

**Minutes of 1080th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 9.3.2015, 10.3.2015 and 16.3.2015**

Present

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow
Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor P.P. Ho

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr C.P. Lau

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Ms Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H. T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H. F. Leung

Mr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Mr Ken Y.K. Wong/Mr K.H. To

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment)

Mr Victor W.T. Yeung

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport), Transport and Housing Bureau

Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Assistant Director of Lands (Regional 1)

Ms Doris M.Y. Chow

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Ms Julia M.K. Lau

Mr Clarence W.C. Leung

Mr Laurence L.J. Li

Dr W.K. Yau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Ms Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr Louis K.H. Kau (9.3.2015 and 16.3.2015 (a.m.))
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (10.3.2015 and 16.3.2015 (p.m.))

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr K.K. Lee (9.3.2015)
Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (10.3.2015)
Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (16.3.2015 (a.m.))
Mr T.C. Cheng (16.3.2015 (p.m.))

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 9.3.2015.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Mr Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Roger K.H. Luk

Professor S.C. Wong

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms Anita W.T. Ma

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport),
Transport and Housing Bureau
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Assistant Director/Regional 1, Lands Department
Ms Doris M.Y. Chow

Agenda Item 3 (cont'd)

Consideration of Representations and Comment in respect of the Draft Shek Kip Mei
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K4/28
(TPB Paper No. 9855)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

Hearing for Group 2 (Representations No. R2 to R405, R407 to R5110, R5112 and C1)

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

3. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenter of Group 2 to invite them to attend the hearing. However, other than those who were present or indicated that they would attend the meeting, the rest had either indicated not to attend the hearing or made no reply. Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comment in the absence of the other representers who had indicated that they would not attend or had made no reply.

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

Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau – District Planning Officer/Tsuen Wan and West
Kowloon (DPO/TWK), Planning Department
(PlanD)

Mr Philip Y.L. Chum – Senior Town Planner/Sham Shui Po (STP/SSP),
PlanD

Mr M.S. Ng – Town Planner/Sham Shui Po 2 (TP/SPP2), PlanD

Mr Cary P.H. Ho – Senior Nature Conservation Officer (South)
(SNCO(S)), Agriculture, Fisheries and
Conservation Department (AFCD)

Mr Marco Y.W. Pang – Geotechnical Engineer/Geo Projects 31
(GE/GP31), Civil Engineering and Development
Department (CEDD)

Mr Marco H.Y. Tai – Engineer/Sham Shui Po (E/SSP), Transport
Department (TD)

R40 – Maria Francesch-Huidobro

R4224 – Charina Bagor

R4241 – Arlene Arceta

Dr Maria Francesch-Huidobro – Representer and representers' representative

R49 – Andrew Yick

R51 – Chan Sau Ching

R218 – Yick Mun Lam

R247 – Shee Lick Industrial Company

R753 – Grace Tam

Mr Yick Chee Bui – Representers' representative

R50 – Wong Joan Yan Shingx

R4382 – Wong Hang Yi

Ms Wong Hang Yi – Representer and representer's representative

R204 – Ngai Fung Lin

R363 – 嚴順發 (Yim Shun Fat)

R4763 – Olivia

R4764 – Leung Tak

R4765 – Franky

R4766 – 夏美如

R4779 – 梁峻軒

Mr Yim Shun Fat – Representer and representers' representative

R237 – Ho Shun Ying

R301 – 李陳德霞

R375 – Ng Hau Wun, Angela

R377 – Ng Hau Ning, Helen

R415 – 吳玉蓮

Mr Ho Shun Ying – Representer and representers' representative

R299 – Tang Siu King

Ms Tang Siu King – Representer

R370 – Li Cheuk Man

Mr Li Cheuk Man – Representer

R660 – Lee Chung Yiu Bennie

Mr Lee Chung Yiu, Bennie – Representer

R676 – 林育豪 (Lam Yuk Ho, Peter)

Mr Lam Yuk Ho, Peter – Representer

R4402 – 歐曉靜

R4403 – 歐曉蕾

R4416 – 陳慧紅

Ms Cindy Lam – Representers' representative

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedure. As a large number of representers had indicated that they would attend the hearing, it was necessary to limit the time for making oral submissions. The Board agreed on 23.1.2015 that each representer/commenter or his representative should be allotted 10 minutes for his oral presentation. The representers and commenter had been informed about the

arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenter or their representatives 2 minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Oral submission was to elaborate on, rather than repeating, the contents of the written submission as the written submissions had also been provided to Members. The contents of the oral submission should be relevant to the proposed amendment.

6. The Chairman said that this meeting session would hear the second batch of the Group 2 representations while the hearing of the first batch of the Group 2 representations had been completed on 6.3.2015 and the hearing of the remaining Group 2 representations was scheduled for 10.3.2015 and 16.3.2015. After the oral submissions, there would be a question and answer session. If needed, there would be short breaks. The Board would deliberate on the representations after completion of all the oral presentations and the question and answer session. He then invited DPO/TWK to brief Members on the representations and the comment.

7. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, repeated the presentation which was made in the session of the meeting on 6.3.2015 as recorded in paragraph 46 of the minutes of 6.3.2015.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

8. The Chairman then invited the representers and their representatives to elaborate on their representations.

R40 – Maria Francesch-Huidobro

R4224 – Charina Bagor

R4241 – Arlene Arceta

9. Dr Maria Francesch-Huidobro made the following main points with a summary of her points shown on the visualiser:

- (a) she submitted a representation as a Hong Kong citizen and was a tenant of Dynasty Heights;

- (b) she opposed the rezoning of the representation site north of Yin Ping Road (the Site) from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group C) 13” (“R(C)13”) for private residential development as a matter of principle;
- (c) the designation of green belts around built-up areas was to limit urban sprawl. Green belts were designated based on their environmental and amenity values and were for people’s enjoyment and recreation;
- (d) the current “GB” rezoning exercise was wrong in principle as it was a top-down planning process by officials not elected by the community who were taking away the green belts from the local community for development. The local people only wanted the Government to leave the green belts as they were and did not want to have any artificial environment around their districts;
- (e) when she walked up Wan Chai Trail the day before, she noticed from one of the information boards put up by the Government along the trail saying that it was important to have green belt in our city to forestall upslope intrusion of urban development. The green belt between Kennedy Road and Stubbs Road was a pretty and remarkable one in Hong Kong;
- (f) the main argument of the Government for rezoning the Site was to help resolve the housing shortage problem. She did not oppose releasing land for housing as it was a necessity and Hong Kong people should have proper housing. If Hong Kong positioned itself as Asia’s world city, it should have decent housing for its people for nurturing a high-quality population. However, the rezoning of the Site would not really solve Hong Kong’s housing shortage in practice. The focus should be on helping those 950,000 Hong Kong citizens who had no access to public housing. The future development at the Site would probably become a luxurious housing estate and benefit only the middle to upper class. It could not help those people who were in dire housing need, including the manual workers, elderly and the youth;

- (g) the lower income group and the youth required affordable and accessible transportation, shopping, dining and entertainment facilities but such facilities would not be provided in the Site. With the provision of 980 flats, the Site would become a failure eventually as flat size was too small for neither a luxurious estate nor a housing estate for the middle class. It would become an eyesore at the natural hillside which was very close to two scenic walking trails and the catchment area of Kowloon Reservoir;
- (h) as the occurrence of rainy days in Hong Kong would increase according to the information from the Government, building works on the Site which was adjacent to slopes full of boulders would be a geotechnical challenge and it posed a risk on the safety of the nearby residents; and
- (i) possible solutions to Hong Kong's housing problem included tackling decisively the abuse of land use in the New Territories and revising the Small House policy to free land for housing development. If the Government could change the Small House policy, the legitimacy of its governance would be increased very substantially. The Government could also identify those under-utilised government and public facilities in the Shek Kip Mei and Sham Shui Po districts, military barracks and public utility sites for housing development, and speed up the implementation of urban renewal project.

[Actual speaking time: 10 minutes]

R49 – Andrew Yick

R51 – Chan Sau Ching

R218 – Yick Mun Lam

R247 – Shee Lick Industrial Company

R753 – Grace Tam

10. Mr Yick Chee Bui, the representers' representative, made the following main points:

- (a) based on the Paper and the presentation of DPO/TWK, it seemed that all the opposing grounds made by the representers had been or could be addressed by the Government or the future developer and that there were no outstanding issues to stop the Site from being rezoned and developed. However, he queried if the issues involved were that simple as depicted by the Government. The Board should not treat this hearing as a procedure for approving the zoning amendment but should consider carefully the justifications put forward by the representers;

- (b) although consultation had been conducted, a large number of objections to the rezoning proposal were received during the consultation process. The Government did not mention how it would respond to those objections received but only indicated that it had carried out the consultation process. For instance, for Representation Point Q3 recorded in Annex IX of the Paper in relation to the motions passed by the Sham Shui Po District Council (SSPDC) objecting to the rezoning due to the concern on the inadequacy of information, the response provided by the Government was just that it had followed the procedure to consult SSPDC but it did not really address the concern of SSPDC. He wondered if the Government would provide further response on this point or Members were satisfied with the Government's response in the Paper;

- (c) as regards the traffic impacts, the relevant information in the Paper, such as road junction capacities and trip generations, was provided by TD based on the development parameters of the Site provided by the Government. For parking provision at the Site, the ratio of the number of flats to number of parking spaces was roughly 10:1, which was totally unrealistic for a residential development at that location. Indeed, no existing housing estate at the locality of Tai Wo Ping was provided with such a low number of parking spaces. As the plot ratio of the Site was 2.88 and the area was only served by a minibus route, it was unreasonable for the Government to assume a very low car parking ratio for the Site. He queried if the low car parking ratio adopted was a means to conceal the trip generation and possible traffic impacts;

- (d) the flyover at Lung Ping Road leading to Cornwall Street only had two lanes, one in each direction. The assessment of TD that there would be sufficient capacity at the junction of Nam Cheung Street and Cornwall Street was misleading as most people living in Tai Wo Ping would use Cornwall Street rather than Lung Cheung Road to go to work in the morning. The Government was making assumptions in conducting the assessment such that the development at the Site would not generate significant adverse traffic impact in order to secure the approval of the Board. Members should well understand the type of housing that would be developed at the Site and whether the proposed parking ratio of 10:1 was realistic. He hoped that the Government could respond to his query on the parking provision;

