

**Minutes of 1122nd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 27.9.2016**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

Assistant Director of Lands/Region (3)
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan (a.m.)

Deputy Director of Lands/General
Mr Jeff Lam (p.m.)

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

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr T.Y. Ip

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3
Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Andy S.H. Lam

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Mr Louis K.H. Kau (a.m.)
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board
Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (a.m.)
Mr T.C. Cheng (p.m.)

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/30

(TPB Paper No. 10175)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Chairman extended a welcome and said that as there was a large number of attendees for the meeting and the Secretariat would need more time to conduct the registration and verification of authorizations, the meeting would adjourn for a short while.

[The meeting resumed at 9:15 a.m.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

2. The following government representatives and the representers/commenters or their representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government representatives

| | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang | - | District Planning Officer/Hong Kong, Planning Department (DPO/HK, PlanD) |
| Ms Jessica K.T. Lee | - | Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (STP/HK), PlanD |
| Mr Chan Chung Yuen | | Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department |
| Mr Mok Hing Man | - | Senior Engineer, Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) |
| Mr Tse Chun Wah | - | Engineer, EMSD |

Representers/Commenters or their representatives

R8/C4 – Judy Chan

Ms Chan Judy Kapui - Representer and commenter

R13/C7 – South Horizons Concern Group

R14 – Au Yuen Fat, Joseph

Mr Au Yuen Fat, Joseph - Representer and representer's and
commenter's representative

R16/C1 – Designing Hong Kong Ltd.

R511 – Cody Chow

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representers' and commenter's
representative

R133 – Yeung Wai Chun

R573 – Lee Hon Chun, Alex

Mr Lee Hon Chun, Alex - Representer and representer's
representative

R254 – Yeung Pui Man

R405/C8 – Ng Wai Huk, Allan

Mr Ng Wai Huk, Allan - Representer, commenter and
representer's representative

R265 – Tsui Kai Sang

Mr Tsui Kai Sang - Representer

R287 – Fung Mei Ping

Ms Fung Mei Ping - Representer

R296 – Tony Chan

R349 – Chau Kut Yu

Mr Tony Chan - Representer and representer's

representative

R336/C9 – Ng Tsz Ying, Monica

Ms Ng Tsz Ying, Monica - Representer and commenter

R287 – Fung Mei Ping

R352 – Ritko Lo

R411 – Lo Kwai Fun Mable

R432 – Tse Wai King

R542 – Lai Kai Fan

R543 – Mr Fung

R544 – Mr G Fung

R545 – Mr J Fung

R546 – Ms A Chow

R567 – Lam Wai Fun Edith

R571 – Chan Ka Lok

R580 – Lau Wai Yee

Dr Chan Ka Lok - Representer and representers' representative

R408 – Amanda Pak

Ms Amanda Pak - Representer

R414 – Ho Yin Kan

Ms Ho Yin Kan - Representer

R421/C10 – Alex Chan

R605 – South Horizons Estate Owners Committee

Mr Alex Chan - Representer, commenter and representer's representative

Mr Chau Sze Lam] Representer's representatives

Ms Yeung Tsz Ting]

