* and *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) listed in the Register that the potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1 were mostly larger and in better quality in terms of height, diameter at breast height and tree spread. For those potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1 with no specimen in the Register for comparison (including *Ilex rotunda*, *Adenanthera microsperma*, *Eucalyptus exserta*, *Delonix regia*, *Lophostemon conferta*, *Cratoxylum cochinchinense*), they were likely the largest and best specimens of their kind in Hong Kong. PlanD had

alleged in the TPB hearing in June 2023 that HKGC had overstated the merits of those potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1. However, the above comparison had proved that the allegation could not be credited;

- (f) there was no valid reason why those 222 nominated potential OVTs should not be added to the Register. Dr L.M. Chu, the President of the Hong Kong Institute of Horticultural Science, also shared the same view and had submitted a separate parallel nomination to GLTMS for the potential OVTs in the Area. If those trees were successfully added to the Register, the total number of OVTs in Hong Kong would be increased by 50%;
- (g) it was stated in paragraph 21 of the TC that removal of OVT was prohibited except when an OVT had died. If the 222 potential OVTs in the Area were added to the Register and to be preserved, the proposed public housing development at the Site would not be feasible. As Mr Alexander Main Duggie presented to the Board in June 2023, such critical issue had been ignored in the EIA, the EIA approval conditions and the TPB Paper No. 10902 on the consideration of representations and comments on the draft OZP;
- (h) Kowloon Park and Victoria Park were the only open spaces in Hong Kong with a large number of OVTs where 42 and 14 OVTs were identified respectively. If the 62 potential OVTs in Sub-Area 1 were added to the Register, the Area would be well ahead of Kowloon Park and rank the top in respect of presence of OVTs in Hong Kong;
- (i) tree protection zones were required to protect the potential OVTs or groups of trees during construction in accordance with the Tree Management Practice Note No. 1 promulgated by DEVB in 2019. In addition, the EIA approval condition stipulated that the 0.39 ha of woodland in the centre of Sub-Area 1 should be retained. With the preservation of the woodland and the tree protection zones as required, it was apparent that the Site was not suitable for public housing development. Such observation was also supported by the Judgment and the Decision might subsequently be quashed by the CFI;

- (j) the trees in the Old Course were extremely healthy and robust in general, and were not damaged from the recent typhoon and extreme weather conditions. The quality and value of the trees in the Area were the results of meticulous care as well as management and maintenance by HKGC. The loss of the Old Course and the potential OVTs therein would be a devastating loss of a unique and irreplaceable cultural heritage landscape and tree arboretum; and
- (k) the Site should be zoned as “OU(CR)” and HKGC should be allowed to continue their successful stewardship of the Area over the past century. Even if the Site was zoned “U”, it was essential that the trees must be protected and maintained in the same manner as it had been in the past.

F27 – Heung Yee Kuk New Territories (新界鄉議局)

18. Mr Yau Wing Kwong made the following main points:

- (a) Heung Yee Kuk New Territories maintained its views as stated/presented in the previous written and oral submissions; and
- (b) while he noted that the subject hearing was mainly on the proposed rezoning of the Site from “R(A)” to “U”, he was of the view that the future development of the Site should involve a wider consideration of local circumstances and context.

19. Ms Julia Lau Man Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) based on her past experience as a member of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE) and the advice from the Chairman and members of AAB, it was incorrect to state that there was no government policy to conserve cultural landscape in Hong Kong as section 3(1) of the Antiquities and Monuments Ordinance clearly specified that any place or site could be declared to be a monument, historical building or archaeological or palaeontological site/structure by reason of its historical, archaeological or palaeontological significance. Therefore, she was confused by PlanD’s

response in paragraph 4.3.6 (a) of the Paper that the existing historical grading system was generally applied to buildings and structures;

- (b) it was stated in paragraph 4.3.6 (2) of the Paper that AAB voted to evaluate the cultural heritage value of the whole FGC as one site in 2018. However, according to PlanD's response, the evaluation process was still underway without a concrete programme. It was unjustifiable that a heritage assessment could not be completed after five years. To avoid irrevocable damage to the heritage value of FGC, she considered that any development in the Area should be withheld until the completion of the heritage assessment;
- (c) heritage and cultural conservation was intended to avoid damage to the heritage value of structures and the landscape of a site. According to the Notes of the OZP, public works co-ordinated or implemented by the Government and temporary uses for a period of five years or less were always permitted on land falling within the boundary of the OZP, including the subject "U" zone. It meant that any public works or temporary residential development could be undertaken in the Area without the need for planning permission from the Board. Such developments might adversely affect the characteristics and value of FGC; and
- (d) she urged the Board to consider the future development in the Area in a cautious manner so as to avoid irrevocable damage to the heritage value of FGC.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10-minute break. Mr Timothy K.W. Ma left this session of the meeting during the break.]

20. As the presentations of government representatives, the further representers and/or their representatives in this session 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 further representers, 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 question to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The

Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

“U” Zoning and the Permitted Uses

21. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting a further representer stated that most “U” zones on the OZPs were vacant while the Site was very different in nature, the rationales for proposing the “U” zoning for the Site;
- (b) noting that some further representers raised concerns on the potential damage of the ecological and heritage values of the Site arising from possible development/use in the interim period, whether it was necessary to consider the further representers’ proposal of not allowing developments/uses specified in paragraphs (7)(a) and (7)(b) of the covering Notes in respect of the “U” zone for the Site, such that developments with potential adverse impacts such as public works like road works, geotechnical works, sewerage works would require planning permission from the Board; and
- (c) noting that some further representers were concerned that the Site could be used for large-scale temporary uses like transitional housing, extensive felling of trees or construction of major roads in the interim period, whether there was any mechanism to avoid such uses or development which might bring along adverse impact.

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

- (a) over the years, the Board had designated “U” zoning for different sites on different OZPs mainly for the reason that the long-term uses or development parameters of those sites were subject to further study/assessments or pending finalisation of alignment/provision of relevant infrastructures. Pending the review to be conducted by CEDD and the outcome of the JR proceedings, the Site was proposed to be rezoned to “U”, and the circumstances were similar to

those of the other “U” zones. As illustrated in the “U” zone examples, designating a site to “U” zone had no relationship with its existing site condition;

- (b) the “U” zoning was an interim arrangement pending the outcomes of CEDD’s review and the JR proceedings. The Government had already committed on various occasions that no construction works for the proposed public housing development would be undertaken at the Site during the interim period. In fact, public works coordinated or implemented by Government being always permitted was a standard provision applicable to most zonings under the covering Notes of OZPs. Such provision was intended to provide flexibility for undertaking such uses, yet it did not necessarily imply that such works should be undertaken within the “U” zone or other zones on the OZPs. It should also be noted that paragraphs (7)(a) and (7)(b) of the covering Notes of the OZP included some essential uses or developments, such as maintenance or repair of amenity planting, plant nursery, refreshment kiosk telecommunications radio base stations and drainage works, and such provisions would provide flexibility for the Government to undertake those uses/developments if needed. In any case, the Government would ensure that no substantial works would be carried out at the Site during the interim period; and
- (c) allowing temporary uses (expected to be five years or less) was a standard provision under the covering Notes of the OZPs for urban and new town areas to provide flexibility for short-term uses on a temporary basis. It should be noted that paragraph (6) of the covering Notes of the OZP also stated that the temporary uses should comply with any other relevant legislation, the conditions of the Government lease concerned, and any other Government requirements. There were effective mechanisms within the Government to control and scrutinise the temporary uses. Taking transitional housing as an example, any such proposal at the Site would be subject to land grant from the Lands Department (LandsD), and scrutiny of relevant government bureaux/departments (B/Ds). In any case, development of housing at this juncture would breach the Government’s commitment not to pursue any

construction works at the Site as mentioned above. Felling of trees on government land would also require approval from the LandsD, while major road works would be subject to the control under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance (Cap. 370).

