

**Minutes of 1326th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 18.10.2024**

Present

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

Chairperson

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Elton C.K. Lau (a.m.)

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung (p.m.)

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Donna Y.P. Tam

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Vice-chairperson

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Ben S.S. Lui

Dr Venus Y.H. Lun

Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui

Mr Rocky L.K. Poon

Dr Tony C.M. Ip

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee (a.m.)
Ms M.L. Leung (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms Bonnie K.C. Lee (a.m.)
Mr Kenny C.H. Lau (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1325th Meeting held on 13.9.2024

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The draft minutes of the 1325th meeting were confirmed without amendment.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Approval of Draft Outline Zoning Plans and Development Scheme Plan

2. The Secretary reported that the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) approved the draft San Tin Technopole Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) (renumbered as S/STT/2), the draft Mai Po and Fairview Park OZP (renumbered as S/YL-MP/8), the draft Ngau Tam Mei OZP (renumbered as S/YL-NTM/14), the draft Tseung Kwan O OZP (renumbered as S/TKO/30) and the draft Urban Renewal Authority Kwun Tong Town Centre – Main Site Development Scheme Plan (DSP) (renumbered as S/K14S/URA1/4) on 17.9.2024, and approved the draft Mid-levels East OZP (renumbered as S/H12/14) on 24.9.2024 under section 9(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The approval of the first three OZPs was notified in the Gazette on 20.9.2024, that of the Tseung Kwan O OZP and the DSP on 27.9.2024, and that of the Mid-levels East OZP on 10.10.2024.

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that on 11.9.2024, the Secretary for Development referred the approved Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TP/30 and the approved Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/39 to the Town Planning Board for amendment under section 12(1A)(a)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the OZPs was notified in the Gazette on

20.9.2024.

(iii) Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations on Draft Outline Zoning Plans

4. The Secretary reported that the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-KTS/21 was agreed by Members on 19.9.2024 by circulation. She briefly introduced that on 31.5.2024, the draft Kwu Tung South OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the 2-month exhibition period, nine valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the valid representations was recommended to be considered by the full Town Planning Board (the full Board) collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board of the draft Kwu Tung South OZP was scheduled for today's meeting.

5. The item was also to seek Members' agreement on the hearing arrangement for consideration of representations in respect of the draft Nam Sang Wai OZP No. S/YL-NSW/9. The Secretary briefly introduced that on 12.7.2024, the draft Nam Sang Wai OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, eight valid representations were received. In view of the similar nature of the representations, the hearing of the valid representations was recommended to be considered by the full Board collectively in one group. To ensure efficiency of the hearing, a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time would be allotted to each representer in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations by the full Board of the draft Nam Sang Wai OZP was tentatively scheduled for December 2024.

6. The Board agreed to the hearing arrangement in paragraph 5 above.

(iv) New Town Planning Appeal Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 3 of 2024

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in “Green Belt” Zone, Lot 391 S.A in D.D. 28, Lung Mei, Tai Po, New Territories

Application No. A/NE-TK/793

7. The Secretary reported that a Notice of Appeal was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 11.9.2024 against the decision of the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 12.7.2024 to reject on review an application (No. A/NE-TK/793) for a proposed house (New Territories Exempted House – Small House). The application site fell within an area zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) on the approved Ting Kok Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-TK/19.

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

(a) the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone which was primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. There was no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from this planning intention; and

(b) land was still available within the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone of Lung Mei and Tai Mei Tuk which was primarily intended for Small House development. It was considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services.

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

[Professor Simon K.L. Wong joined the meeting during reporting of the appeal case.]

(v) Town Planning Appeal Decision Received

Town Planning Appeal No. 2 of 2023

Proposed Temporary Open Storage for a Period of 3 Years and Filling of Land in “Green Belt” Zone, Lots 2273, 2277 and 2278 in D.D.102, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long

Application No. A/YL-NTM/447

10. The Secretary reported that the subject appeal was against the Town Planning Board (the Board/TPB)’s decision on 24.2.2023 to reject on review an application (No. A/YL-NTM/447) for proposed temporary open storage for a period of 3 years and filling of land at Lots 2273, 2277 and 2278 in D.D. 102, Ngau Tam Mei, Yuen Long (the Site). The Site fell within “Green Belt” zone on the approved Ngau Tam Mei Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-NTM/12 which was in force at the time of section 16 and section 17 applications, and had been rezoned to “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”) and “Open Space” (“O”) on the approved San Tin Technopole OZP No. S/STT/2 currently in force.

11. The appeal was heard by the Town Planning Appeal Board (TPAB) on 17.5.2024. During the hearing, the Appellant expressly affirmed to TPAB that it had decided not to proceed with the applied open storage use in Lots 2277 and 2278, and only to store office items and homewares in a structure on Lot 2273 which was claimed by the Appellant as an “existing use”. On 3.10.2024, the appeal was dismissed by TPAB and the reasons were summarised below:

- (a) the Appellant claimed that “existing use” was not interpreted correctly during the application process. TPAB considered that the Appellant had made significant changes to the application during the hearing, and that it was not in a position to handle the determination of fact, i.e. whether the storage use within the structure could be considered as “existing use”;
- (b) the Appellant argued that TPB failed to take into account the Government’s development plan for the area as the Site had been rezoned to “R(A)1” and “O” on the extant San Tin Technopole OZP, and the Appellant’s revised

proposal should be more justifiable in land use terms under the new zonings. TPAB considered there was no meaning in arguing about this as TPB did not know that the Appellant would make significant changes to its application and would not proceed with filling of land at the time when its decision was made. TPAB noted that the new San Tin Technopole OZP was gazetted after TPB's consideration of the concerned section 16 and section 17 applications. While TPAB was entitled to consider the latest circumstances in exercising its independent judgment, it would not be appropriate for TPAB to act as a first-instance decision-maker for the application if the Appellant only made significant changes to its proposal during the planning appeal stage. The best way forward was for the Appellant to submit a new application incorporating its amended proposal for TPB's consideration under the latest planning circumstances; and

- (c) the Appellant contended that the applied use had insignificant impact on the environment. TPAB considered that whether the applied use would have insignificant impact on the environment was a determination of fact. In any case, it was not an issue that TPAB should deal with at that stage.

12. In conclusion, TPAB considered that TPB did not make any errors in its decision regarding the Appellant's original application, and that the Appellant should be given the opportunity to submit a new application with the revised proposal to TPB for consideration, based on the latest OZP.

13. Members noted the decision of TPAB.

(vi) Appeal Statistics

14. The Secretary reported that as at 9.10.2024, four cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning).

15. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	45
Dismissed	179
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	214
Yet to be Heard	4
Decision Outstanding	0
<hr/>	
Total	442

Procedural Matters

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Secretary for Development under Sections 8(7) and 8(8)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/22 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval
(TPB Paper No. 10985)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

16. The Secretary reported that the major amendment on the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP) involved the rezoning of a site on Pok Fu Lam Road from “Green Belt”, “Residential (Group C)6” and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Global Innovation Centre” to facilitate the development of a Global Innovation Centre by the University of Hong Kong (HKU) for deep technology research (Amendment Item A). Representations had been submitted by HKU (R1), The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (R264), Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (R265), The Conservancy Association (R3637) and MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R3662). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu (<i>Vice-chairperson</i>)	- co-owning with spouse properties in Pok Fu Lam;
--	---

- Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong - being an independent non-executive director of MTRCL;
- Mr K.W. Leung - being a former executive committee member of HKBWS and a former chairman of Crested Bulbul Club Committee under HKBWS;
- Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;
- Professor Roger C.K. Chan - being an Honorary Associate Professor of the Department of Urban Planning and Design of HKU;
- Dr Venus Y.H. Lun - being a special project director of a research and development centre which was hosted by HKU and two other universities, and an external examiner of one of HKU's programmes;
- Mr Ben S.S. Lui - co-owning with spouse a property in Pok Fu Lam, his spouse owning a car parking space in Pok Fu Lam, and he and his spouse being directors of a company owning properties and car parking spaces in Pok Fu Lam;
- Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui - being an Adjunct Professor of Department of Social Work and Social Administration of HKU, and having close relative living in Pok Fu Lam;
- Dr Tony C.M. Ip - being an Adjunct Associate Professor of Department of Biological Sciences of HKU,

and having current business dealings with
The Conservancy Association;

- Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donations from the Kadoorie family and being acquainted with some representers;
- Professor B.S. Tang - being a Honorary Professor of Department of Urban Planning and Design and Department of Real Estate and Construction of HKU;
- Professor Simon K.L. Wong - his spouse being a programme director of Master in Statistics of HKU;
- Mr Simon Y.S. Wong - being a close relative of some representers;
and
- Mr Derrick S.M. Yip - being a consultant of a football league which had potential collaboration with HKU and a member of the Advisory Board of the Gleneagles Hospital which was partnering with HKU to provide medical services.