R436 – Ng Lee Lan

R459 – Dennis Leung

Mr Dennis Leung - Representer and representer's
representative

R423 -李俊諺、羅慧嫻

R438 – Kwan Wai Tak

R492 – Lam Kai Fai

Mr Lam Kai Fai - Representer and representers'
representative

R453 – Lo Allie

Ms Lo Allie - Representer

R455 – Leung Kin Tong

Mr Leung Kin Tong - Representer

R458 – Chan Yun Chiu, Gary

Mr Chan Yun Chiu, Gary - Representer

R472 – Richard Hoyer

Mr Richard Hoyer - Representer

R486 – Tang Poon Hang, Edwin

Mr Tang Poon Hang, Edwin - Representer

R518 – Mok Wah Hoi

Mr Mok Wah Hoi - Representer

R548 – Warren Man

R549 – Vikki Fung

Mr Warren Man - Representer and representer's

representative

R550 – Minah Leung

Ms Minah Leung - Representer

R566 – Law Yuk Lan

Ms Law Yuk Lan - Representer

R582 – Yu Chi Kin

Mr Yu Chi Kin - Representer

R600 – Li Frazer Tsz Yan

Mr Li Frazer Tsz Yan - Representer

R602 –Zhu Hong

Ms Zhu Hong - Representer

C16 – Nip Chi Keung

Mr Nip Chi Keung - Commenter

3. The Secretary reported that one of the representations was submitted by the South Horizons Estate Owners' Committee (SHEOC) (R605). Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had declared interest for owning a property in South Horizons. Members noted that Dr Fok had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting.

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

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. Representers or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation numbers, followed by the oral submissions by the commenters or their representatives. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer/commenter or their representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters and their representatives 2 minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course

6. The Chairman informed the attendees that as the number of representers/commenters or their representatives who indicated that they would attend the hearing was more than those originally scheduled, and the estimated total speaking time required was more than 600 minutes, there was possibility that the hearing might not be able to complete at this meeting and another day might have to be arranged to continue the hearing.

7. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the representations and comments.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica K.T. Lee, STP/HK, made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) on 24.12.2015, the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H15/30 (the Plan) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The

amendments involve the following:

- (i) Amendment Item A - rezoning of a site at Lee Nam Road, Ap Lei Chau (Site A) from “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Cargo Handling Area” (“OU(Cargo Handling Area)”), “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Industrial” (“I”) to “Residential (Group A) 4” (“R(A)4”) for private residential use with a building height restriction of 110mPD. The site was currently occupied by the Hong Kong School of Motoring (HKSM);
 - (ii) Amendment Item B - rezoning of a strip of land fronting the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area (Site B) from “OU(Cargo Handling Area)” to “Open Space” (“O”). The site would be used as a temporary reprovisioning site for HKSM;
 - (iii) Amendment Item C1 – rezoning of the southern portion of the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area from “I” to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business(3)” (“OU(B)3”) with a building height restriction (BHR) of 100mPD;
 - (iv) Amendment Item C2 - rezoning of the northern portion of the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area from “I” to “OU(B)4” with a BHR of 115mPD;
- (b) a total of 607 representations and 16 comments were received;

The Representations

- (c) for Amendment Item A, out of the 607 representations, six indicated support (R1 to R6), one had no objection (R7), 597 indicated objection (R8 to R604) and three provided comments (R605 to R607) on the proposal;

- (d) for the 36 representations related to Amendment Item B, 10 indicated support (R1 to R3, R8 to R10, R12, R598 to R600) and 26 indicated objection (R571 to R583 and R585 to 597) to the proposal;
- (e) for the 19 representations related to Amendment Items C1 and C2, five indicated support (R1, R2, R8 to R10) and 14 raised objection (R591 to 604) to the proposal;

Major Grounds of Representations, Representers' Proposals and Responses

Amendment Item A

- (f) the major grounds of the representations and responses to grounds of representations, as summarised in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.3 and paragraphs 6.3.1 to 6.3.27 of the Paper respectively, were highlighted below:

Supportive/No objection Representations (R1 to R7)

- (i) the proposed residential development could better utilize Site A, increase flat supply and stabilize property price;
- (ii) the new shopping facilities of the proposed residential development could promote positive competition and lead to improved management of the existing shopping malls. An increase in population in the area could attract more shops and dining facilities and enhance diversity;
- (iii) the increased residential population would induce better transport services. The MTR South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) to be commissioned in end 2016 could improve the existing traffic problem;
- (iv) response - all the supportive views were noted;

Adverse Representations/Providing Comments (R8 to R607)