23. In response, Mr Kenneth To Lap Kee (F26's representative) clarified that he did not intend to oppose rezoning the Site to "U". He wished to point out that unlike other "U" sites which were mostly vacant, the Site was of ecological and heritage values. In that regard, the Notes of the OZP should be suitably revised to prevent any potential adverse impacts on the Site, whereas the ES should be refined to provide some guidance on the use of the Site in the interim period.

Site Management and Hosting of Golf Tournaments

24. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) which party was responsible for managing the Area, and whether the condition of the Area was properly maintained to allow golf activities after the Area was reverted to the Government, especially during days of extreme weather conditions in September;
- (b) noting that the Area was lent to HKGC on a temporary basis until mid-November 2023 to facilitate the hosting of international golf tournaments, whether HKGC had encountered any difficulties under such arrangement;
- (c) whether there would be any further discussions or service agreement between HKGC and LCSD so that HKGC could assist in managing the Area in future; and
- (d) whether the Area could be used as a golf course in future such that Holes 1 to 8 could continue to be used for hosting golf competitions.

25. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) the Site had been opened for public use as a park under the management of LCSD from 4.9.2023 to 10.9.2023. Extreme weather conditions occurred in early September and the Black Rainstorm Warning Signal had been hoisted on 8.9.2023. The Site was under the management of LCSD at that time. According to LCSD, most of the trees at the Site were still in good conditions. LCSD had rich experiences and expertise in managing parkland and grassland to ensure the quality of the Area as a public park, and would engage outsourced professional teams to provide management services if needed;
- (b) in case HKGC required temporary additional land for supporting the organisation of major events in future, the Government could provide appropriate assistance where possible, including letting the Area to HKGC for hosting golf tournaments; and
- (c) there was no service agreement between HKGC and LCSD regarding management of the Site in future.

26. In response, Messrs Andy Kwok Wing Leung and Kenneth To Lap Kee (F26's representatives) made the following main points:

- (a) although the Area was lent to HKGC for hosting international tournaments from 11.9.2023 to 15.11.2023, HKGC had assisted the Government to manage the Area such as the turf grassland after reversion of the Area to the Government on 1.9.2023. HKGC assisted LCSD to tackle the waterlogging problem arising from the extreme weather conditions in early September within the Area in order to protect the CSC. He considered that the professional team of HKGC was more familiar with the Area and could provide assistance to the Government in managing and preserving the Area;
- (b) HKGC expressed appreciation to the Government for lending the Area to HKGC for hosting international golf tournaments. Under the tenancy terms, golf activities were only allowed when competitions were held. In other words, HKGC would need to maintain the Area in good conditions for hosting

competitions. While the current arrangement and existing conditions of the Area could enable HKGC to host international golf tournaments, he could not anticipate whether such arrangement would still be feasible in future as the conditions of the Site might change over time;

- (c) playing golf was currently prohibited in the Area except during the golf tournament period. To ensure that the conditions of the Area were suitable for golf competitions, HKGC was maintaining the Area at their own cost at the moment. For instance, ARAMCO – Greater Bay Area Junior Golf Tour was currently held and all the 18 holes of the Old Course were required for competition purpose; and
- (d) HKGC was willing to collaborate with the Government in managing the Area so that the 32 ha of land could be used for hosting golf tournaments and open to the public for playing golf or as a park.

27. The Chairperson remarked that the Government's stance regarding the use of the Area was clear. As the Chief Executive had indicated earlier, the Area would be open for public enjoyment as a public park, not a golf course, but the Government could provide appropriate assistance to HKGC, if needed and where possible, including lending the Area to HKGC for hosting golf tournaments. The Area was currently lent to HKGC temporarily for hosting international golf tournaments until mid-November 2023. After the said period, LCSD would continue to manage the Area as a park open for public enjoyment. As for the LIV Golf to be held next year, the organisers of LIV Golf should be well aware of the current situation of the Area before deciding to host the tournament in Hong Kong. Based on international tournaments hosted by HKGC in the past, it was understood that the Area, i.e. Holes 1 to 8 of the Old Course, was intended mainly to provide backup facilities, but not as the venue for hosting competitions of professional golfers.

28. Mr Andy Kwok Wing Leung (F26's representative) supplemented that a charity golf competition, namely EFG Young Athletes Foundation International Golf Challenge, was held in the Old Course including the Area, in September which involved professional golfers in Hong Kong and Singapore. The tournament was originally planned to be held in the Eden Course. However, as the Eden Course was saturated due to heavy rain, with agreement from

the Government, the tournament was held in the Old Course with better drainage conditions. That incident reflected the importance of the Old Course as a venue for hosting golf completions.

Register of OVTs

29. Noting from F28 and F244 that nominations had been submitted to list the 222 potential OVTs in the Area in the Register, a Member asked how the nominations would be processed. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, said that GLTMS of DEVB had received the nomination submissions and LCSD was assessing the submissions in accordance with the TC.

Heritage Aspect

30. A Member asked whether the existing historical grading system could be applied to the whole FGC or only the buildings/structures therein, and the reasons for taking a period of more than five years for assessing the heritage value of FGC. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, said that the existing historical grading system generally applied to buildings and structures. While he was not in a position to comment on the progress of the assessment, it was noted that as FGC was neither a building nor a structure, more detailed research by the Antiquities and Monuments Office was required to explore whether and how the existing assessment mechanism and the assessment criteria could be applied in assessing the heritage value of FGC. In any case, the graded historic buildings within FGC were located outside the Area and would not be affected.

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

32. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:50 p.m.

33. The meeting was resumed at 2:10 p.m.

34. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

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

Chairperson

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr C.H. Hau

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Chief Engineer/New Territories East
Transport Department
Mr K.L. Wong

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

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

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

Government Representatives

PlanD

Mr Anthony K.O. Luk - DPO/FSYLE
Mr Patrick M.Y. Fung - STP/FSYLE
Ms Lily H. Lau - TP/FSYLE

CEDD

Mr Gavin C.P. Wong - CE/N
Mr Daniel T.L. Lau - SE/N

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department

Mr Boris S.P. Kwan - Senior Nature Conservation
Officer (North)

WSP (Asia) Limited

Mr Emeric W.K. Wan] Consultants
Mr Dennis C.H. Chan]

Ecosystems Limited

Mr Klinsmann K.L. Cheung - Consultant

Further Representatives and their Representatives

F42 – Castka Gillian Hancer

Ms Castka Gillian Hancer - Further Representative

F51 – Cheung Shee Chee Jeffrey (張士志)

F110 – Jenkins Alexander Michael Collier

Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith - Further Representatives'
Ms Hui Cheuk Nam Representatives

F57 – Liu Che Ning (劉哲寧)

F90 – Lam Chung Lun Billy (林中麟)

F206 – Wan Man Yee

F1107 – Mossip Mark S

F1377 – Lee Man Yick Stephen (李萬益)

F1461 – Tang Suk Fong Jennifer

F1575 – To Shing Chee Kuwalkii (屠承志)

F1621 - Lam Kwok Kwong Paul

Mr Wan Man Yee] Further Representers and Further

Mr Lam Kwok Kwong Paul] Representers' Representatives

F58 – Yen Gordon

Mr Yen Gordon - Further Representative

F82 – Shim Youn Hee (沈潤姬)

F83 – Robinson James Alexander

F84 – Robinson Kelly Shim

Mr Robinson James Alexander - Further Representative and Further
Representers' Representative

F116 – Lam Sze Ken Kenneth

Mr Lam Sze Ken Kenneth - Further Representative

Ms Wong Lai Kwan Fanny - Further Representative's
Representative

F195 – Fred Neal Brown

Mr Fred Neal Brown - Further Representative

F197 – Lee Dick Wai Roy Lester

Mr Lee Dick Wai Roy Lester - Further Representative

F198 – Yau Siu Yan (游小茵)

F199 – Lee Hung Bun (李鴻斌)

Mr Lee Hung Bun

- Further Representer and Further
Representer's Representative

F203 – Ellis Roger Peter Frederick

Mr Ellis Roger Peter Frederick

- Further Representer

36. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the further representers and/or their representatives to elaborate on their further representations. The Chairperson remarked that the further representers and/or their representatives should make their oral submissions in relation to whether they supported or opposed the Proposed Amendment, i.e. the proposed rezoning of the Site from "R(A)" to "U", and the rationales behind.