17. Members noted that the Vice-chairperson, Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Mr Ben S.S. Lui, Dr Venus Y.H. Lun, Professor Bernadette W.S. Tsui and Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, other Members who had declared interests relating to the amendment item and/or representers could stay in the meeting.

18. The Secretary briefly introduced TPB Paper No. 10985. On 22.3.2024, the draft OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the 2-month exhibition period of the draft OZP, 3,678 valid

representations were received. Consideration of the representations by the Town Planning Board (the Board) was tentatively scheduled for November 2024. Under section 8(4)(a) of the Ordinance, the Board was required to submit the draft OZP together with the schedule of the representations to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval within 5 months after the 2-month plan exhibition period, i.e. on or before 22.10.2024, unless the Secretary for Development (SDEV) agreed to extend the specified period. The Ordinance provided that SDEV might extend the 5-month period up to three times, for 2 months each time. Given the large number of representations received and the complexity of the issues raised in relation to the location, development intensity, visual, traffic, landscape, environmental, slope safety and public health impacts, etc. of the proposed Global Innovation Centre, more time was required for relevant parties to review the concerned issues. The representations would only be ready for the Board's consideration in early November 2024, and it was envisaged that a few days would be required to complete the hearing process and the deliberation process would only be completed by end November 2024. As such, the aforementioned original submission deadline of 22.10.2024 could not be met in any event. After the Board's consideration of the representations, time was also required to prepare the submission to the CE in C. It was anticipated that there would be insufficient time to complete the above process should extension of the specified period be sought once for 2 months only (i.e. on or before 22.12.2024). Hence, it was necessary to seek SDEV's agreement for two extensions of the statutory time limit for a total of 4 months.

19. The Board agreed that SDEV's agreement should be sought to extend the time limit for submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for approval for a period of 4 months from 22.10.2024 to 22.2.2025 under sections 8(7) and 8(8)(a) of the Ordinance.

Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of the Draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-KTS/21

(TPB Paper No. 10983)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

20. The Secretary reported that a representation was submitted by The Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas) (R9), a subsidiary of Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with HLD;
and

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip - being the vice-president cum co-head of Public Policy Institute of Our Hong Kong Foundation which had received donation from HLD before.

21. Members noted that Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho would join the meeting after this item. As the interest of Mr Ryan M.K. Ip was indirect, Members agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

22. The Chairperson said that notification had been given to the 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 representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their absence.

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE)

Ms Lucille L.S. Leung - Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (STP/FSYLE)

Representer and Representers' Representatives

R1 – Kyland Investments Limited

Mr To Lap Kee]
Ms Lam Tsz Kwan] Representer's Representatives
Mr Mak Chi Wung]

R2 – Elmtree Worldwide Limited

Ms Lam Tsz Kwan]
Mr To Lap Kee] Representer's Representatives
Mr Mak Chi Wung]

R8 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

R9 – Towngas

Mr Cheng Wa - Representer's Representative

24. The Chairperson extended a welcome. She then briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representer and representers' representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer

would be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the presenter and the presenters' representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the presenter and the presenters' representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives, the presenter or the presenters' representatives. After the Q&A session, the government representatives, the presenter and the presenters' representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would then deliberate on the representations in their absence and inform the presenters of the Board's decision in due course.

25. The Chairperson invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lucille L.S. Leung, STP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the amendment items on the draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (the draft OZP), the grounds/views of the presenters and PlanD's views on the representations as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10983 (the Paper). The amendment items on the draft OZP were mainly to reflect two section 12A (s.12A) applications agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board, including:

- (a) Item A – rezoning of a site to the south of Kam Hang Road and east of Hang Tau Road (Item A Site) from “Recreation” (“REC”) and “Agriculture” (“AGR”) to “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) subject to a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 2.4 and a maximum building height (BH) of 72mPD in order to take forward the RNTPC's decision on 27.10.2023 to agree to a s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/17 for a proposed private residential development; and
- (b) Item B – rezoning of a site to the north of Kam Hang Road (Item B Site) from “REC” to “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) subject to a maximum BH of 8 storeys (excluding basement) to take forward the RNTPC's decision on 27.10.2023 to agree to a s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/16 for a proposed privately-operated 150-bed residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) with retail shops on the ground floor.

26. The Chairperson then invited the representer and the representers' representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R1 – Kyland Investments Limited

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

- (a) R1 (Kyland Investments Limited) and R2 (Elmtree Worldwide Limited) were the owners of the private lots within Items A and B Sites. They were the applicants of the two agreed s.12A applications No. Y/NE-KTS/17 (for Item A) and Y/NE-KTS/16 (for Item B);
- (b) he represented R1 to make the presentation while Ms Lam Tsz Kwan would represent R2 to make the presentation. Mr Mak Chi Wung was the property development consultant of R1 and R2. They supported Items A and B and hoped that the draft OZP would be approved. Once the draft OZP was approved, R1 and R2 would proceed with the subsequent land exchange applications to facilitate early implementation of the proposed private residential development at Item A Site and the proposed RCHE at Item B Site;
- (c) Item A was to take forward the agreed s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/17 to rezone Item A Site to "R(B)" for a proposed private residential development. The proposed private residential development at Item A Site was to echo with the Government's development plan under the Northern Metropolis Development Strategy as well as the Government's policy direction on increasing housing supply;
- (d) the Kwu Tung area was undergoing transformation. Further north across Fanling Highway was the Kwu Tung North New Development Area (KTN NDA) which would be developed as a development node with medium to high-density residential developments. Locating to the south of KTN NDA across Fanling Highway, the northern part of Kwu Tung South was gradually

transforming into a medium-density residential neighbourhood with “Comprehensive Development Area (1)” (“CDA(1)”) and “CDA(2)” zones subject to a maximum PR of 3. Item A Site was located to the immediate south of the said “CDA” sites. The proposed residential development at Item A Site and those medium-density “CDA” developments nearby could offer alternative housing choices to the market;

- (e) Item A Site had been part of a previous s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/14 (submitted by the same applicants of the s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/17) for rezoning Item A Site and a site to its north from mainly “REC” and “AGR” to “CDA” with a maximum PR of 3 and a maximum BH of 75mPD to facilitate two proposed residential developments. In 2020, RNTPC partially agreed to the s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/14 to rezone the northern part of the concerned application site (i.e. the current “CDA(2)” site) to “CDA” subject to the development parameters as proposed by the applicants. However, RNTPC considered that the development intensity of the southern part of the concerned application site (i.e. Item A Site) should be further reviewed taking into considerations that the site was located further away from Fanling Highway and a lower development intensity was more appropriate. In 2022, the same applicants submitted the s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/17 to rezone Item A Site to “R(B)” subject to a reduced PR of 2.4 and a reduced BH of 72mPD. Subsequently, RNTPC agreed to the s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/17 in October 2023 and the zoning amendments were submitted to the Board for consideration in 2024. It had taken about 4 years to formulate and review the development proposal, agree on the development parameters with concerned government departments, address departmental comments on the development proposal and technical assessments, and go through the statutory planning procedures. It was hoped that the proposed development at Item A Site could be implemented as early as possible;
- (f) detailed design including landscape treatment/tree preservation would be further examined at the subsequent land exchange stage;

- (g) as regards some representers' concerns on the traffic impacts brought about by the proposed developments at the roads and junctions of Kwu Tung Road, Hang Tau Road and Kam Hang Road, road improvement works including improvement of the Kam Hang Road/Kwu Tung Road and Kam Hang Road/Hang Tau Road junctions, widening of Kam Hang Road and provision of bus lay-bys at Kam Hang Road would be carried out by R1, R2 and the project proponents of the "CDA(1)" and "CDA(2)" developments to improve road capacity and enhance public transport services in the area. Since Item A Site and the nearby "CDA" sites were proposed for medium-density developments, such development scale allowed the concerned project proponents to invest in improvement works to the transport infrastructure as well as the drainage and sewerage systems in the area; and
- (h) various technical assessments on landscape, traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage and water supply aspects as well as the risk impact on the high-pressure gas pipeline had been conducted. Concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the submitted technical assessments.