- (e) as regards the function of green belt as a buffer between the urban area and the country park, the Site was only about 70m from Lion Rock Country Park to its north. He queried if a distance of 70m was adequate to serve as a buffer for separating the development at the Site from the country park. He went hiking very often, and did not want to see the activities of people in their homes when he walked along the hiking trail in Lion Rock. Although many places in Hong Kong also had hiking trails located very close to high-rise buildings due to historical reasons, the Government should not repeat those faults to allow a very narrow buffer between country park and the built-up areas. The Government had not done any consultation or provided any information regarding the adequacy of the green buffer. Members should consider if the 70m buffer, which was really a short distance, between the Site and the country park was adequate; and

- (f) the Government had stated repeatedly in its responses in the Paper that the Site was a disturbed area. Although the Site had been disturbed, the disturbance happened about thirty years ago when the area was a squatter area. However, after years of recovery upon clearance of the former squatters, the vegetation in the Site had regenerated and become mature. The Site was not barely covered with vegetation now as shown in the

photos provided by the Government. If he was not told of the history of the Site, he could never recognise that the currently vegetated Site had once been a squatter area. When the vegetation in the Site had regenerated through over twenty years of natural succession, he wondered if it was still a good reason to disturb the Site again merely because the Site had been disturbed many years ago. Members should safeguard Hong Kong's natural environment from development which was irreversible.

[Actual speaking time: 10 minutes]

R50 – Wong Joan Yan Shingx

R4382 – Wong Hang Yi

11. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Wong Hang Yi made the following main points:

- (a) she grew up and lived in Sham Shui Po. The living conditions of Sham Shui Po were poor as buildings were packed closely together and the air quality was poor;
- (b) the Site was the starting points of some hiking trails from where the hikers set off their journeys. She did not agree with the presentation of DPO/TWK that there were no footpath or hiking trail within the Site as she was very familiar with the place and she had been walking on those hiking trails for many years. If the Site was developed for residential use, three existing hiking trails would be affected. As Sham Shui Po was lack of trees and recreational facilities, the Site became the backyard of Sham Shui Po where the residents could get away from their crowded living environment. It was sad that the Site would soon be sold for development;
- (c) her secondary school geography teacher brought her and her classmates to the Site and the surrounding hillside for field study as there were abundant

ecological resources. There were streams, tortoises, monkeys, boars, hawks, birds, dragonflies, fireflies and different kinds of trees in the hillside. It was impossible to find a place in the urban area with such abundant ecological resources and beautiful scenery. The natural state of the Site had already been regenerated after many years of recovery. She could not agree that the Site did not have significant ecological value. Development of the Site was definitely detrimental to the wildlife and the natural habitats within and around the Site;

- (d) there was a seasonal stream immediately next to the Site which could hardly be found in the urban area. Although the water flow was little during the dry season, the stream would be full of water in summer. She could even find tortoises in the stream when she was small. However, the stream had been polluted due to the development of Dynasty Heights. If the Site was also developed, the condition of the stream should be further worsened or the stream might even disappear. Although the Government said that the future developer should implement pollution control measures to minimise the environmental impacts during construction, it could be expected that the Government would not have much monitoring after the Site was sold;

- (e) the hillside was full of boulders. Its geographical features including the boulders and stream were of no difference from those of the country park. The hiking trails in the hillside were frequently visited by hikers who treasured very much the natural setting of the area. In view of the existence of a large number of boulders in the hillside, the Site was not suitable for development for safety reason. Notwithstanding the Government's proposal of using vertical retaining wall for the development of the Site, she was still worried that extensive slope stabilisation works would be required, resulting in extensive tree felling and affecting the hiking trails. As seen from the artificial vegetated slopes of Dynasty Heights, trees could not grow healthily on artificial slopes and the quality of the plants there was poor;

- (f) the Site was easily accessible from her home and was the only leisure ground of her family where they could get in touch with the natural environment and observe the sky at night. She and her family were delighted to hear the news that the Conservancy Association had discovered Lesser Spiny Frog and Big-headed Frog which were rare species in the hillside, and hoped that such discovery could save the Site from development; and
- (g) it was not worthwhile to sacrifice the Site, which was beautiful, for the provision of about 980 flats, which could not make any contribution to resolving the current housing shortage problem of Hong Kong.

[Actual speaking time: 21 minutes]

R204 – Ngai Fung Lin

R363 – 嚴順發 (Yim Shun Fat)

R4763 – Olivia

R4764 – Leung Tak

R4765 – Franky

R4766 – 夏美如

R4779 – 梁峻軒

12. Mr Yim Shun Fat made the following main points:

- (a) he was a property owner and resident of Dynasty Heights;
- (b) when he first learned that the Site would be rezoned for housing development, he was happy as the value of his properties might increase. After further thought, however, he found that the Government was wrong to rezone the Site. SSPDC had not yet agreed with the rezoning. The Government had not provided further information to SPPDC as requested but submitted the proposal to the Board for agreement;

- (c) he was familiar with the environmental conditions of the Site as he could see the Site from his flat. As the Site had regenerated from a previous human settlement to a relatively natural environment over the years, wildlife habitats had already established there. He could often see monkeys, boars and different types of wildlife in the Site. The Government was wrong in saying that the Site did not have important ecological value;