Housing Need/ Population and Development Density

- (v) Ap Lei Chau was the second most densely populated island in the world. Since the population density and traffic load of the area had already reached its maximum capacity, there should not be any further increase in population and plot ratio;
- (vi) the Government should first develop sites in Wong Chuk Hang area, such as the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) and the Hong Kong Police College site; areas near Wah Fu Estate; the New Territories or other areas with lower population density. The Government should find alternative sites for residential development in less densely populated areas or areas already with adequate facilities;
- (vii) the Government stated earlier that Marina South was the last piece of land for residential development in Ap Lei Chau;
- (viii) the responses to the above grounds were:
- planning was an on-going process in response to the changing societal needs;
 - to increase land supply to meet the housing and other development needs, the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply in the short, medium and long term, and would continue the effort with a view to increasing land supply and meeting housing and other development needs;
 - alternative housing sites such as Wong Chuk Hang “CDA” site had been committed for a commercial cum residential development on top of the railway depot for the SIL(E)

there. The potential of areas near Wah Fu Estate for residential development was being examined by the Government. As for the Hong Kong Police College, the Security Bureau and the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF) indicated that the existing facilities were required to meet the training needs and there was no plan to relocate the College;

- Marina South had been included in the 2011-12 Land Sale Programme and was the only “Residential (Group A)” site in the area that had not been developed at that time;

Provision of Facilities and Open Space

(ix) the open space/market/shopping mall/eating place/community/medical/educational facilities in Ap Lei Chau were inadequate;

(x) further increase in population would pose additional demand for various facilities and affect the livelihood and living quality of local residents;

(xi) there was a lack of about 2.83 ha of district open space in the area in the planned future;

(xii) the responses to the above grounds were:

- open space, community, leisure and recreational facilities were provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Based on a planned population of 159,000 in Ap Lei Chau, there was no shortfall on government, institution or community (GIC) and open space provisions as per HKPSG requirement in the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau area. Moreover, there was no request from the relevant government bureaux/departments to use the subject site for GIC uses. The

future developer of the site could also provide some commercial and retail facilities in response to the market demand;

- the provision of district open space (DOS) was measured in accordance with District Council (DC) boundary. There was currently a surplus of about 12.92 ha DOS to serve the existing population in the Southern District;
- even for the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau area alone, there was an overall surplus of about 5.56 ha of open space (taking into account the shortfall of about 2.83 ha DOS compensated by the surplus of about 8.39 ha local open space (LOS));

Traffic and Infrastructural Related Aspects

- (xiii) the traffic congestion problem in Ap Lei Chau had not been resolved for years. The existing transport infrastructures were unable to cope with the increased traffic generated by additional developments;
- (xiv) the proposed residential development and the nearby proposed commercial development would further increase the population and thus cause adverse traffic impacts on South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau. The traffic congestion in South Horizons, Ap Lei Chau, Wong Chuk Hang, Aberdeen Tunnel and even the Southern District would become worse;
- (xv) the Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only external road link connecting the island with the other areas on Hong Kong Island. In case of any accidents happened, there would be further traffic congestion in Ap Lei Chau area and even up to Aberdeen Tunnel, blocking the access of emergency vehicles to South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau area and putting the residents' lives at risk;

- (xvi) the redevelopment of the existing liquefied petroleum gas depot and oil products transit depot (LPG/oil depots) for residential use was refused by the Government years ago due to traffic reasons. The Government was contradicting itself in the rezoning proposal for residential development despite there was a marked increase in the number of vehicles and residential developments in the area;
- (xvii) there was no information on the relocation site for the HKSM. Relocating the HKSM might cause inconvenience to the learners;
- (xviii) the responses to the above ground were:
- according to the Traffic Review study conducted by the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) which had taken into account the increase in traffic flows brought about by the proposed residential development, all major road junctions in Ap Lei Chau would still have spare capacities in the design year of 2021. The traffic volume to capacity ratio of Ap Lei Chau Bridge had not yet reached its capacity;
 - given the small size of the proposed residential development, C for T advised that its influence area was small and impact on Aberdeen Tunnel was minimal. Moreover, the traffic volume to capacity ratio of Aberdeen Tunnel had not reached its capacity yet. Its traffic flow was affected by merging movements at the northbound down-ramp of Canal Road Flyover and the tailing-back effect of traffic heading towards Cross Harbour Tunnel and Wan Chai/Causeway Bay. The situation would be improved upon the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E) and the Central-Wan