R2 – Elmtree Worldwide Limited

28. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lam Tsz Kwan made the following main points:

- (a) Item B was to take forward the agreed s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/16 to rezone Item B Site to "G/IC(1)" for a proposed RCHE with retail shops on the ground floor. The retail shops could cater for the daily shopping needs of the RCHE users/visitors and the local residents;
- (b) the proposed RCHE development was in line with the Government's policy to alleviate the surging demand for RCHE places, help improve the wait-listing situation of subsidised RCHE places and provide quality living environment for the elderly. The Government had launched the "Incentive Scheme to Encourage Provision of RCHE in New Private Development" (the

Scheme) to incentivise the private developers to provide RCHEs in their new private developments. The Scheme allowed concession to exempt eligible RCHE premises from payment of land premium for various types of land transactions. The Government further enhanced the Scheme in recent years by relaxing the maximum total gross floor area (GFA) of not exceeding 5,400m² to 12,000m² or 10% of the total permissible GFA permissible under lease, whichever was the greater, to be exempted in the GFA calculation of the entire project;

- (c) surrounded by medium-density residential developments, the proposed PR of about 3 and BH of 8 storeys at Item B Site were in line with the development intensity and BH profiles descending from KTN NDA towards Kwu Tung South;
- (d) Item B Site had an area of about 1,700m². The proposed RCHE would have 8 storeys and a maximum site coverage (SC) of 46%, with supporting facilities such as car parking spaces and retail shops on the ground floor. The maximum SC of 46% referred to that of the 7-storey building on top of the 1-storey non-domestic podium, the calculation of which was in compliance with the requirements stipulated in the First Schedule of the Building (Planning) Regulations;
- (e) with regard to the indicative development scheme of the proposed RCHE, private open space would be provided on the flat roof of 1/F. With stepped building design, garden terraces would also be provided on 5/F and 7/F, providing a quality living environment for the elderly residents. The dormitory portion on 7/F was 24m in height as measured from the ground floor. Such design was in compliance with the statutory requirements. The Social Welfare Department (SWD) and the Fire Services Department (FSD) had no objection to the indicative development scheme submitted under the s.12A application. In any case, the design and construction of the proposed RCHE would have to comply with all relevant licensing and statutory requirements in future;

- (f) the project proponents would provide a new road junction to the southeast of Item B Site for an additional village access to Kam Hang Road, which would help improve the accessibility to those domestic structures at the east;
- (g) having considered that the nearest retail facility (i.e. Kwu Tung Market Shopping Centre) was located more than 900m away from Item B Site and that only limited amount of GFA for retail use would likely be provided in the nearby “CDA(1)” development, the proposed retail shops on the ground floor of the RCHE could cater for the daily shopping needs of the RCHE users/visitors and the local residents within walking distance;
- (h) in spite of the planned multi-welfare services complex with 2,000 RCHE places in KTN NDA, the proposed privately-operated RCHE at Item B Site could enhance market diversity, offering alternative choices for different users in the community;
- (i) various technical assessments on landscape, traffic, environmental, sewerage, drainage and water supply aspects as well as the risk impact on the high-pressure gas pipeline had been conducted. Concerned government departments had no adverse comments on the submitted technical assessments;
- (j) after the OZP amendments stage, there were land exchange procedures which would involve local consultation; and
- (k) the Board should agree to the OZP amendments.

R9 – Towngas

29. Mr Cheng Wa made the following main points:

- (a) since the proposed developments at Items A and B Sites were in close vicinity of a high-pressure gas pipeline underneath Kam Hang Road, the project proponents should conduct Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) to evaluate

the potential risk based on the forecasted ultimate population and determine the necessary mitigation measures if required;

- (b) noting from PlanD that QRAs had been conducted by the project proponents in support of the two s.12A applications in relation to Item A and Item B respectively, the project proponents of Items A and B were requested to provide Towngas with the copies of the submitted QRA reports for record purpose; and
- (c) the project proponents should consult Towngas in the design stage and closely co-ordinate with Towngas during the construction stage to ensure that appropriate protective measures would be carried out.

R8 – Mary Mulvihill

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

- (a) she opposed Items A and B and the amendments to the Notes of the OZP;

Item A

- (b) in considering the previous s.12A application No. Y/NE-KTS/14, Members had reservation on the proposed rezoning and expressed the views that whilst the proposed residential development was considered not entirely incompatible with the surrounding uses, the proposed development intensity with a PR of 3 and a BH of 75mPD might not be compatible with the immediate surrounding area to the south of Kam Hang Road which was predominantly rural in nature with low-rise and low-density domestic structures and might cause potential visual impact. It was queried why the current proposal with reduction in PR of merely 0.6 and no amendment to the BH of 75mPD could be acceptable when compared to the previous s.12A application;

- (c) it was indicated in the Paper that 112 trees were proposed to be felled. There were no details about the number and location of trees at Item A Site in the RNTPC paper. While the 1:1 tree compensation ratio would be adopted, the compensatory trees included palm trees which were classified as ‘plants’, not ‘trees, and the compensatory trees were usually ornamental in nature;
- (d) the proposed residential development at Item A Site would create a new community and there would be a need for recreational facilities. The original “REC” zone was intended to meet such a need. There was no detail on how the rezoning of Item A Site from “REC” to “R(B)” could meet the recreation need of the area;
- (e) the project proponents were misleading in saying that the proposed residential development was a response to cater for the urgent need of housing. The growing number of vacant residential units in the market had proven that the proposed residential development at Item A Site was about a property investment initiative rather than meeting the genuine need for homes;
- (f) the project proponents claimed that the proposed residential development would provide a high-quality living environment. It was doubtful how an average unit size of 66m² could achieve a high-quality living environment;

Item B

- (g) while noting that the proposed RCHE would be standalone, it was doubtful why the GFA of it was to be exempted. There was also objection to the inclusion of a shopping mall on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE. Approving such a proposal with significant percentage of GFA dedicated for commercial use would set a precedent that led to reduction in the amount of GFA for community services in “G/IC” zone. That was unacceptable, in particular in districts like Kwu Tung South with significant shortfalls in various GIC facilities such as child care centre, pre-school rehabilitation services, day rehabilitation services, etc. The RCHE building should be dedicated entirely for GIC uses;

- (h) the proposed RCHE development at Item B Site appeared to be developing a mini shopping mall and achieving a higher PR and BH. Item B Site was at an inferior location to Item A Site. Providing a RCHE at Item B Site was not appropriate. The elderly residents at Item B Site could only visit the podium-roof open space. There was a large at-grade open space surrounded by trees at Item A Site. Locating the RCHE at Item A Site would allow the elderly residents to enjoy the at-grade open space;
- (i) the retail shops at Item B Site would attract vehicles and on-street parking that would have negative impact on the RCHE regarding air pollution and noise disturbance. The retail shops as well as restaurants on the ground floor would generate hygiene problem such as infestation of rodents;
- (j) the SC of 46% for the proposed RCHE was doubtful as the podium had already covered most of Item B Site;
- (k) the proposed dormitory on 7/F was not permitted under the restriction of “24m in height” for RCHE as stipulated under relevant regulations. The section plan provided by the project proponents indicated that the RCHE building would have a height of about 37m;
- (l) allowing a RCHE development with a BH exceeding 24m would encourage private developers to develop high-rise RCHE building. For example, a s.12A application No. Y/K14S/3 for proposed hotel development and social welfare facilities in Kwun Tong was submitted to the Board, with RCHE premises up to 20/F. Locating RCHE premises at high levels would pose significant safety problem. In the event of fire or other emergencies, the fire and rescue personnel had to take long time to rescue or evacuate elderly residents, putting the safety of the elderly residents at risk. As a related issue, the public currently had no right to raise objection to or provide comment on s.12A applications which had undermined the public consultation procedures;

Items A and B

- (m) a considerable amount of government land (GL) (about 2,500m² in total) was involved in Items A and B Sites. It was not sure how the community would benefit from the ceding of GL for the two proposed developments;

Amendments to the Notes of the OZP

- (n) the amendments to the Notes in relation to the “G/IC(1)” zone for Item B and the “V” zone (i.e. moving some uses from Column 2 to Column 1 and adding new use to Column 2) based on the latest Master Schedule of Notes to Statutory Plans deprived the community of having a say in both the location and design of the concerned facilities, i.e. ‘Shop and Services’ in the “G/IC(1)” zone and ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’, ‘Public Convenience’ and ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ in the “V” zone;
- (o) deletion of the restriction clause on filling of pond and/or excavation of land in the Notes for “Open Space” (“O”) and “REC” zones would allow unfettered excavation of land within these zones. By approving such deletion, the Board would relinquish its role in monitoring developments that could have devastating impact on the land and natural resources; and

Others

- (p) while there were representations from the representatives of Kam Tsin Village Affairs Committee and Hang Tau Village Affairs Committee, no representation from the North District Council or Sheung Shui District Rural Committee had been received, which reflected that district council/rural committee no longer made any effort to understand the issues in the communities they were supposed to represent.

31. The Chairperson clarified that the s.12A application No. Y/K14S/3 mentioned by R8 was yet to be submitted to the Board for consideration. While there was no provision under the amended Town Planning Ordinance for the public to provide comment on s.12A

applications, if a s.12A application was agreed by the Board, the proposal would eventually be incorporated into the relevant statutory plan in the form of amendment item for the Board's consideration under the plan-making process. Subject to the Board's agreement, the draft plan incorporating the proposed amendments would then be exhibited for public inspection for 2 months and the public could make representations in respect of the amendment items on the draft plan. Hearing meeting would be held to consider the representation(s).