- (d) most vehicles in Tai Wo Ping used Nam Cheong Street and Cornwall Street rather than Lung Cheung Road for access as they were the most convenient routes linking with other areas. However, the current developments in Tai Wo Ping, namely Dynasty Heights and Beacon Heights, were connected to Nam Cheong Street/Cornwall Street only by a two-lane, two-way flyover. If any maintenance works were carried out at this flyover necessitating the closure of one of the two lanes, serious traffic congestion would occur in Tai Wo Ping. Upon completion of the two new housing developments east of Beacon Heights, the traffic conditions of Tai Wo Ping should be much worsened;

- (e) when he first moved into Dynasty Heights, his flat could enjoy an open view to Hong Kong Island across the harbour. However, the view was totally blocked at the moment due to the development of many high-rise buildings down the hill in recent years. If the Site at the back of his flat was developed as well, his flats would become sandwiched between developments and the living environment would be more congested; and

- (f) the hillside belonged to all residents of Sham Shui Po regardless of their financial position. The development of the Site would only benefit several hundred households who could live there but at the expense of the right of the Sham Shui Po residents, in particular the grassroots people, to enjoy the scenic environment of the hillside including the Site, and it was not worthy.

R237 – Ho Shun Ying

R301 – 李陳德霞

R375 – Ng Hau Wun, Angela

R377 – Ng Hau Ning, Helen

R415 – 吳玉蓮

13. Mr Ho Shun Ying made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Dynasty Heights and also represented some of his neighbours;
- (b) he was shocked when he first learned that the Site would be developed as it was densely covered with tress. It was hard to have such a green site in Sham Shui Po. It was a pity if the Site with so many ecological resources was sacrificed for the development of only a few hundred flats; and
- (c) while the Government might consider that the trees within the Site were not rare species such that they could be felled for development, he considered that the large number of trees within the Site did have their ecological and amenity values and should be preserved.

[Actual speaking time: 2 minutes]

R299 – Tang Siu King

14. Ms Tang Siu King made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Dynasty Heights;
- (b) she believed that future luxurious residences developed at the Site would mostly be owned by the affluent people from the Mainland but not Hong Kong people;

- (c) if the Site was used for development of public housing, there would be many people and many buses moving around, changing the tranquil character of the area;
- (d) similar to the Board's approval of the proposed heritage hotel at Lugard Road despite strong objection, she did not believe that her objection could change the decision of the Board to approve the zoning amendment; and
- (e) as her home was close to the hillside, there were sometimes wild animals such as snakes, monkeys and boars, entering her garden. If the hillside of the Site was developed, she might not see these wild animals again. She hoped that the Site could remain in its current state.

[Actual speaking time: 3 minutes]

R370 – Li Cheuk Man

15. Mr Li Cheuk Man made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Dynasty Heights;
- (b) he objected to the rezoning of the Site mainly for environmental and ecological reasons;
- (c) it was not worthwhile to sacrifice the Site, which had been regenerated from previous disturbance for over twenty years, for the development of some 900 flats which could not contribute to resolve the housing problem in Hong Kong;
- (d) he enjoyed the current tranquil environment and good air quality of the area. There would be environmental impacts on the surrounding areas and the nearby residents during the construction of the Site; and
- (e) the provision of car parking spaces in Tai Wo Ping was inadequate. The

traffic conditions of the area should be improved and more public transport services should be provided to support the new developments in the area.

[Actual speaking time: 3 minutes]

R660 – Lee Chung Yiu Bennie

16. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lee Chung Yiu, Bennie made the following main points:

- (a) he was a residents of Dynasty Heights;
- (b) Hong Kong was a leading city of China and it should be the model of development for other Mainland cities. It should not be developed as a ‘concrete jungle’. As Mainland cities did not have a well-balanced approach in land use planning, many problems appeared, such as the hazy weather in Beijing. If the planning of Hong Kong was too short-sighted, Hong Kong would soon become a second or third tier city of China and would be marginalised;
- (c) a set of rules and orders had been established for the governance of Hong Kong and it should be strictly followed. The current change of the green belt policy was a breach of the established rules;
- (d) there had been many new developments in front of Dynasty Heights in recent years. If the Site at the back of Dynasty Heights was also developed, Dynasty Heights would be sandwiched by developments;
- (e) comparing the developments of China and Japan, Japan had maintained a high percentage of greenery but China did just the opposite by giving the priority to development and sacrificing the natural environment. Hong Kong should not follow the Mainland’s mode of haphazard development; and

- (f) a former Director of Housing had asserted that the country park could not be developed. It was outrageous to rezone the Site which was only 70m away from the country park for development.

[Actual speaking time: 6 minutes]

R676 – 林育豪 (Lam Yuk Ho, Peter)

17. Mr Lam Yuk Ho, Peter made the following main points:

- (a) he was a property owner and resident of Dynasty Heights; and
- (b) one-third of the boundary of Dynasty Heights abutted on Yin Ping Road. His flat was subject to serious traffic noise and dust from Lung Cheung Road. If about one thousand flats were developed at the Site at the end of Yin Ping Road, he could not imagine how much more noisy and dusty his flats and other flats of Dynasty Heights would become.