F42 – Castka Gillian Hancer

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Castka Gillian Hancer made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed the "U" zoning for the Site and asked for maintaining the status quo of FGC;
- (b) climatic change was a fact and extreme weather conditions would become more frequent. Ping Kong Tsuen was situated at the lowest valley portion and prone to flooding. The impact of the recent Super Typhoon Saola and black rainstorm in September on the Ping Kong area would have been more severe if the golf course was not maintained to a high standard by HKGC. The turfgrass avoided excessive runoff flowing to the nearby villages. Except for a pipe blockage in FGC, there was no blockage of drainage inlets nor flooding of the fairways. Although the car park in FGC was flooded, it attenuated the runoff onto Fan Kam Road;
- (c) should FGC be developed and paved, surface runoff in the area would

inevitably be increased. The risk of flooding in Ping Kong Tsuen and the surrounding areas would be increased, resulting in potential loss of life and properties. Although the Government had promulgated stormwater management strategies, including the blue-green and sponge city concepts like the use of swales, filter strips/bio-trenches, wetlands, green roofs and porous pavements, there was a lack of specific details on implementation and proven performance of the proposed strategies/measures. Different government departments were currently responsible for different parts of the drainage system, e.g. CEDD was responsible for the drainage system of slope areas while the Highways Department was responsible for the drainage system of roads. A collaborative strategy amongst different government departments should be adopted;

- (d) about 70% of the proposed public housing development in Sub-Area 1 was hard-paved area and there was little room for greening. Greening should comprise local open spaces, preservation of the potential OVTs, etc.; and
- (e) paragraph 88 of the CFI's decision dated 24.8.2023 stated that "...when the locations of potentially registrable OVTs are considered in conjunction with... (... a revised layout plan aiming to protect the woodland of 0.39 ha in the centre of Sub-Area 1), it appears to identify that any large-scale development in Sub-Area 1 becomes at least extremely difficult, if not impossible." She concurred with the CFI's decision that when the potential OVTs were to be preserved, there was hardly any space left for large-scale development in Sub-Area 1.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong and Mr Timothy K.W. Ma joined the meeting during F42's presentation.]

F51 – Cheung Shee Chee Jeffrey (張士志)

F110 – Jenkins Alexander Michael Collier

38. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith made the following main points:

- (a) the falling of only four and 20 trees in the Old Course and New Course/Eden Course respectively under the recent extreme weather conditions highlighted that trees in FGC were generally robust and in good conditions under the long-term effective tree management by HKGC; and
- (b) although the recent Super Typhoon Saola did not affect the 38 CSC, a pipe between the CSC and a pond was blocked due to the subsequent black rainstorm, which might have posed danger to the CSC. While LCSD staff had been removing the fallen branches and trees, HKGC staff had successfully fixed the blockage issue. It showed that HKGC had all along put extra care and meticulous effort in managing and maintaining the trees and turfgrass in FGC, and LCSD should liaise with HKGC and leverage their experience in managing the golf course.

39. Mr Cheung Shee Chee Jeffrey (F51) clarified that Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith was his and F110's representative, and Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith went on to play a video clip narrated by Professor Ho Puay Peng, which covered the following main points:

- (a) Professor Ho Puay Peng was a former member of the Board and AAB, and currently a professor at the National University of Singapore and was the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)'s Chair on Architectural Conservation and Management in Asia;
- (b) HKGC submitted an application to the UNESCO Bangkok Office for the Asia-Pacific Awards for Cultural Heritage Conservation. FGC satisfied three areas of achievements on understanding of the place, technical achievements, and sustainability and impact. It was expected that the result would be announced in November 2023;
- (c) FGC, in particular the Old Course, had enormous cultural, social, historical and landscape significances;

- (d) golf as a sport and a form of culture was thriving at the Old Course due to its long history. As the Old Course was an integration of nature and sports, and having regard to the unique landscape design as well as the social fabric around it, it represented a very important element of Hong Kong's cultural heritage;
- (e) the design of the Old Course followed the original natural undulating terrain which reflected the ingenuity of the golf course designer. It was well-maintained in terms of integrity and authenticity, and was used as a venue for international golf tournaments and practices. Its resilience towards natural and man-made disasters, including the recent extreme weather conditions, had proved that it was well-maintained;
- (f) keeping the golf course in its entirety as well as in its use would be sustainable, both environmentally and socially;
- (g) the nearby villagers had maintained a good relationship with HKGC in the use of land in ritualistic requirements as well as gaining access to the Old Course, which showed the sustainability of social fabric;
- (h) the concept of cultural landscape approach was crucial in the latest development of the conservation movement, which recognised the integration of tangible and intangible heritages of a site, the coordination between the nature and design as well as the incorporation of social fabric into a historic site. Similar to the Shaw Studios Compound which was previously graded by AAB as a whole compound (i.e. the site and the buildings), the historic, cultural, design and social elements that formed an integrated whole of FGC should be taken into account by AAB in assessing the cultural heritage value of FGC including the Old Course;
- (i) FGC was the oldest golf course in Hong Kong as well as in Asia. As Hon Coleman J had pointed out in the Judgment, the Old Course as a whole was recognised to be of important cultural heritage. The entire site should be

protected and maintained as a golf course to safeguard its historical significance;

- (j) designating the Old Course as a park would undermine its cultural and historical significance and was not in line with the Government's mandate as reaffirmed in the 2022 Policy Address in protecting cultural heritage; and
- (k) he objected to the proposed "U" zoning.

F58 – Yen Gordon

40. Mr Yen Gordon made the following main points:

- (a) he was a sports enthusiast and enjoyed the countryside of Hong Kong;
- (b) the winning of medals in the recent Asian Games by Hong Kong golf players signified Hong Kong's ability to groom athletes to international standard and proved that golfing was not an activity for the minority;
- (c) hosting more international tournaments in Hong Kong could bring economic benefits to the city;
- (d) a golf course was not only about sand pits, trees and greens, and there were a lot of requirements and standards that needed to be met in order for a golf course to qualify to host international tournaments. Although the Government would lend the Site to HKGC for hosting events, it should be recognised that it took a long time to prepare and maintain a golf course for such purpose, and the Government did not have such experience;
- (e) he doubted the need and benefit to convert the golf course into a park. The benefit of maintaining the Old Course for attracting more international athletes and grooming more elite golfers would be much greater than that of simply allowing people to walk their dogs given that there were many other parks serving such recreational needs;

- (f) the Site should continue to be allowed to use as a golf course, which would not preclude it from being used for other activities, and indeed the Old Course was previously used for other purposes, including open space and the hosting of community events during non-golfing times;
- (g) while the current proposal of using FGC as a park might be an interim arrangement, it should be considered holistically and the Government should opt for the option that could maximise economic, environmental and public gains;
- (h) if the Site was taken back for other purposes, it would cast uncertainties to organisers of upcoming international tournaments that had already expressed interest in using FGC to host their events; and
- (i) noting that Singapore which had an area smaller than Hong Kong had more than twenty golf courses whereas there were less than 10 in our city, he appealed that the option that could bring the greatest benefit to Hong Kong should be given priority.