32. As the presentations of PlanD's representative, the representer and the representers' representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions to the representer and the representers' representatives and/or the government representatives. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board nor for cross-examination between parties.

Site Selection for the Proposed RCHE

33. Two Members raised the following questions to R1/R2's representatives:

- (a) the rationale for locating the proposed RCHE at Item B Site, and whether considerations had been given to integrating the proposed RCHE into the proposed residential development at Item A Site; and
- (b) noting that Item B Site was located at Kam Hang Road which was far away from railway station/bus stops and might be inconvenient for family members to visit their elders residing in the RCHE, whether considerations had been given to addressing such issue.

34. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, made the following points:

- (a) in light of the ageing population problem in Hong Kong, the Government had adopted multi-pronged approach to increase RCHE places. Apart from the provision of subsidised RCHEs, the Government had stepped up measures to encourage private developers to provide RCHEs in their developments.

Since the proposed RCHE would be privately-operated and self-financing, due regard had been given to the location of the proposed RCHE during formulation of the scheme. Should the proposed RCHE be integrated into the proposed residential development at Item A Site, issues such as interface between the RCHE and private residential use, design of internal vehicular access to the RCHE and the residential portion, and management and maintenance responsibility of the RCHE would need to be carefully considered. In view of the complexity of the above issues, it was considered more appropriate to develop a free-standing RCHE building at a separate site, i.e. Item B Site. Item B Site, with an area of about 1,700m² and private lots owned by R1 and R2, was considered suitable for RCHE development; and

- (b) whilst Item B Site at Kam Hang Road was currently relatively inaccessible, with the implementation of road improvement works (i.e. upgrading and widening of Kam Hang Road and provision of bus lay-bys on Kam Hang Road) by the project proponents of Items A and B Sites as well as the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” sites, the road capacity of Kam Hang Road and public transport services such as bus and mini-bus services from Item B Site to Kwu Tung Station would be greatly enhanced.

Height Requirement for the Proposed RCHE

35. Noting R8’s claim that the height of the proposed RCHE did not meet the statutory requirement of “24m in height”, a Member enquired about the interpretation of the “24m in height” requirement for RCHE.

36. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2’s representative, said that the RCHE was proposed to be situated at a height of not more than 24m above the ground floor, measuring vertically from the ground level of the RCHE building to the floor of the RCHE premises where it was situated (at 33mPD). That fully complied with the statutory requirement, and the project proponents had no intention to contravene the statutory requirement.

37. With the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD supplemented that in accordance with section 20 of Residential Care Homes (Elderly Persons) Regulation (Cap. 459A), 'no part of a RCHE shall be situated at a height more than 24m above the ground floor, measuring vertically from the ground of the building to the floor of the premises in which the RCHE is to be situated'. The ground of the building was at a level of 9mPD while the highest floor of the RCHE premises (i.e. 7/F) was at a level of 33mPD. Thus, the proposed RCHE had a height of 24m above the ground floor. SWD had no objection to the proposed RCHE at the stages of the s.12A application and OZP amendments. In any case, the design and construction of the proposed RCHE would have to comply with all relevant licencing and statutory requirements in future.

38. The Chairperson remarked that the ground of the RCHE building was at a level of 9mPD and the floor of 7/F of the RCHE premises was at a level of 33mPD. The height requirement for RCHE under Cap. 459A referred to the floor level of the RCHE premises where it was situated, not the roof level of 7/F at 36.7mPD. In that regard, 33mPD minus 9mPD equalled 24m, and hence the RCHE was situated at a height of not more than 24m.

39. A Member further enquired how the ground level would be measured if a site was not situated on flat land. In response, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that the measurement of ground level would make reference to the site formation/street level (i.e. street level of 9mPD in the present case).

Retail Shops on the Ground Floor of the Proposed RCHE

40. Noting R8's claim that restaurants located on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE might cause hygiene problems, a Member asked whether restaurants were allowed to be located on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE. In response, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that according to the Notes of the OZP for the "G/IC" zone, 'Shop and Services (on ground floor in "G/IC(1)" only)' was a Column 1 use which was always permitted while 'Eating Place' was a Column 2 use which would require planning permission from the Board. As such, the provision of restaurant at Item B Site would require section 16 application.

41. Regarding the concerns on provision of retail shops with the RCHE, the same Member enquired about the rationale for putting retail shops on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, said that some floorspace on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE would be allocated for the internal vehicular access and car parking and loading/unloading spaces, and the remaining floorspace on the ground floor was proposed for the provision of about four retail shops. The reason for proposing some small-scale retail shops at Item B Site was to serve the shopping needs of the RCHE users/visitors as well as the local residents. The retail shops would be designed with their frontages facing Kam Hang Road, minimising nuisances to the elders residing in the RCHE. Besides, the 1/F flat roof would be used to provide private open space for the elderly residents, avoiding nuisances caused by road traffic and street activities if the open space was located on the ground floor.

Targeted Service Recipients of the Proposed RCHE

42. With the growing trend of more Hong Kong elderly people choosing to retire in the Greater Bay Area cities and relatively low occupancy rate of private RCHEs in Hong Kong, a Member asked R1/R2's representatives about the targeted service recipients of the proposed RCHE. In response, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, said that there were varying standards in the service levels of private RCHEs in Hong Kong and some private RCHE operators might provide lower-quality services for lower prices. He believed that the project proponents aimed to provide elderly care services of better quality to give choices to those who could afford.

Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Developments in the Area

43. Noting that three development projects, i.e. the proposed residential development at Item A Site, the proposed RCHE development at Item B Site and the proposed comprehensive residential development at the "CDA(2)" site, would likely be implemented in tandem in the locality, a Member raised concern on the cumulative impacts brought by the proposed developments on the local neighbourhood. The Member asked R1/R2's representatives whether the project proponents of the three developments would co-ordinate among themselves on the implementation programmes and whether any mitigation measures would be carried out to minimise the nuisances to the local neighbourhood.

44. In response, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, said that the project proponents of the "CDA(2)" development were the same as those of Items A and B. The project proponents of the three development projects would draw up a co-ordinated works programme, under which road widening works of Kam Hang Road and road excavation works for laying underground utility pipelines would be better managed and co-ordinated so as to reduce the chances of repeated road excavation works and minimise the nuisances to the local neighbourhood.

Inclusion of GL in the Proposed Developments

45. In relation to a presenter's allegation that the project proponents would benefit from including some GL in their development sites, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, said that land premium would need to be paid in the land exchanges involving the inclusion of GL in the development sites.

Risk Aspect

46. Noting that R9 (Towngas) raised concern on the potential risk posed by the high-pressure gas pipeline underneath Kam Hang Road on the proposed developments at Items A and B Sites, a Member asked R1/R2's representatives how R9's concern would be addressed. In response, Mr To Lap Kee, R1/R2's representative, said that QRAs had been conducted in support of the two s.12A applications in relation to Item A and Item B respectively, and relevant government departments had no comment on the submitted QRAs. The project proponents would liaise with Towngas during the detailed planning, design and construction stages of the proposed developments. The development details and other technical aspects of the proposed developments would also be subject to the scrutiny of concerned government departments in the subsequent development stages.

47. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures for the presentation and Q&A sessions had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the representations in closed meeting and inform the presenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the presenter and the presenters' representatives and the government's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

48. The Chairperson invited views from Members. Some Members had the following views/suggestions in relation to Item B:

- (a) the idea of proposing a free-standing RCHE building at Item B Site was supported;
- (b) the design of the proposed RCHE building with private open space/terrace gardens on different floors and retail shops on the ground floor was appreciated as it could provide a more decent living environment for the elderly residents and bring convenience to the RCHE users/visitors;
- (c) while noting that 'Eating Place' was a Column 2 use within the "G/IC" zone that required planning permission from the Board, the project proponents might consider applying to the Board for providing a teahouse on the ground floor of the proposed RCHE. A teahouse was perceived as a good gathering venue for the elderly residents and their family members/visitors; and
- (d) there was concern that by putting 'Shop and Services' as a Column 1 use of the "G/IC" zone, upper floors of the proposed RCHE building could be converted to 'Shop and Services' in future and some unattractive 'Shop and Services' uses such as car repairing workshop might be permitted to be provided at Item B Site.

49. At the invitation of the Chairperson, the Secretary made the following clarifications:

- (a) according to the Notes of the draft OZP for the "G/IC" zone, 'Shop and Services (on ground floor in "G/IC(1)" only)' was a Column 1 use which was always permitted while 'Shop and Services (not elsewhere specified)' was a Column 2 use that required planning permission from the Board. It meant that 'Shop and Services' were only allowed on the ground floor at Item B Site;

- (b) according to the Definition of Terms, ‘Shop and Services’ meant any premises where goods were sold or where services were provided to visiting members of the public. It included various kinds of shops and services such as retail shop, convenient store, medical clinic, dental clinic, etc.; and
- (c) ‘car repairing workshop’ as mentioned by a Member was not a ‘Shop and Services’ use but another use which was not provided for in the “G/IC” zone.