[Actual speaking time: 2 minutes]

R4402 – 歐曉靜

R4403 – 歐曉蕾

R4416 – 陳慧紅

18. Ms Cindy Lam, the representers' representative, made the following main points:

- (a) she grew up at Sham Shui Po;
- (b) as the three representers she represented only received the documents from the Board on the evening of 4.3.2015 and the Board's Secretariat could not arrange for them to attend the hearing on another day, she was authorised to make the oral submissions on their behalf;

- (c) the representers grew up at Sham Shui Po. They considered that over years of development, the buildings in the district were getting taller and taller for the accommodation of more and more people. The new developments in recent years had particularly worsened the air quality of Sham Shui Po. Nevertheless, they acknowledged the need for providing more housing to people;
- (d) the representers often played at the hillside around the Site when they were young. As the topography of the Site was steep and it was vulnerable to landslide, the Government did not plan to develop the Site after clearing the squatters and allowed the area to regenerate naturally. Now the representers would bring their children to the hillside for hiking and playing during weekends as it was the only piece of spacious green site in Sham Shui Po and was free of charge;
- (e) the representers learned in 2014 from the news that the Site had been put in the land sale list without consultation and without going through the statutory planning process. Some hiking trails near Yin Ping Road also were blocked at that time. Hikers could no longer walk from Choi Hung Estate via Phoenix House to the hiking trails. Newspapers had once reported that the Site would be used for public housing development, which was understandable by the representers. However, it was later reported by the media that the Site would be sold for private housing development. It was a shock to the representers as it meant the loss of a beautiful public green site for the enjoyment of only a small group of people;
- (f) the representers then started to study what green belt and green buffer were, and the environmental enhancement efforts of the Government. They found out that the Government had implemented various measures to improve the environment and planted many new trees in the past few years. The Site was the only piece of green belt site in Sham Shui Po. Even the open spaces provided by the Government could not replace the greenery and good air quality offered by the Site. The representers objected to the

rezoning proposal and requested the Government to retain the Site as a green belt for the enjoyment of the general public; and

- (g) meeting the housing need was the only reason for rezoning the Site. The development parameters provided by the Government indicated that about 980 flats and 115 car parking spaces would be provided at the Site. However, the Secretary for Development said in the week before that for sites on the land sale list of 2015/16, the requirement for provision of a minimum number of units would not be stipulated in the land leases of the sites for allowing flexibility to the market. As such, it was wondered if the assumed 980 flats for the Site were still relevant as the eventual number of flats provided at the Site would be at the discretion of the developer. The information provided in the Paper, e.g. the assessed traffic impact and the estimated population, would also be irrelevant if there was no control on the number of units and it was meaningless to continue the discussion based on the information of the Paper.

[Actual speaking time: 9 minutes]

19. As the presentation from PlanD's representative, the representers and the representers' representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

[Mr H.W. Cheung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

20. The Chairman asked DPO/TWK to explain to the Board again the criteria of the "GB" review and why the Site, which was covered with vegetation, was rezoned for housing development. In response, Mr Lawrence Y.C. Chau, DPO/TWK, said that it was stated in the 2013 Policy Address that the Government would adopt a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply for meeting housing and other development needs. Stage 1 of the "GB" review was undertaken with the focus mainly on those "GB" sites which were devegetated, deserted or formed and did not require extensive tree felling or slope cutting. It was reaffirmed in the 2014 and 2015 Policy Address that the Government would continue to review various land uses and rezone sites as appropriate for residential use. Stage 2 of the

“GB” review covered the “GB” sites which were located on the fringe of urban or new development areas with a relatively lower buffer or conservation value, including those sites which were close to existing developed areas or public roads. The rezoning of the Site met the criteria of Stage 2 of the “GB” review as the Site was served by Yin Ping Road and its conservation value was relatively lower as it was a piece of disturbed land which was only regenerated after 1987. As it was announced in the 2015 Policy Address that the Government had adopted a total housing supply target of 480,000 units for the ten-year period from 2015/16 to 2024/25, the “GB” review would continue for the identification of more suitable land for housing development.

21. A Member asked the following questions: (1) why the Site was put in the land sale list of 2015/16 before the Board had made its final decision on the zoning amendment; (2) if the zoning amendment was not accepted by the Board eventually, how the land sale programme of the Government would be affected; (3) how many other sites were similarly put in the land sale list before the Board had made decisions on the zoning amendments; and (4) whether it was the case that the future developer of the Site could have a discretion on the number of units to be developed at the Site as mentioned by one of the representers’ representatives.

22. In response, Mr Chau said that 980 flats at the Site was an estimate, which was calculated by dividing the maximum gross floor area (GFA) of 58,750 m² (i.e. plot ratio of 2.88) permitted over an assumed average flat size of 60 m² per flat. TD had assessed the required parking provision and the relevant trip generations based on different scenarios of flat size and flat numbers. With a fixed total GFA, if the flat size was increased, the number of flats would decrease accordingly, and the required parking provision under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) would also be different. For instance, when the average flat size was doubled to 120 m², the flat number would be halved to 490 flats. The number of parking spaces required would increase since flats of 120 m² in size had a higher parking ratio than flats of 60 m² according to the HKPSG. However, the overall trip generation under the two scenarios would be similar. Mr Marco H.Y. Tai, E/SSP, TD, supplemented that for the development of 980 flats at an average flat size of 60 m², 115 parking spaces (at the upper limit) would be required under the HKPSG. The Chairman noted from the website of the Lands Department (LandsD) that there were 29 sites on the land sale list of 2015/16, and 15 required rezoning. He said that if the Board did not agree with

the rezoning proposals eventually, the sites would be taken out from the land sale list and would not be sold. The Government might then explore if there were other suitable sites that could be added to the land sale list to maintain the housing supply target.