F82 – Shim Youn Hee (沈潤姬)

F83 – Robinson James Alexander

F84 – Robinson Kelly Shim

41. Mr Robinson James Alexander made the following main points:

- (a) he had been a Hong Kong resident since 1978. He was a registered architect and civil engineer, and had worked in a senior position in a property investment and development firm for over 30 years. He fully understood the development process in Hong Kong. He had attended the TPB hearing held in June 2023;
- (b) developing part of the Old Course for public housing was a wrong decision made by the previous administration, and inefficient allocation of

professional manpower and financial resources was a major concern. Since the continuous population growth in the 1930s, Hong Kong had implemented relatively successful public housing policy in the period from the 1970s to 1990s to meet housing demand. Despite the continued acute housing demand in society, the previous administration erroneously curtailed the supply of housing land starting in 2001 and as a result, there was currently a shortfall in public housing supply. However, the Government had not learnt from the lesson and continued to waste valuable time and professional manpower to develop a small amount of public housing units on a small piece of land (i.e. the 9 ha of land in Sub-Area 1). Instead, professional manpower and financial resources should be concentrated on expediting the planning and implementation of the strategic, large-scale and comprehensive development of the Northern Metropolis (NM);

- (c) he opposed the “U” zoning with the planning intention for housing development. That was unprecedented. His and the other two further representers’ (F82 and F84) opposing views were not fully reflected in the Paper and the Government had not provided responses to them. Their major opposing views covered the following:
 - (i) the 9 ha of land in Sub-Area 1 should have been properly zoned “OU(CR)” based on the statutory EIA process. However, the EIA process was seriously flawed and compromised by the Government’s insistence that at least some part of FGC should be used for developing high-rise, high-density public housing;
 - (ii) the Board had completely ignored one of the very important EIA approval conditions, i.e. to develop Sub-Area 1 with a sponge city concept, which was clearly specified in the EPD’s letter to CEDD dated 11.5.2023. That was also not included in the amended Notes and/or remarks to the OZP for Sub-Area 1. Item (c) of the EIA approval conditions stated that “The project proponent shall develop Sub-Area 1 with sponge city concept with a view to preserving the

hydraulic performance of the site to avoid substantially affecting the groundwater level, minimising flooding risk of the site during heavy rainstorms and identify necessary measures to avoid the stormwater runoff which could contaminate the surrounding rural environment, in particular, the important swampy woodland in Sub-Area 4.”; and

- (iii) any public housing development in Sub-Area 1 would create massive areas of hard-standing concrete, such as buildings, roads, emergency vehicular accesses, playgrounds, etc., which would result in massive flooding to the nearby rural villages, schools and the North District Hospital (NDH). The adjacent area was currently highly problematic and regularly flooded because of heavier rainstorms caused by global warming. The villagers of Ping Kong Tsuen had already provided video proofs in their presentations in the TPB hearing held in June 2023;
- (d) he queried the intention of not mentioning the EIA approval condition that the project proponent was required to develop Sub-Area 1 with a sponge city concept in the amended Notes and/or remarks in the OZP, and questioned whether it was legally proper to neglect the EIA approval conditions in the statutory plan. That was particularly worrying as the latest amendments to the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO) specified that an urban development project covering an area of less than 50 ha no longer required an EIA report, and the 32 ha of land of FGC was one of such kind;
- (e) as detailed in a document titled ‘Sponge City: Adapting to Climate’ published by the Drainage Services Department (DSD), “Sponge city is a modern stormwater management approach to help solve drainage problems, fully utilize land resources and promote sustainable development. To combat climate change, DSD encourages the sponge city concept to be adopted in new developments for more effective drainage and rainwater reuse to enhance urban flood resilience by the principle of infiltration, retention, storage, purification, reuse and discharge. To implement the

concept, DSD will revitalize water bodies, construct flood retention lakes, and apply sustainable drainage elements.”;

- (f) an article titled ‘Climate Change in China: A New Great War’ published in the Economist on 10.6.2023 stated that “Southern China and Hong Kong are vulnerable to rising sea levels, much stronger typhoons and excessive heavy rainstorms.” Hong Kong was hit by sudden torrential rainstorms on 7.9.2023, causing widespread flooding and landslide across the territory. The Hong Kong Observatory recorded the heaviest one-hour rainfall of 158 mm. Government officials claimed that it was a once-in-500-years rainstorm which was difficult to predict. However, Hong Kong had previously experienced torrential rainstorms in 1886 (the heaviest one-hour rainfall of 88 mm), 1996 (the heaviest one-hour rainfall of 108 mm) and 2008 (the heaviest one-hour rainfall of 145mm). It demonstrated that the sponge city concept was very important and any proposed development in Sub-Area 1 needed to be properly designed to withstand the extreme weather conditions; and
- (g) emergency relief funds were provided by the Government to those affected by the extreme weather conditions. According to a newspaper article in South China Morning Post, 70% of the emergency relief fund applications were from those living in the North District. It implied that the impact of torrential rainstorms in the North District was more serious than other areas, and the sponge city concept should not be overlooked.

F116 – Lam Sze Ken Kenneth

42. Mr Lam Sze Ken Kenneth made the following main points:

- (a) he objected to rezoning the Site to “U” and the Site should continue to be used as a golf course, in recognition of it being a heritage golf course;
- (b) he was the incumbent vice-president and the former president of the Hong Kong Golf Association (HKGA). He had been actively involved in youth

sports training since 2008 and organising large-scale golf tournaments for HKGC. He was also a member of the golf team delegation to the Tokyo Olympics. He had attended the TPB hearing held in June 2023;

- (c) the Old Course was vital to golf sport development in Hong Kong. It was the only venue suitable for large golf tournaments in summer season, e.g. Hong Kong Ladies Open Championship, as its special turfgrass type and drainage design were more resilient to the rainy and wet weather. LCSD took back the management of the Area on that day and subsequently lent the Area to HKGC from 11.9.2023 to mid-November 2023 for holding two international golf tournaments namely ARMACO and HKO. Besides, a golf tournament between Hong Kong and Singapore young athletes had been scheduled to be held in Eden Course on 13.9.2023 and 14.9.2023. However, due to serious flooding in Eden Course and New Course during the recent torrential rainstorms, the Old Course was used instead for hosting the tournament. It demonstrated that the Old Course could serve as an alternative venue for golf tournaments during unexpected and extreme weather conditions;
- (d) some argued that the Old Course was only suitable for hosting amateur golf tournaments, not the professional ones. However, the qualifying competitions of the United States Women's Open Championship for Asian cities/countries were held in the Old Course in 2019. Besides, being enclosed by clusters of mature trees, the Old Course itself was internationally recognised as a challenging golf course and had nurtured the success of many local elite athletes. The challenging 18-hole course and other supporting facilities in the Old Course were the essential elements for the success in hosting both professional and amateur golf tournaments;
- (e) there was already a shortage of golf courses in Hong Kong (10 golf courses for 7.5 million population) as compared with other cities/countries like Singapore (20 golf courses for 5.7 million population), South Korea (500 odd golf courses for 50 million population), Ireland (400 odd golf courses for 7 million population), etc. FGC was an important venue for training

elite golf athletes, such as Mr Taichi Kho, Mr Hak Shun-yat, Mr Ng Shing-fung, Mr Matthew Cheung, Miss Tiffany Chan, etc. The remarkable results achieved by the young golf athletes in the Asian Games were very encouraging. As most of the training of golf athletes was conducted in FGC, any reduction in golf facilities would be a serious setback for their training. Golf was currently a Tier B sport which received fewer subsidies when compared with a Tier A sport. Any reduction in golf facilities would inevitably affect the training of the elite golf athletes and the young players;