50. The Chairperson concluded that Members generally supported or had no objection to the OZP amendments, and agreed that the OZP should not be amended to meet the adverse representations. All grounds of the representations had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the Paper as well as the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

51. After deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of **R1** on Item A and **R2** on Item B and the views provided by **R9** on Items A and B, and decided not to uphold **R3 to R8** and agreed that the draft Kwu Tung South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

- “(a) Items A and B are to take forward two section 12A (s.12A) applications which were agreed by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board) taking into consideration the compatibility of the proposed developments with the surrounding areas in terms of land use and development intensity, findings of relevant technical assessments, comments from the relevant government bureaux/departments, and all the public comments received. The amendments are considered appropriate (**R3 to R8**);
- (b) relevant technical assessments on traffic, environmental, drainage, sewerage, water supply, landscape, visual aspects and quantitative risk have been conducted under the two s.12A applications and confirmed that there is no insurmountable technical impacts arising from the proposed developments with the implementation of appropriate mitigation/improvement measures. The development details and other technical aspects of the proposed

developments would be subject to the scrutiny of concerned government departments in the subsequent development stages of land exchange application and/or building plan submission (**R3 to R8**);

- (c) the planned provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities in Kwu Tung South is generally sufficient to meet the demand of the planned population except for some GIC facilities. The provision of GIC facilities will be closely monitored by the relevant government bureaux/departments. The Government would continue adopting a multi-pronged approach to further enhance the provision of GIC facilities to serve the district needs (**R8**);
- (d) amendments to the Notes of the “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone are to take forward the RNTPC’s decision to agree to a s.12A application for a proposed residential care home for the elderly with retail shops on the ground floor. The Notes of the “G/IC” zone are revised to reflect such intention as agreed by the Board. The amendments are considered appropriate (**R8**);
- (e) incorporation of ‘Government Refuse Collection Point’ and ‘Public Convenience’ under Column 1 and ‘Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre’ under Column 2 for the Notes of the “Village Type Development” zone will streamline the provision of these common and essential facilities in village areas. The provisions of these facilities will also have to follow the relevant design guidelines and/or require planning permission from the Board (**R8**); and
- (f) the “Open Space” (“O”) and “Recreation” (“REC”) zonings are primarily intended for development. Having taken into account that there is currently no pond within the “O” zone and that the Drainage Services Department has no concern on land excavation activities within the “O” and “REC” zones from drainage perspective, it is considered that these activities would no longer pose a significant threat on the local environment in the said zones. Deletion of these clauses could help streamline planning control (**R8**).”

52. The Board also agreed that the draft OZP, together with its Notes and updated Explanatory Statement, was suitable for submission under section 8(1)(a) of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

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

[Mr Stanley T.S. Choi joined the meeting after the break.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-ST/648

Proposed House in “Village Type Development” Zone, Lot 210 S.C in D.D. 96, Chau Tau Tsuen, San Tin, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 10986)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

- | | |
|------------------------|---|
| Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo | - District Planning Officer/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (DPO/FSYLE) |
| Mr Kimson P.H. Chiu | - Senior Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East |
| Miss Karen K.Y. Chan | - Town Planner/Fanling, Sheung Shui and Yuen Long East (TP/FSYLE) |

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

55. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Karen K.Y. Chan, TP/FSYLE, PlanD briefed Members on the background of the review application including the application site (the Site) and the surrounding area, the applicant’s proposal and justifications, the decision of the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10986. As there had been no major change in planning circumstances since the consideration of the section 16 application, PlanD maintained its

previous view of not supporting the application.

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

57. A Member noted that the existing house at the Site was not a surveyed squatter structure according to the Lands Department (LandsD)'s record, yet the applicant claimed that the existing house at the Site had not been properly surveyed/recorded in the squatter control survey in the early 1980s. The Member enquired whether there was any mechanism to verify the existence of the house at that time in the 1980s.

58. In response, Miss Josephine Y.M. Lo, DPO/FSYLE, PlanD said that the applicant claimed in his written submission that the existing house at the Site had not been properly surveyed/recorded in the squatter control survey in the early 1980s. LandsD's views on the status of the existing structure at the Site were sought. According to LandsD, the 1982 Squatter Control Survey was conducted by the Housing Department before the whole squatter control responsibility was transferred to LandsD. That said, it was not under LandsD's purview to survey/record any existing development at that time in the 1980s, and LandsD was not in a position to comment on whether the existing structure at the Site had not been properly surveyed at that time as claimed by the applicant. As per LandsD's record, the existing structure at the Site was not a surveyed squatter structure. Regardless of whether the existing structure at the Site was a surveyed squatter structure or not, the Site was an Old Schedule Agricultural Lot (the Lot) held under the Block Government Lease which contained the restriction that no structures were allowed to be erected without prior approval of the Government, and the existing structure also encroached onto government land (GL). As advised by LandsD, erecting unauthorised structure at the Lot and illegally occupying GL were subject to enforcement actions by LandsD.

59. Members had no further question to raise. The Chairperson thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

60. The Chairperson invited views from the Members. Members generally agreed with RNTPC's decision to reject the application.

61. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application for the following reason:

“the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone which is primarily to designate both existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion. Land within “V” zone is primarily intended for development of Small Houses by indigenous villagers. No strong planning justification has been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention.”

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 11:05 a.m.]

62. The meeting was resumed at 1:30 p.m.

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

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

Chairperson

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Professor Roger C.K. Chan

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho

Mr Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan

Dr C.M. Cheng

Mr Daniel K.W. Chung

Mr Ryan M.K. Ip

Professor B.S. Tang

Professor Simon K.L. Wong

Mr Simon Y.S. Wong

Mr Derrick S.M. Yip

Chief Traffic Engineer/Kowloon
Transport Department
Mr Vico P. Cheung

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

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Gary C.W. Tam

Director of Lands
Mr Maurice K.W. Loo

Director of Planning
Mr Ivan M.K. Chung

[Messrs Ricky W.Y. Yu and Vincent K.Y. Ho joined the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Kowloon East (Cha Kwo Ling) Harbourfront Development

(TPB Paper No. 10984)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

64. The Chairperson remarked that, in 2018, the Town Planning Board (the Board) agreed with the current “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zoning at the waterfront of Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) for the proposed Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus development after considering the relevant representations and comments on the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5. During the hearing, concerned parties, including the local community and the residents nearby, expressed concerns on the visual impact of the proposed VTC campus, the connectivity between the hinterland and the waterfront as well as the reduction in planned open space. As such, VTC was requested to consult relevant stakeholders, including the Board, on the latest development and design of the VTC campus and its integration with open space in the adjoining areas prior to finalisation of the development scheme so as to address the local concerns. In the process of reviewing the design, VTC had taken into account the comments/suggestions received and incorporated them into the revised scheme, where appropriate. The project was currently at an advanced stage, with detailed design drawings and tendering documents being prepared for seeking funding approval from the Legislative Council (LegCo) and the land grant conditions being finalised.

65. The Secretary reported that the project was jointly commissioned by the Education Bureau, the Development Bureau, and VTC with P&T Architects Limited (P&T), Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited (ARUP) and AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) as the consultants. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

Dr Tony C.M. Ip - having current business dealings with P&T, ARUP
and AECOM; and

Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho - having current business dealings with AECOM.

66. Members noted that Dr Tony C.M. Ip had tendered an apology for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was a briefing to Members on the latest development and detailed design of the Kowloon East (CKL) Harbourfront Development, the interests of Mr Vincent K.Y. Ho only needed to be recorded, and he could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

67. The following government representatives and the representatives from the project proponent and its consultants were invited to the meeting:

Government Representatives

Education Bureau (EDB)

Mr Kasper S.K. Ng - Principal Assistant Secretary (Further Education)
(PAS)

Mr Jacky C.Y. Lam - Assistant Secretary (Further Education)

Development Bureau (DEVB)

Mr S.K. Ng - Senior Engineer (Harbour)

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr Ernest C.M. Fung - Senior Town Planner/Kowloon

Ms Helen K.W. Ip - Town Planner/Kowloon

Project Proponent

VTC

Dr Eric S.L. Liu - Deputy Executive Director

Mr Philip S.W. Shum - Director, Estates & Campus Development Office

Mr Stephen K.W. Ho - Deputy Director, Estates & Campus Development
Office

Ms Ariel K.Y. Chow - Project Manager, Estates & Campus Development Office

P&T

Mr Joel C.S. Chan - Group Director

ARUP

Mr Thomas M.K. Lee - Associate Director

Mr Wilson Chan - Senior Project Manager

68. The Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the project team to brief Members on TPB Paper No. 10984 (the Paper).

69. Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB briefly introduced the background and latest progress of new VTC campus project, and made the following main points:

- (a) it had been the Government's policy to provide quality and diversified education pathways with multiple entry and exit points for young people with different aspirations and abilities through vocational and professional education and training (VPET). Since the announcement in the 2014 Policy Address, the Government and VTC had been taking forward the project to develop a new VTC campus in CKL. The project would not only provide state-of-the-art facilities to meet the needs of VTC and VPET students but also help improve the current overcrowding situation at VTC's existing campuses;
- (b) after considering the relevant representations and comments on the draft Kai Tak OZP in relation to the VTC project in 2018, the Board decided not to uphold the representations and agreed to rezone the site for the proposed new VTC campus in CKL to "G/IC". The Board also considered that the proposed VTC campus serving the young people of Hong Kong was compatible with the objective of enhancing the vibrancy and diversity of the waterfront area;

- (c) EDB and VTC, in consultation with relevant stakeholders, had been exploring enhancements to the design of the project. To achieve better synergy, VTC had agreed to take up the co-ordination of the design and development of both the VTC campus and the adjoining public open spaces (POS), as well as associated public facilities at the CKL harbourfront. Relevant government departments had been consulted in formulating the design;
- (d) given its scale, the project was divided into two phases, i.e. the pre-construction works and the main works. Having consulted the stakeholders including the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development (KTTF) of the Harbourfront Commission and the Kwun Tong District Council (KTDC), the Government and VTC consulted LegCo and obtained funding approval in July 2022 for the pre-construction works, including the design of the VTC campus and POS, construction of basketball courts, and re-provisioning of the temporary soccer pitch and the whole of Wai Lok Street. The pre-construction works were undergoing. The main works of the project comprised the development of the VTC campus, POS and the associated public facilities. Stakeholder consultation, including KTTF and KTDC, had been conducted for the main works; and
- (e) the project design was in compliance with the requirements of the OZP, including land use and building height (BH) restrictions. In addition, the project proponent had made a wide range of enhancements at different stages in response to the feedback received. For instance, VTC had adjusted the campus development scale by reducing the number of academic buildings from three to two and excised 1ha of land from the original campus site to form a POS. A responsive design, such as stepped BH, building setback from residential neighbourhoods and improved pedestrian connections, had also been adopted to facilitate the integration of the campus with the waterfront in terms of accessibility, air and visual permeability. Positive feedback on the project design was received during the stakeholder consultation exercise.

70. Dr Eric S.L. Liu, Deputy Executive Director, VTC provided some background on VTC and its new campus project, and made the following main points:

- (a) VTC was the largest VPET provider in Hong Kong, offering a wide range of full-time and part-time VPET programmes that awarded formal qualifications ranging from secondary three to degree levels and provided students with multiple progression pathways. In line with the Government's policy, VTC had drawn up a strategic development plan for its campuses to foster synergy and provide state-of-the-art facilities pivotal to enhancing the image and quality of vocational education. This would provide more practical training opportunities and support for aspiring youngsters to explore new directions and enhance their competitiveness and income through acquiring new skillsets;
- (b) the new VTC campus at CKL harbourfront was mainly used for the re-provisioning of its Hong Kong Institute of Vocational Education (IVE) (Haking Wong) and IVE (Kwun Tong). Upon completion, the new campus would continue to offer not only programmes currently provided by the two aforesaid institutions but also other programmes in response to evolving industry and market needs. These programmes would mainly encompass six disciplines: Business, Design, Engineering, Health and Life Sciences, Hospitality, and Information Technology. The new campus would provide a variety of full-time and part-time programmes for secondary school graduates and in-service employees, helping them obtain diploma, higher diploma, professional diploma and other professional qualifications; and
- (c) the proposed facilities at the new campus would include advanced training workshops and laboratories, large-scale training and teaching venues, classrooms, exhibition spaces, and both outdoor and indoor learning spaces and facilities. A smart campus management system would be implemented to create a conducive learning environment while enhancing multi-disciplinary skills of VPET students, preparing them for challenges arising from technological innovations.

71. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Joel C.S. Chan, Group Director, P&T briefed Members on the integral layout, enhanced measures and detailed design of the project, and made the following main points:

Design Concept

- (a) a unique branding and identity based on the concept of “Dynamic Water” was proposed for both the VTC campus and the POS, aiming to deliver a coherent and integrated design. Inspired by rippling water and reflections on Victoria Harbour and guided by the wisdom of the Chinese metaphor ‘海納百川’ (i.e. the inclusiveness of the sea), the inclusive design concept of the POS was manifested in the harmonious co-existence of multiple land uses. In response to public aspirations for an accessible and well-designed waterfront area, the VTC campus, situated at a prominent location fronting the Victoria Harbour in CKL, would be integrated with the adjacent POS under the theme “Campus on the Waterfront”, promoting positive interactions among stakeholders within and outside the campus. The sculptural form of the buildings and landscape features reflected the dynamic motion of the water and waves;

Development Layout

- (b) the project comprising six sites (viz. Sites 1 to 6) was located along the CKL harbourfront, mainly covered by the Kai Tak OZP. The proposed VTC campus was at Site 1, adjoined by the POS at Sites 2 and 3 and a public sports ground at Site 4. The POS comprised Site 2 (about 1ha) and Site 3 (about 4.5ha) where Site 2 which had previously been part of the campus site (zoned “G/IC”) was later carved out by VTC to form a POS, and Site 3 was the harbourfront promenade to be implemented by VTC at the invitation of DEVB. Site 4 was designated for the reprovisioning of soccer pitches (currently in Site 1) and the provision of basketball courts. Wai Lok Street (currently in Site 1) would be relocated to Site 5, in-between Site 4 and the existing Kwun Tong Sewage Pumping Station (KTSPS) (outside the project site). Site 6 was reserved for the Government to reprovision the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) filling station (currently in Site 1);

- (c) the pre-construction works covering Sites 4 to 6, after obtaining funding approval from LegCo in 2022, had been under implementation for expected completion in 2025. Upon reprovisioning of soccer pitches, Wai Lok Street and LPG filling station (all currently in Site 1), Sites 1 to 3 would be handed over to VTC for the main works involving the construction of the VTC campus and the POS. The VTC campus development at Site 1 had a site area of about 3.2ha and a total gross floor area (GFA) of about 180,000m² (equivalent to a plot ratio of about 5.6), representing a reduction of the previously proposed 230,000m² by 22%. The BH of the two academic blocks would be stepped down from 70mPD to 60mPD (from southeast to northwest). Upon completion of the construction, the POS at Sites 2 and 3 would be handed over to the Government for management;
- (d) to the northwest of the project site were the KTSPS Landscape Deck Park (LDP) and the revitalised Tsui Ping River, leading to the Kwun Tong Promenade in the further northwest via a bridge over the river. To the east was the proposed public housing development to be implemented at CKL Village by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS). Under the proposed public housing project, two Grade III historic buildings (i.e. the Law Mansion and the Tin Hau Temple) would be preserved and some facilities (e.g. a fire station cum ambulance depot, a government joint-user complex and a school) supporting the proposed public housing development would be provided;

Enhancement Measures

- (e) taking into account comments and suggestions received during the stakeholder consultation exercise, the development scheme had been enhanced by reducing the GFA of the VTC campus by 22%, excising 1ha of land from the previous campus site to form a POS, providing a 40m-wide setback of the campus buildings from Wai Yip Street and relocating the access road of the LPG filling station (i.e. Wai Lok Street) to the northwestern edge of the project site to facilitate an integrated design of the POS and the public sports ground in Sites 2 to 4. Against the higher-rise Laguna City

(with BHs of about 80mPD to 92mPD) and the proposed public housing development in CKL Village (with BHs of about 110mPD to 130mPD), the lower-rise new VTC campus would be subject to a two-stepped BH profile of 60mPD and 70mPD to minimise the visual impact;

- (f) the project design incorporated elements to enhance coherence and connectivity with the hinterland and the surrounding developments, including the KTSPS LDP and the revitalised Tsui Ping River. The 1ha POS (Site 2) carved out from the original VTC campus site would become a direct connection between the hinterland and the waterfront promenade. There would be multiple pedestrian access points along Wai Yip Street and CKL Road, allowing the harbourfront areas to integrate with the hinterland in a comprehensive manner both at-grade and at elevated levels, in terms of physical access and visual permeability. The entrances of the VTC campus from Wai Yip Street would be located near the pedestrian crossing facilities, which would facilitate onward public access to the waterfront and the POS via the landscaped platforms between the two campus buildings;

- (g) the campus buildings were set back from Wai Yip Street to maximise open streetscape and natural ventilation along Wai Yip Street while minimising visual impact on the nearby residential developments. Between the two academic blocks were 40m-wide separation and a link-bridge, offering an opportunity to pursue an extensive landscaped area in-between for maximum pedestrian enjoyment, with an open, podium-free and fenceless design. These design features would enhance air ventilation and the view corridor in the street environment, and promote visual permeability and compatibility with the surroundings. Full utilisation of the basement level would help achieve the curved-edge building design and a 30% site coverage of greenery. In terms of greening and landscape provision, the design of the campus building emphasized permeability and sustainability of the green environment. Apart from extensive greening on the ground level, multi-storey green decks and balconies would be incorporated on the external walls of the campus building to further enhance the environment. The campus development aimed to attain a “platinum” rating in the BEAM Plus green

building certification;