23. A Member asked the following questions: (1) when the Site was first rezoned as “GB”; (2) whether the site of Dynasty Heights was previously rezoned from “GB”; (3) when Dynasty Heights was first occupied; (4) what the plot ratio and parking ratio of Dynasty Heights were; (5) whether the parking provision at Dynasty Heights could meet the demand of its residents; and (6) what the arrangements were for protecting the section of the stream that encroached onto the southern corner of the Site.

24. In response to the Member’s question on the utilisation of parking spaces at Dynasty Heights, Mr Yim Shun Fat (R363) said that he did not have information on the actual utilisation rate of parking spaces at Dynasty Heights, but the parking ratio at Dynasty Heights should be higher than that of the proposed development at the Site. However, residents of Dynasty Heights still faced the problem of inadequate parking spaces and some of them had to park their cars at Beacon Heights. If the Site was developed into a luxurious housing estate, its residents would certainly face a keener problem of inadequate parking spaces based on the currently proposed parking ratio and they would need to park their cars around different car parks in the area.

25. As regards the Member’s question on the zoning history of the Site, Mr Chau illustrated with a slide in the Powerpoint presentation that on a previous version of the OZP exhibited in May 1971, the Tai Wo Ping area including the southern part of the Site, which was still a squatter area, was under a residential zoning. From 1976 through 1980, the more detailed planning of the area had been done and the size of the residential zoning had been reduced. The OZP exhibited in September 1980 indicated that two residential zones covering broadly the sites of the current Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights were designated. The southern part of the Site and the areas to its south and southeast were designated as “GB” on that OZP. The Planning Scheme Area of the OZP had been extended northwards in 1987 where the whole of the Site was included within the “GB” zone. The boundaries of the residential zones covering Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights were further refined in 1987 and 1993. The land use zonings in this part of Tai Wo Ping remained more or less the same since 1993 until the Site was rezoned from “GB” to “R(C)13”

in July 2014. The plot ratio of Dynasty Heights was 1.55 and it was first occupied in 1999. There was no information on the parking ratio of Dynasty Heights at the moment.

26. As regards the Member's question on the protection arrangement for the stream, Mr Chau said that the stream was in fact a small ephemeral water course, and no water course was observed during the dry season. Mr Cary P.H. Ho, SNCO(S), AFCD, supplemented that the current landscape of the Site was not natural as it had been disturbed before 1987 when it was a squatter area. The flow direction of the water course within the Site was not apparent, and the water course did not possess high ecological value. When there was water flowing through, some aquatic organisms might appear in the water course. The presence of Lesser Spiny Frog and Big-headed Frog had been recorded, but they were not the very rare species. It was possible to see monkeys, boars and birds within the Site in this regenerated woodland. Generally speaking, the trees within the Site were not old and they were not of particular value for preservation.

27. The same Member asked if the Site was under "GB" zoning while Dynasty Height was under residential zoning in 1987, and if there was illegal parking around Dynasty Heights. In response, Ms Cindy Lam (representative of R4402, R4403 and R4416) said that there was no illegal parking in the vicinity of Dynasty Heights. Some residents of Dynasty Heights would park their cars at Beacon Heights and Chak On Estate. As regards the zonings, Mr Chau said that in 1971, the southern part of the Site was within a residential zone while the northern part was outside the Scheme Boundary of the OZP; whereas in 1980, the southern part of the Site was rezoned to "GB" and its northern part remained to be outside the Scheme Boundary of OZP.

28. A Member said that as mentioned by Mr Ho of AFCD, the woodland within the Site had already been regenerated over the past years and there were wildlife within the Site. This Member asked if the history of the Site for having been a piece of disturbed land many years ago should be an important factor in deciding that the Site could be rezoned for development. In response, Mr Chau said that the environment of the Site was not entirely the same as the surrounding natural environment. There were still remnants of squatter structures within the Site and the trees growing there were mainly common species with no particular value for preservation. Mr Ho supplemented that according to the tree survey conducted by LandsD for the Site, there are about 680 trees in the Site, about 60% of which

were *Macaranga tanarius* (血桐), *Mallotus paniculatus* (白楸) and *Celtis sinensis* (朴樹). These three tree species were very common in Hong Kong, and the mix of tree species in the woodland was relatively simple. Although a woodland had been developed within the Site after over twenty years of natural regeneration, its ecological value was relatively lower than that of the surrounding natural woodland in terms of the age and species of trees, the mix of tree species and the structure of the woodland.