- (f) HKGC hosted at least 20 golf tournaments in FGC every year. Together with the free-of-charge training tee-times allowed in FGC, HKGC sponsored at least HK\$11 million in green fees per year. Although the Jockey Club Kau Sai Chau Public Golf Course (KSCGC) was a public golf course, all bookings for training/hosting golf tournaments were charged;
- (g) he understood that land supply was very important to the society, yet the debates on Private Recreational Leases and the use of FGC had become politicised. Golf was a sport activity which should bring positive impacts to the community, particularly the young generation, and should not be deprived for political reasons; and
- (h) HKGC had been making continuous contribution in promoting golf sport and nurturing world-class golf athletes in Hong Kong. He emphasised that FGC should be retained and used as a golf course, and hoped that the Government would provide more golf driving ranges/training grounds to help promote golf sport development in Hong Kong.

F195 – Fred Neal Brown

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Fred Neal Brown made the following main points:

- (a) he had attended the TPB hearing held in June 2023 and had raised grave concerns on the traffic and transport issues, particularly the Traffic and

Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA) conducted by CEDD (June 2022). However, the Government had not provided substantive responses to address those concerns;

- (b) the TTIA report should be regarded as invalid since it did not take into account the traffic generated from the public transport interchange (PTI) and the 40,000 m² gross floor area (GFA) of non-domestic uses in the proposed public housing development. Besides, traffic analysis on the accesses and junctions to/from NDH had also been omitted in the TTIA report;
- (c) HKGC's consultants had conducted a re-assessment from the traffic and transport perspectives. Based on the same background traffic figures as CEDD had adopted in the TTIA report, HKGC's consultants had added in the traffic generated from the PTI and non-domestic uses, i.e. +33% outbound traffic and +44% inbound traffic from/to the proposed public housing development. The findings showed that the junctions at Po Kin Road/Ping Kong Road/Fan Kam Road would be the bottlenecks in the local network. Vehicular queuing at the junctions would block the accesses to NDH, which would put emergency services at risk. Tai Tau Leng Roundabout would also be overloaded, and hence the accesses to/from Sheung Shui and traffic flow along Route 9 would be disrupted. In conclusion, the proposed public housing development in Sub-Area 1 could not be supported on traffic and transport grounds;
- (d) in the TPB hearing held in June 2023, CEDD's representatives said that a sensitivity test had subsequently been conducted with trip rates of the two elements (i.e. the PTI and non-domestic uses) incorporated and the result indicated that the performance of the relevant junctions remained acceptable from the traffic engineering perspective. It was doubtful whether the trip rates of the non-domestic uses were properly incorporated in the sensitivity test as CEDD's representatives said that the non-domestic uses such as the retail facilities would mainly serve the local needs, the locals would access those facilities on foot and hence, and no major traffic flow was anticipated. Besides, CEDD's representatives had misinformed Members that HKGC's

consultants had adopted assumptions on the high side of traffic generation in the re-assessment. He clarified that HKGC's consultants had applied exactly the same background traffic figures as CEDD had adopted in the TTIA report. Furthermore, the Government had responded that measures would be taken to resolve any traffic and transport issues and the accesses to NDH would not be blocked. However, there was no information on the said measures nor their effectiveness. In addition, the Government said that a strategic highway was being studied, which would resolve any other problems. It was questionable how a strategic highway which would only be built many years after population intake could resolve the traffic and transport problems in the area in a timely manner. In gist, no technical documentation nor traffic analysis had been provided by the Government for public scrutiny and review;

- (e) it was suggested that the Government should provide the Board with a sound basis for assessing the feasibility and impact of the development proposal on traffic and transport grounds. CEDD should prepare an up-to-date and professionally correct and valid TTIA report, which should be circulated to all interested parties and the community for comment and review and then the Board could make an informed and sound decision;
- (f) paragraph 4.3.11 of the Paper indicated that in the review of the Site, CEDD would update/review the TTIA only on an as appropriate basis to support the revised scheme and the subsequent rezoning proposal. However, it should be noted that ACE recommended that CEDD was required to review the traffic impact and arrangement for the Site, i.e. not on an "as appropriate" basis. He fully supported and welcomed a new, comprehensive and up-to-date TTIA;
- (g) in preparing the new TTIA report, the following aspects should be duly considered. With regard to the territory planning and transport assumptions, the 2016 Territorial Population and Employment Data Matrix data that was used in the TTIA was outdated and should be totally replaced. Increased development intensities in the Fanling North and Kwu Tong North

New Development Areas, San Tin Technopole, planned/committed public and private development proposals, cross-boundary travel and traffic to be generated by the integration of Shenzhen and NM, planned/committed highway and traffic improvements as well as all other relevant factors should be taken into account. As regards the development proposal in Sub-Area 1, all development components, including the proposed public housing, public/private car parks, servicing facilities, PTI, non-domestic uses, etc., and the preliminary road layout along Ping Kong Road should be taken into account in order to come up with detailed traffic generation estimates for Sub-Area 1 and NDH. Concerning the technical analysis, volume/capacity assessments for all relevant links/junctions including weaving analyses on the junction performance, junction reserve capacity assessments including cycle time/queue lengths as well as all other relevant factors should also be considered; and

- (h) he opposed the “U” zoning and suggested that the Sub-Area 1 should be rezoned to “OU(CR)” to reinstate golfing, sports and recreational activities, similar to Sub-Areas 2 to 4. It was important to reinvest in FGC, which was a cultural and historic asset that would contribute to the social and economic sustainability of the NM, the Twin Cities of Hong Kong and Shenzhen and the Greater Bay Area. It was also in line with the Government’s initiatives that FGC and golf as a whole could continue to play an important role in promoting Hong Kong as a leading city in Asia.

F197 – Lee Dick Wai Roy Lester

44. Mr Lee Dick Wai Roy Lester made the following main points:

- (a) he had been engaging in golf sports/training for years. Many young golfers conducted their training in the Old Course and had achieved remarkable results in international golf tournaments, for example, Miss Tiffany Chan who was the first Hong Kong groomed golfer to be qualified to play in the Ladies Professional Golf Association Tour in the United States, and Mr Taichi Kho who won the gold medal in men’s individual

event and the bronze medal in men's team event at the recent Asian Games. That had been inspiring to many youngsters to follow suit and learn to play golf;

- (b) without sufficient golf facilities, the development of golf sport in Hong Kong and the nurturing of young golf athletes would be significantly hindered. In the 2022-23 Budget, it was mentioned that the Government had been pro-actively promoting sports development with new resources allocation of more than \$60 billion since 2017 for promoting sports in the community, supporting elite sports, as well as for maintaining Hong Kong's status as a centre for major international sports events. Therefore, more sports and recreational facilities should be provided and the Government should not take away the 8 holes in the Old Course;
- (c) some criticised that even if 8 holes in the Old Course were taken away, 10 holes were still left in the Old Course for golfing. Golf was a very unique sport, losing 8 holes in the Old Course was equivalent to losing the entire 18-hole course as the remaining 10 holes of the Old Course could not meet the requirements for hosting international tournaments for an 18-hole round of golf;
- (d) the Old Course was not the only option for housing development in view that there were many other land supply alternatives, e.g. brownfield sites; and
- (e) he opposed the "U" zoning and suggested that the Government should maintain the status quo of the Old Course as a golf course.