- (h) in Site 4, the elevated basketball court would spare space underneath to accommodate toilets, changing rooms and other ancillary facilities, allowing efficient use of land. The facilities under the elevated deck were designed in small and separated building bulks to ensure natural ventilation and daylight penetration;
- (i) the POS was proposed to adopt a multi-level design in stepping profile, which would incorporate landscape in wavy and undulating form integrated with seating, outdoor gym, fitness area, etc. With various levels, the POS would offer elevated landscape gallery opportunities, providing great views for indoor/outdoor users. Such roof terraces, which echoed the adjoining multi-level KTSPS LDP design and aligned with the nearby Tsui Ping River with a water-themed landscape area, would exhibit an open and welcoming gesture to the neighbourhood;
- (j) the planting theme of the POS was Blossom Ensemble (百花齊放). Flowering season and colours of flowering trees were studied to promote visual interest. Feature trees and canopy trees were proposed near entrance nodes and key thematic zones for a vibrant harbour. Two flowering trees of different colours would be planted to create a scenic view for photo-taking. To minimise the visual impact of the reprovisioned LPG filling station at Site 6 and the proposed skatepark at Site 2, the POS would be crafted with wavy landform and landscape features so as to obscure these two facilities;
- (k) an elevated landscape deck at the waterfront promenade was designed to integrate with the VTC campus, creating synergy between the campus and the POS, and enhancing the experience for the public to enjoy the harbour view at an elevated level, in addition to the at-grade promenade level. The elevated landscape deck would also be furnished with relevant facilities, such as food and beverage facilities, covered seating areas and tables with open sea view, toilets, baby care room and supporting facilities. Adequate electricity, water and sewerage provisions would be provided to facilitate event hosting

at the harbourfront;

- (l) the facilities on the waterfront were mostly passive ones such as an amphitheater, simple fitness equipment, multi-purpose activity space, lawns, refreshment kiosks and seating furniture to accommodate social gatherings and enhance public enjoyment. In order to create a unique identity for the POS and VTC campus, opportunities would be explored to display the artwork design of VTC students at suitable locations in the harbourfront area. In alignment with the planned cycle track network at the Kai Tak Development, the project encouraged cycling as a leisure and recreation activity and the 50m-wide promenade was equipped with a 10m-wide cycle track with related cycling facilities;
- (m) to further promote coherence in design, undulating forms would be incorporated in the overall landscaping of the project site, the elevated landscape deck connecting the VTC campus with the waterfront promenade, the sports ground (Site 4) and the potential elevated footbridge (to be constructed by other parties) to the future public housing development at CKL Village;
- (n) the design in the eastern portion of the promenade had taken into consideration the existing heritage preserved near the CKL Village. Vista and open view from Tin Hau Temple to the harbour were maintained. By using stones originating from CKL Village to build a rockscape garden and reserving a spot for placing the historic dragon boat (i.e. “Hop Yee Lung”), the promenade design with integrated seating, tables, trellis, planters and play areas would raise the awareness of CKL’s history. Welcoming Garden and Victoria Harbour Logo, with a design echoing the history of CKL Slipway and mascots in sports styles, were also incorporated into the POS design to enhance the harbourfront areas as Hong Kong’s brand identity; and
- (o) since 2018, the project team had maintained communication with relevant stakeholders, including KTTF and KTDC, on the integral layout, pre-construction works and main works. In September 2024, a site visit was

conducted for representatives from relevant government bureaux/departments, members of LegCo and KTDC as well as local representatives, and the current design of the project was well received.

[Mr Vico P. Cheung joined the meeting during the presentation session.]

72. After the presentation of the project team, the Chairperson invited questions and comments from Members.

73. Members appreciated the detailed presentation given by the project team and welcomed the enhanced design of the entire development put forward by VTC and its consultants. Considering the proposed VTC campus and the surrounding POS as a landmark development, they expressed general support to the current design of the project and commended the attractive design of the public space with varied landscaping.

Accessibility and Connectivity

74. Noting that the current pedestrian connections between the project site and the hinterland mainly relied on several at-grade signalised crossings on the heavily trafficked CLK Road and Wai Yip Street, some Members raised concerns on the overall accessibility and connectivity of the proposed development and had the following questions and suggestion:

- (a) the total number of staff and students expected at the new campus, and how they would reach the campus;
- (b) noting that the existing at-grade pedestrian crossings across CKL Road and Wai Yip Street might not be able to cope with the increase in pedestrian traffic generated by the proposed development, whether the provision of additional footbridges/underpasses had been considered to accommodate the increased pedestrian flow;
- (c) how the KTSPS LDP with a popular children's play area was connected to the planned POS;

- (d) whether the width of the walkways on the landscape decks in the POS was adequate; and
- (e) a pedestrian traffic study was suggested to assess the impacts arising from the completion of various proposed developments nearby.

75. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB, Dr Eric S.L. Liu, Deputy Executive Director, VTC and Mr Joel C.S. Chan, Group Director, P&T made the following main points:

- (a) the new VTC campus could accommodate about 6,000 students and 800 staff members. Public pedestrian connections between the nearby MTR stations and the new VTC campus were currently available. Depending on the students' needs, VTC would consider arranging shuttle bus services between the campus and designated pick-up/drop-off points in the territory. The entrance plaza of the campus, apart from serving as an event space, had ample space for loading/unloading (L/UL) of shuttle buses. VTC would also negotiate with bus and mini-bus operators to offer additional services for the staff and students when the new campus was in use in the future;
- (b) in previous stakeholder consultations, KTTF expressed concerns on the limited pedestrian crossings to the planned POS. In that regard, it was expected that upon completion of the residential developments nearby and the Route 6 (a bypass diverting traffic away from east Kowloon), the number of vehicles, especially heavy goods vehicles and concrete mixer trucks, running on CKL Road and Wai Yip Street would decrease in the long term. The project team, together with the Harbour Office of DEVB, the Transport Department (TD) and PlanD, would monitor the development progress and traffic conditions. Should relevant authorities consider additional footbridge/underpass necessary, the proposed development would accommodate such proposal;
- (c) the design theme of "Dynamic Water" of the POS would blend in well with the design of the KTSPS LDP, both denoting an integrated connection in terms of design and physical linkage. The connection between the KTSPS LDP and the

waterfront was currently through the existing temporary CKL Promenade to the south and would be maintained during the construction process;

- (d) the project design emphasised the importance of uninterrupted pedestrian connectivity and visual connectivity throughout the whole development. The details of the landscape deck in the POS (including the walkway widths) would be further examined at the detailed design stage; and
- (e) the traffic impact assessment conducted for the redevelopment of CKL Village had taken the proposed development into account. It was understood that to enhance pedestrian connections between the future public housing development at CKL Village and the eastern part of the POS, relevant government departments would provide some improvement measures thereat, e.g. a proposed signalised pedestrian crossing and a potential footbridge. Regarding the overall traffic condition in the area concerned, relevant government departments were also in close liaison to monitor the potential impacts of new development projects in the area and the mitigation measures so required.

Open Campus

76. Some Members rated highly the open campus design and had the following questions:

- (a) as the proposed CKL harbourfront was not close to the MTR stations, people might choose to drive. Whether some parking spaces could be reserved in the new VTC campus for visitors;
- (b) whether the campus facilities such as canteen could be open to the public; and
- (c) whether security would be a concern for an open campus.

77. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB and Dr Eric S.L. Liu, Deputy Executive Director, VTC made the following main points:

- (a) the parking demand of the staff and students would be prioritised during school hours. VTC would also facilitate public access during non-school hours subject to operational needs, particularly in case of special activities involving public participation or collaboration with outside parties. On the other hand, additional car parking facilities were planned under various development projects in the area. For instance, the proposed public housing project at CKL Village would include a public car park cum public transport interchange in the future government joint-user complex. TD would monitor the overall demand for parking facilities in the district, and the Police would take enforcement actions against illegal parking when necessary;
- (b) the planned VTC campus would provide day and evening courses as well as on-the-job training for students and employees, and on-campus practical training sessions in the evenings and weekends for online students. The canteens in the new VTC campus were designed mainly to suit the above operational mode and serve the staff, students and guest speakers from professional practitioners. Allowing full access to the canteens by the public might create overloading problems; and
- (c) the design intention of the open campus was to facilitate public access to the waterfront and better integration with the neighbourhood. Public access to the G/F and 1/F of the two academic buildings for specified events was allowed. Appropriate security measures would be implemented at the entrances/exits of the campus buildings.