Chai Bypass (CWB);

- the Emergency Transport Coordination Centre (ETCC) of the Transport Department (TD) would liaise and coordinate among government departments, public transport operators and relevant organizations to handle the emergency;
- the previous request for rezoning of the existing LPG/oil depots for residential development was rejected by the Metro Planning Committee on land use, traffic, environmental and visual grounds. In relation to traffic ground, there was inadequate information in the submission to demonstrate that the traffic impacts arising from the rezoning proposal on the local traffic networks and Aberdeen Tunnel were acceptable. The situation was different from the subject amendment in that C for T had carried out a Traffic Review study and confirmed that the associated traffic impact was acceptable;
- C for T was liaising closely with relevant departments to identify suitable temporary site on Hong Kong Island for the relocation of the HKSM. Before a relocation site was identified, the HKSM would continue to use Site B under short term tenancy (STT). That was consistent with the prevailing practice to put vacant government land into short term use before the site was developed permanently;

Environmental Aspects

- (xix) the proposed residential development would increase population density and traffic flow and thus creating air pollution, noise nuisance, sewerage impact, health hazard problems and heat island effect;

- (xx) construction works and vehicles would also cause nuisance, pollution and damages to roads;
- (xxi) Site A, which was located near the existing sewage treatment plant, was not suitable for residential development;
- (xxii) the responses to the above grounds were:
 - the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) had no in-principle objection to the proposed rezoning as it would not result in insurmountable adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas including traffic related pollution;
 - the construction works of the proposed development were subject to statutory control of the relevant pollution control ordinances and their subsidiary regulations;
 - improvement works including odour treatment for the plant were being carried out under the Harbour Area Treatment Scheme (HATS) Stage 2A project. The deodorising systems could reduce more than 99% of odour;

Risk Aspect

- (xxiii) the proposed residential development was located near the existing LPG/oil depot which would pose safety hazard to the future residents. No risk assessment had been conducted;
- (xxiv) Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only access between the island and the outside. The safety issue in case of any accident happened in the LPG/oil depots had never been addressed;
- (xxv) the responses to the above grounds were:
 - the proposed residential development fell within the 500m

Consultation Zone (CZ) of the existing LPG/oil depots. The Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) had carried out a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) on the LPG/oil depots, which indicated that the risk levels for the proposed residential development were in compliance with the Government Risk Guidelines of the HKPSG. The QRA was endorsed by the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installation (CCPHI) on 8.3.2016;

- the 2-m high perimeter wall of the LPG/oil depots acted as an effective barrier to minimize the hazardous impacts of fire and gas leaks on the surrounding public. The proposed residential development was outside flammable zone of the fireball which was considered as the worst case scenario;
- in the event of any critical incidents and disasters, the Security Bureau would immediately activate the Emergency Response System and the Contingency Plan for Disasters. It would co-ordinate concerned departments on rescue operations including saving lives, protecting property and containing the situation;

Air Ventilation Aspect

(xxvi) the proposed residential development would cause ‘wall effect’ and affect the air ventilation;

(xxvii) the responses to the above ground were:

- an Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation (AVA EE) had been carried out in accordance with the Housing, Planning and Lands Bureau (HPLB) and Environment, Transport and Works Bureau (ETWB) Joint Technical Circular No. 01/2006 to assess the potential ventilation

impact of the proposed rezoning;

- in view of the geographical location of Site A, the surrounding topographical features and existing building morphology, the proposed residential development was unlikely to impose significant adverse ventilation impact on the surrounding;