29. A Member asked the following questions: (1) what the respective development intensities of Beacon Heights, Dynasty Heights and the Site were; (2) what their respective car parking ratios were; and (3) whether the capacity of Yin Ping Road/Lung Ping Road was adequate to support the traffic generated from the three developments. The Chairman also asked if the planned parking provision was made on the basis of a single development or an area as a whole. In response, Mr Chau said that the plot ratios of Dynasty Heights and the Site were 1.55 and 2.88 respectively, whilst the plot ratios of the two new housing sites north of Lung Cheung Road to the east of Beacon Heights were 1.01 and 1.46 respectively. Mr Tai supplemented that the proposed parking provision for the Site was based on the assumptions of 980 flats and an average flat size of 60 m², and the traffic implication was assessed on the basis of this particular development. The assessment on the traffic flow of Tai Wo Ping had taken into account the existing developments (i.e. Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights), the two new developments north of Lung Cheung Road and the proposed development at the Site. It was estimated that the junction of Yin Ping Road and Lung Ping Road would still have sufficient capacity to serve the area up to 2029. Besides, upon completion of improvement works at the junction of Nam Cheong Street and Cornwall Street, that road junction would also have the capacity to meet the traffic demand up to 2029.

30. A Member asked DPO/TWK to clarify the criteria adopted in Stage 2 of the “GB” review in determining the low buffering value and low conservation value of a “GB” site and whether the recreational use of a “GB” site was also a consideration. The Chairman also asked DPO/TWK to explain whether the Site was the only site within the subject strip of green belt to the north of Lung Cheung Road and Tai Po Road identified for rezoning. In response, Mr Chau said that the Site was a piece of previously disturbed land whilst the areas to its east and west within the same strip of green belt were natural slopes. As such, the buffering and conservation values of the Site were comparatively lower and it was identified in Stage 2 of the “GB” review for rezoning. Development at the Site did not require the

provision of new road linkage as it was abutting the end of Ying Ping Road. Additional traffic improvement works were also not necessary since the junction improvement at Nam Cheong Street and Cornwall Street had already been planned before and would commence soon. To reduce the extent of slope stabilisation works and the need for felling trees outside the Site, vertical retaining wall was proposed for the development. As a small ephemeral water course was spotted within the Site, a non-building area would be designated in the central portion of the Site for protecting the water course. To the southeast of the Site, there was a natural stream course running in a north-south direction, which also ran underneath the site entrance that was connected with Yin Ping Road. The natural stream course would not be affected by the development, and there was no evidence that the ephemeral water course of the Site was connected to that natural stream course. Mr Ho supplemented that if the Site was to be used for housing development, most of the trees within the Site would have to be felled. However, AFCD took a cautious attitude towards tree felling and would not consider that a tree could be felled simply because it was a common species, but rather whether there was any reason and need for the tree felling.

31. The same Member further asked the following questions: (1) by whom and under what criteria was the Site assessed to have a relatively lower buffering value that it could be rezoned for housing development; (2) whether a well vegetated site could be considered with conservation value; and (3) whether the recreational value of the Site was a consideration in the “GB” review. In response, the Chairman said the “GB” review was done by PlanD in a holistic manner and the conditions of each sites was assessed by PlanD. Mr Chau supplemented that the buffering value and conservation value were interrelated with each other. Although people could access the Site, the hiking trails did not pass through the Site. As earlier explained by Mr Ho of AFCD, the ecological value of the woodland within the Site was relatively lower than that of the surrounding natural woodland in terms of the age and species of trees, the mix of tree species and the structure of the woodland. As regards the recreational value of the Site, there was adequate provision of open space in Shek Kip Mei district to serve its population. As the Site was at the uphill fringe of the district, there was no plan to develop the Site for recreational purposes.

32. Noting that a car parking ratio of about 10:1 was proposed for the Site by the Government, a Member asked whether the number of parking spaces that should be provided would be stipulated for the future developer to follow. Besides, as there were 590

residential units and 592 car parking spaces at Dynasty Heights (i.e. a car parking ratio of roughly 1:1), this Member asked whether the traffic impact of the Site had been assessed with the scenario that the future developer of the Site would also adopt a car parking ratio of 1:1 such that there would be 980 parking spaces at the Site. In response, Mr Chau said that according to the HKPSG, the parking requirement for private housing development was determined by a number of development parameters including the average flat size, the number of flats and the location of the site (as to whether the site was close to rail station). For the provision of 980 flats with an average flat size would be 60 m², it would not result in a car parking ratio of 1:1 but a total of 115 parking spaces, taking the upper limit, would be provided.

33. A Member requested DPO/TWK to explain why the Site was considered to have a relatively low buffering value, noting that it was actually located between the built-up area to its south and the country park to its north and was performing a buffering function. In response, Mr Chau said that given the Site was previously a disturbed area, the existence of a distance of some 70m between the Site and the country park, and the topography of the Site with a series of platforms at different levels ranging from about 130mPD to 180mPD which contrasted largely with the height of the hill to its north, the buffering value of the Site was considered not high.