F198 – Yau Siu Yan (游小茵)

F199 – Lee Hung Bun (李鴻斌)

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

- (a) he objected to rezoning the Site to “U”;

- (b) with reference to the Judgment laid down on 24.8.2023 by Hon Coleman J, the Judge of the CFI (the Judge) of granting an interim stay on the DEP’s approval of the EIA report, as applied by HKGC, pending the determination of the JR, he had the following observations/views:
 - (i) the Judge mentioned that HKGC had criticised that it was irrational for the DEP to have accepted the conclusion of the EIA report that the housing development proposal would have an undetermined impact on the golf course. Mr Lee considered that should the impact be undetermined, the status quo of FGC should be maintained;

 - (ii) the Judgment pointed out that “The Old Course as a whole is correctly recognised to be of important cultural heritage. It is at least a strong argument to say that building residential property on part of the golf course will not have an “undetermined impact”, as the impact is readily determined. The impact is that the integrity of the Old Course as a whole would be lost...This argument seems to me [the Judge] to be rather more than just reasonably arguable.” Mr Lee echoed that losing 8 holes in the Old Course would affect the integrity of FGC;

 - (iv) the Judgment stated that “But where the whole purpose of the EIA Report was in relation to potential development of land to be taken back into government ownership, it is at least strongly arguable that the EIA Report simply failed to take into account something which it ought to have done...there was a failure to advise the DEP of the existence of about 80 potentially registrable OVTs...the proposed locations of at least 8 of 11 intended housing blocks, as well as the proposed transport interchange and special needs school, apparently partly or completely overlap with locations where potentially registrable OVTs now stand...the Club [HKGC] expressly

identified the presence of potentially registrable OVTs when it made its statutory submission in the EIA process. But neither CEDD nor the DEP had yet responded to the point, so that it remains unknown whether the DEP considered the point at all, or whether he rejected it for some reasons known only to him.” Mr Lee considered that he and many others also did not understand why the Site was proposed to be rezoned to “U” and intended for public housing development even when there was strong opposition in the society, and doubted that the Board or the Government might have some reasons known only to itself;

- (v) the Judgment stated that “The EIA Report does not appear to contain any impact analysis as to the consequences for the CSC of ceasing the maintenance of the Old Course as it now stands...that there is a reasonably strong argument that the EIA Report has material shortcomings in this regard, and may be incompatible with the requirements of the Study Brief and Technical Memorandum.” Mr Lee queried how the EIA report, which had material shortcomings and was not in line with the requirements of the EIAO, could serve as the basis to support the rezoning and the proposed public housing development at the Site;
- (vi) the Government’s legal representative pointed out in the court proceedings that the latest amendments to the EIAO specified that an EIA report was no longer required for an urban development project covering an area of less than 50 ha. The EIA process was continued and the EIA report (covering a study area of 32 ha of the land) was submitted only as a gesture of goodwill. The Judgment stated that “...the DEP’s suggestion that the entire EIA process was continued “as a gesture of goodwill” seemed to me [the Judge] to give rise to one of two inferences: (1) the process or its continuation was simply a charade, perhaps as some form of window-dressing to disguise a decision which had already been made or was bound to be made; or (2) the process and its continuation was genuinely

performed...”. Mr Lee questioned whether the TPB hearing process was also a charade or window-dressing to disguise a decision which had already been made;

- (vii) the Judge said that the point of “a gesture of goodwill” was a red herring and it was an unattractive in its poor presentation. Mr Lee considered that the rezoning of the Site to “U” should be withheld pending the determination of the JR;
- (viii) the Judge mentioned that “...there is a real risk of serious, potentially irreversible, damage to the environment of the site – including as to its ecology and cultural heritage... The grant of an interim stay would mark the requirement to preserve the site...whilst the rights and wrongs of the process leading to the EIA Report and the Decision [the DEP’s approval of the EIA report] are considered by the Court at the substantive JR Application...”;
- (ix) the Judgment stated that “...it is at least strongly arguably implicit that if the technical studies concluded and identified that the Project [the proposed housing development] could not viably be built, even if restricted to Sub-Area 1, there would be no reason to cease playing golf on the 32 ha – and indeed, perhaps no need even to have taken back that land – as that might be thought contrary to the public interest in maintaining the cultural heritage of the Old Course, and the benefits to Hong Kong of an increasing number of international golf tournaments hosted at FGC...”. Mr Lee questioned the Government’s rationale of using the Area for everything except golf. It was ridiculous that a part of FGC was currently used as a park for walking the dogs and strolling but golfing was not allowed; and
- (x) the Government’s legal representative claimed that even if the DEP’s approval of the EIA report were to be quashed, under the prevailing laws, the original feasibility study would not require the undertaking of an EIA, and the matter would become an academic

discussion. However, the Judgment stated that "...it is at least strongly arguable that the amendments to the EIAO would not have retroactive/retrospective effect in this context...";

- (c) he was discontented with the Government's responses to the points he made in the TPB hearing held in June 2023, including that there was no problem of sedimentation when the Site (which was a wetland and the soil was soft) was developed for public housing; and providing no stopping 'yellow box' road marking outside the proposed vehicular ingress/egress of NDH could effectively minimise blockage. He also queried that the Government had not properly informed the Board about the full fact of playing golf at KSCGC and simply said that any members of the public could play golf at KSCGC by paying a lower green fee than that in FGC. The Government had not mentioned about the longer travelling time and higher travelling cost to play golf in KSCGC;
- (d) it was suggested that the Area should be used as a public golf course pending the determination of the JR. If the Government wished to continue to use the Area as a park for walking the dogs, strolling, running and/or holding star gazing activities, the golf course could be opened to the public for such purposes after 3 p.m. every day;
- (e) it was estimated about 14,000 people in Canada shared one golf course and about 43,000 people in Singapore shared one golf course. In comparison, about 94,000 people in Hong Kong shared one golf course. That reflected a serious shortage of golf facilities in Hong Kong as compared with other Western and Asian cities. It was queried why the Government still insisted on taking back the Old Course; and
- (f) the 10 objection grounds for taking back the Old Course were: (i) there was a lack of golf courses in Hong Kong; (ii) it was unfair to those who were applying and waiting for a long time for the membership of HKGC; (iii) a long time would need to be spent on building foundation on the Old Course which was a piece of wetland; (iv) the Government disregarded the

important role that HKGC had played on the popularisation of the golf sport development in Hong Kong; (v) the Government disregarded the importance of golf in attracting overseas talents; (vi) the ecological value of FGC was considered higher than that of the country park; (vii) the proposed public housing development would bring traffic congestion and flooding problems to the nearby NDH and villages; (viii) the proposed public housing development proposal would not bring economic benefits to Hong Kong; (ix) FGC could be used for other purposes such as a public golf course; and (x) the proposed rezoning of the Site to “U” should be withheld until there was a determination of the JR.