Visual Aspect

(xxviii) the result of the visual appraisal was not objective as PlanD was the rezoning proponent, technical expert and examiner for the visual appraisal. The visual appraisal should be prepared by other parties appointed by the Board for a fair approach;

(xxix) the proposed residential development would intrude into the ridgeline of Yuk Kwai Shan and contravene the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG;

(xxx) the view of the residents of the South Horizons would be blocked;

(xxxi) the responses to the above grounds were:

- PlanD had put forward reliable technical assessments in support of the zoning amendments for the Board's consideration. The visual appraisal was carried out in accordance with the Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board (TPB PG-No. 41);
- the visual appraisal concluded that the proposed residential development, at a maximum building height of 110mPD, was visually compatible with the nearby developments and

could be perceived as an extension of the existing urban development. There would not be a significant change in the visual context;

- according to the Urban Design Guidelines under the HKPSG, the 20% building free zone was applied to the preservation of selected sections of ridgelines when viewed from seven strategic public vantage points along the Victoria Harbour. Yuk Kwai Shan was not one of the selected sections of ridgelines to be preserved;
- in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it was far more important to protect public views. In this regard, the Visual Appraisal should primarily assess the impact on sensitive public viewers from the most affected viewing points rather than private views from individual flats;

Amendment Item B

- (g) the major grounds of the representations and responses to grounds of representations, as summarised in paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 and paragraphs 6.3.28 to 6.3.31 of the Paper respectively, were highlighted below:

Supportive Representations (R1 to R3, R8 to R10, R12, R598 to R600)

- (i) the zoning amendment could better utilize the waterfront site, and improve the quality of life for people living in Ap Lei Chau;
- (ii) response - the supportive view was noted;

Adverse Representations (R571 to R583 and R585 to 597)

- (iii) the proposed open space was meant to serve the proposed residential development at Site A and the nearby commercial development under Amendment Items C1 and C2, and would not be a real DOS;
- (iv) HKSM would continue to occupy Site B and there would not be an open space in the foreseeable future;
- (v) the responses to the above grounds were:
- given its size and location, the proposed open space was mainly to serve the local people including workers, visitors and residents of the nearby existing and future developments in the area, and not meant to be a DOS;
 - in considering the future development of the open space, the Government would take into account various factors, including demand of leisure facilities in the district, usage of existing facilities, HKPSG, development constraints, resource availability as well as the views of the Southern District Council (SDC);
 - it was consistent with the prevailing practice to use Site B under STT for HKMS before the implementation of permanent development;

Amendment Items C1 and C2

- (h) the major grounds of the representations and responses to grounds of representations, as summarised in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 and paragraphs 6.3.32 to 6.3.34 of the Paper respectively, were highlighted below:

Supportive Representations (R1, R2, R8 to R10)

- (i) the rezoning of the land for business use would provide additional resources for commercial businesses and more non-industrial jobs;
- (ii) response - the supportive view was noted;

Adverse Representations (R591 to R604)

- (iii) the existing traffic in the Southern District was very congested and the capacity of Aberdeen Tunnel had already been overloaded. The newly developed residential and commercial developments under the amendment items would further worsen the existing traffic situation, even with the commissioning of the SIL(E);
- (iv) the responses to the above ground were:
 - C for T had no in-principle objection to the rezoning of the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area to business uses from traffic engineering point of view;
 - among the five existing industrial buildings, two had already been converted into business or retail uses. For the remaining three buildings, the responsible project proponents would be required to demonstrate that no adverse traffic impact on the surrounding areas upon lease modification;

Other Grounds of Representations (R533, R541, R543 to R546 and R585)

- (i) the major grounds of the representations and responses to grounds of representations, as summarised in paragraph 4.10 and paragraphs 6.3.35

to 6.3.36 of the Paper, were highlighted below:

- (i) local residents had not been consulted on the proposed rezoning and the traffic issues. The period selected for public consultation was inappropriate. The majority of Ap Lei Chau/South Horizons residents objected to the proposed housing development;
- (ii) SDC objected to the proposed rezoning of Lee Nam Road site for private residential use and passed a motion opposing the proposed rezoning;
- (iii) the responses to the above ground were:
 - PlanD had followed the established procedures to solicit public views including consultation with District Council, gazetting under the Ordinance and attending meeting/forum to consult the local residents. Details of the consultation procedure were set out in paragraphs 3 and 6.3.35 of the Paper;
 - SDC was consulted on the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential development and the zoning amendments to the OZP on 18.5.2015 and 1.2.2016 respectively. Besides, PlanD together with TD and EMSD attended the local forums on the proposed residential development at Lee Nam Road on 20.5.2015 and 23.12.2015. The public and stakeholders had been given opportunities to provide their views and proposals to the zoning amendments;

Representers' Proposals

- (j) the representers' proposals and responses to the proposals, as summarised in paragraphs 4.11 and 6.3.37 to 6.3.45 of the Paper, were highlighted below:

- (i) to rezone Site A to “G/IC” for community, recreational, leisure or sports facilities, environmental education purposes or different forms of open space such as waterfront promenade;
- (ii) the responses to the above ground were:
- based on a planned population of about 159,000 (including the proposed residential development under Amendment Item A), there was no shortfall on GIC and open space provisions as per HKPSG requirement in the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau area. Moreover, there was no request from the relevant government bureaux/departments to use the subject site for GIC uses;
 - the two existing waterfront promenades in Ap Lei Chau were not connected due to the topographical and site constraints. The elongated site configuration would essentially leave little residual space for waterfront promenade after the residential development was in place. While connectivity with other promenades was not possible, an alternative waterfront park was proposed at Site B to serve the workers, visitors and residents of the nearby developments in the area;

Comments on Representations and Responses

- (k) all the 16 comments received objected to Amendment Item A on similar grounds raised by the representers. The responses to the representations above were relevant;

PlanD's Views

- (l) the supportive views of R1 to R6 and the no-objection of R7 were noted;
and

- (m) PlanD did not support R8 to R607 and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations.

9. The Chairman then invited the representers/commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R8/C4 – Judy Chan

10. Ms Chan Judy Kapui made the following main points:

- (a) she was an elected member of the South Horizons West constituency of SDC. Being a non-executive director of the Urban Renewal Authority Board and a member of the Appeal Panel (Housing), she fully understood that there was an acute demand for additional housing land in Hong Kong. Although she was a resident of South Horizons, her objection to the proposed residential development at Site A was not due to the ‘Not in My Backyard’ mentality but that the site was not suitable for residential development;

Inadequate public consultation

- (b) when SDC was consulted by PlanD on the proposed rezoning of Site A on 18.5.2015, the discussion was terminated due to the lack of sufficient information on traffic assessment. On 15.6.2015, SDC wrote to the Development Bureau (DEVB) requesting the provision of more detailed information on traffic assessment for their discussion at the SDC meeting on 20.7.2015 but no traffic data nor analysis were provided in DEVB’s written reply. On 24.7.2015, SDC wrote to DEVB again inviting them to attend the last meeting of the preceding term of SDC on 21.9.2015. In reply, DEVB only provided some basic information on the traffic flow of major roads in Ap Lei Chau without any data or analysis on the junction capacity of those roads;
- (c) the local forums attended by PlanD and other government departments

were organised by SDC and local residents, and the opinion survey on the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential development was also initiated by SHEOC. It was from the government's Powerpoint presentation at one local forum that the local residents realised that the traffic volume to capacity ratio (v/c ratio) of the local road networks had almost reached their maximum threshold;

- (d) given that there was a lack of essential information on the traffic data on the impact of the proposed residential development on the carrying capacity of the road network, all the 17 elected members, irrespective of their political affiliations, except one abstained, unanimously objected to the proposed residential development which would further increase the population density in Ap Lei Chau;