78. While understanding the challenged of allowing public access to canteens and parking facilities at the VTC campus, a Member suggested providing underground car parks at Sites 2 and 4.

Promenade Design

79. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether water-friendly culture would be promoted taking advantage of the waterfront location;
- (b) whether the design of the promenade would be pet-friendly;
- (c) noting that the POS design had paid respect to some of the heritages of the CKL Village, whether additional space in the POS could be allocated for holding cultural activities (e.g. a bamboo theatre); and
- (d) the intended use of the building at the eastern end of the promenade.

80. In response, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB and Mr Joel C.S. Chan, Group Director, P&T made the following main points:

- (a) Members' views on the importance of enhancing water-land interface and making the promenade more water-friendly were shared by some stakeholders. The project team would collaborate with relevant government departments to enhance the promenade design in this aspect, where appropriate;
- (b) the waterfront promenade was virtually an inclusive park for pets, where various pet facilities, e.g. pet dropping collection box and drinking fountain for pets, would be installed. Also, a pet garden with gated access and fence was proposed near the eastern end of the promenade;
- (c) a responsive design that echoed the historic and cultural elements of CKL Village and strengthened the cultural connection between the POS and its neighbouring area was adopted. When the design team of the proposed public housing development was on board, further discussions with that team would be conducted to assess the need to reserve some space in the promenade for organising traditional cultural events related to CKL (e.g. the celebrations of Tin Hau Festival). As the promenade was expected to be completed by 2030, there would be time to achieve better co-ordination; and

- (d) the building at the eastern end of the promenade was a proposed public toilet facility next to the pet garden. The location of the proposed public toilet would be reviewed at the detailed design stage.

81. The Chairperson supplemented that CKL Village was a squatter area to be redeveloped as public housing for a total flat supply of about 4,000 units, with various supporting facilities, e.g. ancillary shopping facilities, a government joint-user complex, a public transport interchange, etc. The Law Mansion within the public housing site would be preserved and revitalised; the Tin Hau Temple adjacent to the public housing site would remain in-situ; and a spot next to the temple was reserved for placing a historic dragon boat. HKHS was the project proponent of the redevelopment, and the Civil Engineering and Development Department oversaw the site formation works. Whether the historic dragon boat would be displayed near Tin Hau Temple as proposed by HKHS or in the eastern portion of the harbourfront promenade in the POS as proposed by VTC was subject to further discussion among the concerned parties.

Greening

82. A Member opined that the greenery landscape of the promenade would become the focal point of the area, especially so with the loss of greenery at CKL Village upon redevelopment. Nevertheless, the greening ratio at Site 4 was quite low due to the hard paved surface of the ball courts, and the greening elements of the promenade at Site 3 were scattered without large patches of green lawn. The Member also expressed that vertical greening should be maximised to mitigate the visual impact. In response, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB and Mr Joel C.S. Chan, Group Director, P&T acknowledged the need to balance the demands for more public space and more greenery. While it was important to utilise the site in a way that sufficient public space could be provided to ensure overall public enjoyment, achieving a higher greening ratio would be challenging. The project team would explore if there was room for further greening without compromising the provision of various functional spaces, e.g. more planting between soccer pitches, more greenery on the landscape decks, etc.

83. Another Member raised that people generally preferred visiting promenades during night-time rather than daytime in summer. The same Member also suggested the project team to pay regard to shading ability of the tree planting along the waterfront.

Climate Change

84. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) after Typhoon Mangkhut, a study concluded that the site formation level of the Tseung Kwan O waterfront should be raised up to above +5mPD. Noting that the waterfront promenade of the POS would be formed at a lower level of +4.6mPD, whether a flood risk assessment had been conducted and whether there were any measures to prevent flooding, particularly basement flooding; and
- (b) noting that glass curtain wall was prone to exacerbate greenhouse effect, whether glass curtain wall would be installed in the proposed buildings and how birds crashing into the glassy surfaces could be avoided.

85. In response, Mr Joel C.S. Chan, Group Director, P&T made the following main points:

- (a) having consulted the Drainage Services Department, the project ground would be levelled up to about 4.6mPD in the landward side and slightly sloping towards the waterfront edge at 3.8mPD, creating a gradient facilitating the discharge of surface runoff to the sea. To mitigate the impact of flooding, planter walls and raised landscape features would be installed to safeguard the seawall, and the basement level of the buildings would also be equipped with automatic hydraulic water barriers and special flooding-proof design at the entrance/exit; and
- (b) instead of glass curtain wall, the campus buildings would be coated with openable windows with sun-shade facilities. They were meant to be environmental friendly buildings. The depth and the angle of the shading fins could be adjusted under the energy model. The project team would study further to adopt a bird-friendly design.

LPG Filling Station

86. Noting that there was always a long queue of taxis waiting at the present LPG filling station in Site 1 in the afternoon hours, some Members expressed concerns on the proposal of reprovisioning the LPG filling station at Site 6 adjacent to the harbourfront promenade and the ball courts, both of which would be frequented by the general public. They raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was room to relocate the LPG filling station elsewhere outside the project site; and
- (b) whether there were measures to minimise the impact arising from the potential taxi queue outside the reprovisioned LPG filling station at Site 6.

87. In response, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB and Ms Vivian M.F. Lai, DPO/K, PlanD made the following main points:

- (a) the LPG filling station, currently located in Site 1, was in great demand by taxis and mini-buses. Due to a lack of alternative reprovisioning site for the LPG filling station except the project site, the proposed development had to accommodate the reprovisioned LPG filling station and minimise its impacts on the VTC campus, the park goers and the residential areas nearby. A quantitative risk assessment had been conducted for reprovisioning of the LPG filling station at Site 6, being 140m away from the nearest residences, which confirmed compliance with the relevant safety guidelines. During the representation hearing in 2018, the Board had considered that reprovisioning the LPG filling station at Site 6 was practicable after taking into account the local demand for LPG filling, Site 6 as a reprovisioning site in the context of the project and the findings of the safety assessment; and
- (b) there was no formal vehicle holding area in the existing LPG filling station in Site 1. Upon reprovisioning at Site 6, the new LPG filling station would be enhanced to provide a vehicle holding area for around 40 to 50 vehicles inside the station, sparing the reprovisioned Wai Lok Street from queuing vehicles

tailing back onto the busy Wai Yip Street. The above arrangement would be further enhanced and finalised by the relevant authorities, i.e. the Environment and Ecology Bureau and the Environmental Protection Department. In addition, tree buffers would be planted along the boundary of Site 6 to mitigate the visual and air quality impacts of the LPG filling station to the planned POS.

Stakeholder Consultation

88. A Member enquired what measures had been taken to address local stakeholders' concerns. Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB replied that while comments collected from the local community during stakeholder consultation were diverse, and the project team had made various enhancements to address the views of the local community. Major enhancements incorporated included:

- (a) downsizing the campus development scale in Site 1 by reducing the number of academic buildings from three to two;
- (b) excising 1ha of land from the previous larger campus site to form a POS in Site 2 to enhance public access to the waterfront;
- (c) adopting an integrated design with coherent colour scheme to the ball courts in Site 4 and the road surface of the reprovisioned Wai Lok Street; and
- (d) elevating one of the basketball courts in Site 4 to incorporate ancillary changing and sanitary facilities underneath.

89. Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB further said that the overall design with the enhancement measures incorporated was also presented to the KTDC members and the local representatives, including during a joint site visit in September 2024.

Implementation and Management

90. A Member enquired about the construction cost of the campus development and other works, and whether it would be borne by VTC. In response, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS,

EDB said that the whole project was complex in that VTC not only undertook the campus development but also took up the co-ordination with relevant government departments on the design and development of the POS and reprovisioning of recreational facilities. To take forward the construction works of the VTC campus and POS, the Government would seek funding from LegCo, which was a standard practice in respect of campus development projects of VTC.

91. Another Member enquired about the management responsibility of the proposed development. In response, Mr Kasper S.K. Ng, PAS, EDB said that while the campus development was under the management of VTC, the 1ha POS and waterfront promenade at Sites 2 and 3, and the reprovisioned ball courts at Site 4 would be handed over to the relevant government departments for management and maintenance.

92. The Chairperson concluded that Members were generally supportive of the project and content with the proposed scheme design. In particular, the Board praised VTC's strenuous efforts in addressing the concerns of various stakeholders by reducing the bulk of the campus development, offering an additional 1ha POS and adopting an open campus design. It was anticipated that the new VTC campus with 6,000 students would eventually enliven the waterfront. The Chairperson also invited the project team to take into account Members' comments and suggestions, as appropriate, in taking forward the project.

93. As Members had no further questions and comments to raise, the Chairperson thanked the government representatives and representatives from the project proponent for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Ms Kelly Y.S. Chan, Messrs Ryan M.K. Ip and Derrick S.M. Yip left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

94. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 3:40 p.m.