F203 – Ellis Roger Peter Frederick

46. Mr Ellis Roger Peter Frederick made the following main points:

- (a) he opposed the “U” zoning with planning intention for residential development at the Site;
- (b) FGC, particularly the Old Course, was a unique heritage site from the historical, environmental and ecological perspectives. The number of heritage sites in South China and Hong Kong was rapidly diminishing, and the Old Course should be preserved for the next generation to enjoy;
- (c) the proposed residential development at the Site was not supported on traffic and transport grounds as transport infrastructure, such as the capacity of Fan Kam Road, had already been overstrained;
- (d) there were many brownfield sites across the territory which could be used for residential development, and the Old Course was not the only land supply option; and
- (e) remarkable achievements attained by Hong Kong golf athletes at the recent Asian Games were the testimony to the important value of FGC. FGC was not only a training ground for many young golf athletes but also a venue

that could hold international tournaments and attract world-class players. FGC played a crucial role in promoting golf sport in Hong Kong and nurturing local elite golfers.

F57 – Liu Che Ning (劉哲寧)

F90 – Lam Chung Lun Billy (林中麟)

F206 – Wan Man Yee

F1107 – Mossip Mark S

F1377 – Lee Man Yick Stephen (李萬益)

F1461 – Tang Suk Fong Jennifer

F1575 – To Shing Chee Kuwalkii (屠承志)

F1621 - Lam Kwok Kwong Paul

47. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wan Man Yee made the following main points:

- (a) he had the following observations/comments on the proposed amendments to the ES of the OZP in Annex VI of the Paper:
 - (i) regarding paragraph 3.3, as the Site was no longer zoned as residential, it was queried why ‘residential zone’ was still being mentioned in that paragraph;
 - (ii) paragraph 8.1.1 stated that “The Area is generally flat land” while paragraph 8.2.12 stated that “The Area is overlooked by steep natural terrain and may be affected by potential natural terrain landslide hazards.” The two paragraphs seemed contradictory, and FGC was, in fact, not a flat land. FGC was built and designed in a way that respected the natural undulating terrain;
 - (iii) the heading of paragraph 9 was ‘General Planning Intention’ while the text in paragraph 9.1 stated that “.....it is Government’s intention to develop the northern-most portion of the Area for public

housing development.”. He was confused about whether it was the planning intention that represented the collective decision of the Board after conducting the TPB hearing or it was simply an official decision/direction of the B/Ds to develop the Site for public housing; and

- (iv) paragraph 13.3 stated that “A detailed Archaeological Impact Assessment conducted by a qualified archaeologist would be carried out prior to site formation/construction.” It was suggested that ‘and prior to conclusion of planning decision’ be added at the end of that sentence;

- (b) the Board should clearly distinguish the concepts of ‘preservation’ and ‘conservation’. Preservation was associated with simply keeping/protecting a site/building from destruction or just putting the historical objects in other places for reminiscence, while conservation was associated with maintaining and enhancing the inherent value of the concerned site/building. The Old Course, which was built in pre-First World War time, had all along been well-maintained as well as possessed rich natural, historical and cultural heritages, and was worthy of conservation as a ‘living’ heritage. The Site should be zoned for the purpose of cultural heritage conservation;

- (c) in the TPB hearing held in June 2023, the Government responded that the heritage conservation policy in Hong Kong focused on historical buildings/structures, and there was no policy to conserve cultural landscape in Hong Kong. That was incorrect because that was not what was laid down in the law. For example, the Shaw Studios Compound was graded as a whole (including the site and the buildings) having regard to its historical and cultural value;

- (d) the role of the Board was to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community through the process of guiding and controlling the development and use of land. On the safety aspect, he was

currently engaged in various hospital development projects and was worried that the proposed public housing development would result in adverse traffic impact in the area as the design flow to capacity (DFC) ratio of the crucial Tai Tau Leng Roundabout had already reached 0.95 in the peak hours, i.e. with less than 10% buffer, where there was frequently serious traffic congestion. Traffic congestion in the area would cause a delay in emergency services to NDH, and some patients might die because they did not receive timely medical treatment. On the convenience and general welfare aspects, it would be unfair for the residents of the proposed public housing since it was difficult for them to conveniently get to work and back home in future because of the frequent and serious traffic congestion in the area. It was queried how the Board could promote the safety, convenience and general welfare of the community by agreeing to develop public housing at the Site;

- (e) he strongly supported the Government's policy of developing more public housing and had in the past provided a lot of advice on various public housing projects. However, priorities should be accorded to other more suitable land supply options, such as developing brownfield sites, sites identified under Land Sharing Pilot Scheme, sites in NM, etc. He mentioned that the total area in the NM was 31,230 ha while the total area adopted in the NM Strategy was only 30,000 ha. There was an additional 1,230 ha of land and there was no rationale to disturb the Old Course. As sufficient land had been identified by the Government for housing development, it was not necessary to take back part of FGC for public housing development;
- (f) when CEDD conducted further review for the Area, OVTs in FGC should be recorded and the potential impact on the OVTs should be properly assessed. Besides, traffic impact caused by the proposed housing development, particularly on the operation of NDH, should be comprehensively assessed as NDH would be an important hospital in the Northern New Territories, prior to the completion of the new hospital in Kwu Tung North New Development Area; and

- (g) it was advised that when the OZP was submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval, CE in C should be advised to consider/take note that (i) sufficient land had been identified, particularly in NM, for housing and other developments; (ii) hospital development was very important to the society and precautionary principle should be adopted to ensure that there was no adverse traffic impact on the operation of NDH as well as its expansion currently under construction; and (iii) the Site should be rezoned for cultural heritage conservation in view of its unique historical and cultural heritages. The Site was no longer a short to medium housing site due to the ongoing JR.

48. With the aid of visualiser, Mr Lam Kwok Kwong Paul made the following main points:

- (a) he had worked in the field of land development for many years and was experienced in conducting traffic impact assessments;
- (b) it was noted that vehicular movement/circulation at roundabouts was not properly analysed in the TTIA conducted by CEDD;
- (c) the concepts of traffic control system should be noted. ‘Spacing (in metres)’/‘headway (in seconds)’ referred to the distance between the front of the car in front and the front of the car behind while ‘clearance (in metres)’/ ‘gap (in seconds)’ referred to the distance between the rear of the car in front and the front of the car behind. Sufficient clearance/gap was required for vehicles entering roundabouts;
- (d) according to the TTIA, under the reference case (i.e. without the proposed public housing development) in the design year of 2032, the DFC ratio of Tai Tau Leng Roundabout (the Roundabout) was 0.77, which was very poor, in the morning peak hours. However, the TTIA had not analysed the vehicular movement/circulation at the Roundabout and whether there was sufficient clearance/gap for vehicles entering the Roundabout. For

example, with regard to the vehicular movement within the Roundabout, there were about 1,180 and 2,020 vehicles per hour at the Po Shek Wu Road southbound and the Fanling Highway eastbound respectively, which meant that one vehicle would pass through the Po Shek Wu Road southbound and the Fanling Highway eastbound within the Roundabout in four seconds or less than three seconds respectively, which was practically difficult for drivers to enter the Roundabout. For a more specific analysis, there was one outer lane and one inside lane within the Roundabout. For vehicles passing through Po Shek Wu Road southbound within the Roundabout, if all drivers followed the proper lane, the breakdown of the 1,180 vehicles should be 395 vehicles from Fanling Highway eastbound moving from the inside lane to the outer lane towards the NDH direction while 785 vehicles from Fan Kam Road northbound would move from the outer lane to exit the Roundabout towards Fanling Highway. 785 vehicles per hour would therefore be crossing the entry point of Po Shek Wu Road southbound within the Roundabout with the headway of 4.58 seconds (i.e. 3,600 seconds divided by 785 vehicles), which was just enough for one vehicle to safely enter the Roundabout. In such case, when there were 1,065 vehicles per hour moving on Po Shek Wu Road and waiting for entering the Roundabout, only 785 vehicles out of the 1,065 vehicles were able to enter the Roundabout and the remaining 280 vehicles would still be waiting on Po Shek Wu Road. Impatient drivers who forced their way to enter the Roundabout might cause accidents at the Roundabout;