34. Noting that the hillside around the Site was spacious and that DPO/TWK had indicated that the hiking trails did not pass through the Site, a Member asked how the development of the Site would affect the residents of Sham Shui Po to enjoy the hillside and the hiking trails. The Chairman also asked DPO/TWK to elaborate why the buffering value of the Site was relatively lower than those green belt areas to its east and west. In response, Mr Chau said that the hiking trails leading to Lion Rock Country Park were not located within or connected to the Site. The topography of the Site was different from that of its surrounding areas which were mainly steep and natural slopes. As the Site was a piece of previously disturbed land which differed from its surrounding natural woodland, it was identified for rezoning to facilitate housing development.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

35. Noting that the whole area covering the Site and the current site of Dynasty Heights was squatters area in the early 1980s, a Member asked why the site of Dynasty Heights was subsequently zoned for residential use whilst the Site and its surrounding areas were zoned “GB” after clearance of the squatters. In response, Mr Chau said that the reason for zoning the Dynasty Heights site for residential use and the Site as GB” in 1987 was mainly that the Site was located at an upper level away from the main road with greater development constraints. However, following the criteria for identifying sites with relatively lower buffer or conservation value and those located close to existing developed areas or public roads for development under Stage 2 of the “GB” review, the Site at Yin Ping Road was identified for rezoning to residential use in 2014.

36. Noting that the Site was located at an upper level of Yin Ping Road and had a greater development intensity compared with Dynasty Heights and that the parking provision of Dynasty Heights was already inadequate even with its car parking ratio of about 1:1, a Member queried why the proposed car parking ratio of about 10:1 for the Site would be considered as reasonable by the Government. This Member also asked whether the capacities of the roads in Tai Wo Ping were adequate to support the three developments (viz. Beacon Heights, Dynasty Heights and the proposed development at the Site) if the car ownership rate of the future residents at the Site was similar to those of Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights. In response, Mr Chau said that the requirement of 115 parking spaces for the Site was estimated in accordance with the HKPSG by TD based on the development parameters including an estimated 980 flats and an average flat size of 60 m² provided by PlanD. With a table showed on the visualiser, Mr Chau explained that TD had also made estimations on the parking requirement based on other types of flat size as follows:

Average Flat Size	60 m ²	100 m ²	120 m ²	160 m ²	180 m ²
Estimated Car Parking No.	115	206	449	459	516
Trip Rate (per hour)	98	131	127	116	107

The generations of trip rate per hour as estimated by TD under different flat size scenarios were not much different. Based on the above trip rate generations under different scenarios, the capacities of the roads nearby were considered sufficient to support the development at the Site.

37. A Member considered that the capacity of Yin Ping Road should be able to cater for the number of cars that were owned by the residents of the developments that it served. Even if more flats were developed at the Site with a smaller flat size, the car ownership rate of the residents of the development should be more or less similar to those of the existing Beacon Heights and Dynasty Heights, notwithstanding the prescribed planning standards under the HKPSG. In that regard, this Member asked if the development at the Site would provide a large number of flats, whether the capacity of Yin Ping Road would be sufficient to support the development. In response, Mr Chau said that the maximum number of parking spaces provided at the Site would be controlled by the lease restrictions and the parking provision under lease would follow the requirements of the HKPSG. As such, a development with a large number of smaller flats would not be allowed under lease to provide the correspondingly large number of parking spaces. The trip rates estimated by TD for different types of development were based on scientific analysis and statistics.

38. The Chairman asked if the development at the Site would cause noise and air ventilation impacts on Dynasty Heights, which was a concern raised by some representers. In response, Mr Chau said that the Environmental Protection Department, having regard to the development parameters of the Site, considered that the development at the Site would not create adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. As regards air ventilation, an air ventilation assessment had been conducted and it was concluded that the development would not create adverse air ventilation impact on Dynasty Heights.

39. A Member asked the following questions: (1) who the management agent was of the Site after clearance of the squatters; (2) whether new tree had been planted by the Government within the Site; (3) whether the trees and vegetations regenerated at the Site were through its own natural succession; and (4) whether the Site was considered to possess a comparatively higher natural regeneration ability than other disturbed green belt sites. In response, Mr Ho said that the Site was probably under the management of LandsD after clearance of the squatters in 1987 as it was a piece of government land, and the current conditions of the Site appeared to be regenerated on its own through natural succession. The natural regeneration ability of the Site might not be very high judging from the density of trees currently growing within the Site.

[The meeting was adjourned for a break of 5 minutes.]

[Ms Anita W.T. Ma arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

40. In response to a Member's previous question on the recreational value of the Site, Ms Cindy Lam (representative of R4402, R4403 and R4416) said that the Site's recreational value to the residents of Sham Shui Po was profound and it could not be replaced by those recreational facilities, such as community hall or indoor recreational centre, provided in the district by the Government. The Site could be easily accessible from the main areas of Sham Shui Po. It was spacious and provided a breathing and leisure ground for the residents. The Site served not only the Sham Shui Po residents. As it was located at the hillside in the midst of East and West Kowloon, many hikers from other areas of Kowloon would access the Site. As the developments nearby, including Dynasty Heights and the two new housing sites north of Lung Cheung Road, all involved extensive areas of slope stabilisation works, it was questionable if the proposed adoption of vertical retaining structure at the Site was feasible. It was likely that eventually large areas of trees around the Site would be felled for slope stabilisation works, and it would affect people's enjoyment of the hillside. Ms Wong Hang Yi (R4382) supplemented that many elderly people used to go to the Site for exercise in the morning as the Site provided several platforms for their activities. Hikers also used to pass through the Site until recently when most parts of the Site had been fenced off.

41. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures on the second day had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations in the absence of the representers and commenters after completion of all the Group 2 hearing and would inform the representers of its decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representers, the representers' representatives and the government representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

42. The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.