- (e) according to the TTIA, under the design case (i.e. with the proposed public housing development) in the design year of 2032, the DFC ratio of the Roundabout would reach 0.95 on average in the morning peak hours. Po Shek Wu Road southbound within the Roundabout had 1,640 vehicles per hour. Based on similar calculation with the revised figures, 1,070 vehicles per hour would be crossing the entry point of Po Shek Wu Road southbound, with the headway reduced to 3.37 seconds, which was extremely difficult, if not impossible, for vehicles coming from Po Shek Wu Road to enter the Roundabout, resulting in tail back and traffic congestion; and

- (f) a revised TTIA should be conducted for the proposed “U” zoning which was intended for public housing development. A Sphere of Influence (SoI) near NDH should be established. Such SoI should cover all intersections on Fan Kam road (the section between Po Kin Road and the Roundabout), plus all intersections along Po Kin road. A threshold should be established and no development and construction activities should be allowed if the threshold was exceeded. Besides, if it was decided to use DFC ratio as a threshold, the highest DFC ratio should not be more than 0.85 for all intersections within the SoI. With regard to the Roundabout which was a principal access to NDH, a more detailed study should be carried out when the DFC ratio exceeded 0.80. It was also suggested that the requirement of a SoI analysis should be adopted for all new hospitals or medical facilities.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 5-minute break. Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left this session of the meeting during the break.]

49. As the presentations of the further representers and/or their representatives in this session 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 further representers, 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.

Traffic Aspect

50. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the TTIA was an important consideration in rezoning the Site to “U”, and whether there would be any changes to the land uses of the Site under the “U” zoning which might induce additional traffic flow, resulting in adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas and bringing about safety problems to the general public;

- (b) whether there was any adverse traffic impact on the operation of NDH when special/major events were held in FGC; and
- (c) noting that some further representers had grave concerns on the potential traffic impact on the operation of NDH, details of the location of the proposed ingress/egress of the NDH expansion site, and whether the TTIA had taken into account the location of the proposed ingress/egress of the NDH expansion site and the traffic impact caused by the NDH expansion.

51. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) the TTIA under the Technical Study was conducted based on the scenario that the Site was proposed for public housing development. The Government had openly committed that no construction works for the proposed public housing development would be carried out before the long-term zoning for the Site was confirmed. In that regard, a new TTIA for the “U” zoning was not required. Besides, the Site had been opened for public use as a park for passive recreational activities and the original car park facilities had been retained in terms of usage though under a different management mode. Since the current as-built condition of the Site remained unchanged, there would not be any additional traffic flow nor any changes to the background traffic data. Therefore, it was anticipated that there would not be any major changes to the traffic conditions of the Site and the surrounding areas under the “U” zoning; and
- (b) when there were one-off/short-term major/special events held at FGC, temporary traffic management measures would be arranged to cater for the additional traffic, e.g. temporary road closure/traffic diversion. The Police and the Transport Department had advised that there were no major traffic problems associated with the holding of major/special events at FGC on the surrounding areas, including NDH, in the past. HKGC had previously

mentioned that they had rich experience in holding major/special events at FGC and if needed, some fairways could be temporarily used for car parking.

52. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N, CEDD, explained that two general vehicular ingresses/egresses of the NDH expansion site were proposed at Po Kin Road and Po Ping Road while a new ambulance ingress/egress was proposed at Fan Kam Road. The TTIA would be reviewed and updated to take into account the latest information on the location of the vehicular ingresses/egresses of the NDH expansion site.

Social Sustainability/Cultural Heritage

53. A Member asked how the elements of social sustainability/cultural heritage (such as the cultural value of FGC as a whole) were considered under the proposed “U” zoning. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, made the following main points:

- (a) under the Technical Study, CEDD had conducted the EIA which included a cultural heritage impact assessment, ecological impact assessment and other assessments for the Area; and
- (b) taking into account the need for CEDD to conduct the review as well as the uncertainty in the status of the DEP’s approval of the EIA report due to the ongoing JR proceedings, the proposed “U” zoning was considered appropriate for the Site. The “U” zone was an interim zoning which did not determine nor reflect the permanent zoning/development for the Site at the juncture. It would serve as a stopgap arrangement to provide a buffer period as well as to allow time for CEDD to conduct review with room to take into account the outcome of the JR. It had the flexibility to cater properly for the range of possible scenarios that might result upon the determination of the JR.

Sponge City Concept

54. A Member asked how the sponge city concept would be adopted at the Site. In

response, Mr Gavin C.P. Wong, CE/N, CEDD, said that CEDD was fully aware that one of the EIA approval conditions was the application of the sponge city concept for any housing development at the Site. Under the CEDD's upcoming review, the application of the sponge city concept would be duly considered. For the public housing project, CEDD would liaise with the HD in the design of the public housing to incorporate appropriate sponge city elements. For other public works such as road works, sponge city elements, such as porous pavements, would be adopted to enhance surface runoff infiltration. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, supplemented that the sponge city concept was related to appropriate incorporation of sponge city design elements in the new developments to withstand the extreme weather conditions and there was no presumption against development.

“U” Zoning and Golf Course Use

55. Noting that some further representers requested retaining the golf course use at the Site/the Area, a Member asked whether there was any relationship between the “U” zoning and its use as a golf course. Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, said that the Government had announced that there was no intention to use the Area as a public golf course. On 1.9.2023, the Area was reverted to the Government and was under the management of the LCSD. Starting from 4.9.2023, the Site had been opened for public use as a park (the public park) with various facilities including an inclusive park for pets, a walking trail, etc. The remaining part of the Area would be opened in phases at later stages. To facilitate the hosting of two international golf tournaments at FGC, the public park was temporarily closed between 11.9.2023 until mid-November 2023 and the Area was lent to HKGC. Although from the planning perspective ‘golf course’ was a use always permitted in the “U” zone under the covering Notes of the OZP, whether the Site/the Area would be used as a golf course was the decision of the Government as the landlord. Rezoning the Site to “U” and whether the Site/the Area would be used as a golf course were two separate matters.

OVTs

56. Noting that the EIA report did not cover any analysis on the potential OVTs, a Member asked whether an analysis on the potential OVTs would be conducted at the current stage given that the Area had been reverted to the Government, and if affirmative, what the timetable for completion of the analysis would be and whether the analysis on the potential

OVTs would be taken into account in the upcoming CEDD's review.

57. In response, Mr Anthony K.O. Luk, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD, said that HKGC's representatives had mentioned in the morning session of the hearing on the day that they had submitted a tree survey report on the recommendation of 222 potentially registrable OVTs to the Tree Management Office (TMO) of DEVB for consideration. In accordance with relevant guidelines, TMO together with LCSD would scrutinise the tree survey report, assess the health and physical condition of each individual selected tree and decide whether the recommended trees should be recorded in the Register of OVTs. There was no programme for completion of such assessment. When CEDD commenced the review, the latest progress of the assessment of the potential OVTs would be taken into account. Mr Timothy John Peirson-Smith, the representative of F51 and F110, clarified that the tree survey report on the recommendation of the potentially registrable OVTs was not submitted by HKGC. It was submitted by Mr Jenkins Alexander Michael Collier (F110), as an individual, and Professor L.M. Chu, as the president of the Hong Kong Institute of Horticultural Science.

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

59. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.