Unsuitable for residential development

- (e) Ap Lei Chau, with an area of about 1.32km², was only a very small portion of the Southern District with a total area of about 40km². However, the island had accommodated one-third of the total population of the district;
- (f) as compared with the population density of Kwun Tong which was 52,000 persons/km², the population density of Ap Lei Chau was even higher at 66,000 persons/km². Ap Lei Chau was the second most densely populated island in the world. Given that Ap Lei Chau was characterised by its hilly terrain, the flat land on the island had already been fully developed;
- (g) given the configuration of Site A being a narrow strip of land and was only separated from Yuk Kwai Shan by a road, the site was considered not suitable for residential development;

Adverse traffic impact

- (h) the proposed residential development would further increase the population and further aggravate the existing traffic congestion in the area.

While it was stated that the proposed residential development would have insignificant traffic impact on Aberdeen Tunnel, given that the Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only road link connecting the island with other areas on Hong Kong Island, the traffic of the island would become paralysed even when the bridge was only partially blocked by a minor traffic accident / a car breakdown;

- (i) it was understood from past experience that the Emergency Transport Coordination Centre would not be able to resolve the emergency situation of the area;
- (j) Members would easily be misled by the results of the traffic review unless they had first-hand experience on the local traffic situation of Ap Lei Chau;
- (k) given the extremely high population density of Ap Lei Chau, Members were requested to carefully consider whether it was desirable to further increase the population of the island when the existing traffic congestion was already severe and would be further worsened when other new developments such as planned international school and hotel were implemented;
- (l) there was an existing population of about 90,000 people in Ap Lei Chau of which 50,000 were working population whom required daily commuting to work. The opening of SIL(E), which was a three-car train service, would only have a carrying capacity of about 700 passengers per train. That would not be able to alleviate the existing traffic congestion of the island;

Provision of GIC facilities

- (m) the total population of South Horizons was about 40,000 people and there was a severe shortage of GIC facilities such as library, elderly services to serve the local population. Although a number of GIC facilities were provided in Lei Tung Estate, the local residents of South Horizons would

seldom use those GIC facilities as Lei Tung Estate was not easily accessible. The demand for community facilities was very high as reflected by the high utilisation rate of the community hall at South Horizons. The conclusion that the provision of GIC facilities was adequate to serve the population, which was assessed on a district-wide basis, was unfair to the residents of the South Horizons or Ap Lei Chau. The provision of GIC facilities should be assessed on a neighbourhood basis;

- (n) as there was a lack of site for GIC facilities in Ap Lei Chau, Site A was more suitable to be used for the provision of community and recreational facilities to maintain the quality of life of the local residents. Consideration might be given to providing a cycle track or waterfront jogging track within the site in order to meet the need of the local residents;

Conclusion

- (o) the Board was urged to adopt a more people-oriented approach in planning the future land use of Site A and sympathetic consideration should be given to the views of the local residents. Members should carefully review PlanD's responses as set out in the Paper and made during the presentation which only contained information that were favourable to the rezoning proposal; and
- (p) if the Board decide to push through the proposed residential development despite strong local objection, more judicial reviews (JRs) against the decision of the Board would be expected.

R13/C7 – South Horizons Concern Group

R14 – Au Yuen Fat, Joseph

11. Mr Au Yeun Fat, Joseph, made the following main points:

- (a) the South Horizons Concern Group was a local organization registered

under the Societies Ordinance. The Concern Group was concerned about all matters which might affect the local community of South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau;

- (b) the rezoning of Site A would have significant impact on Ap Lei Chau as well as the Southern District in terms of traffic, environment, population density, and security;

Traffic

- (c) while the congestion of Aberdeen Tunnel was the result of the overflow of traffic from Canal Road West in Wanchai, the local residents of the Southern District were suffering;
- (d) although the traffic flow survey conducted at five junctions at Ap Lei Chau indicated that there were about 20% spare capacity in each of those junctions, the data was flimsy and incomplete and had not addressed the real traffic issues encountered by the local residents of Ap Lei Chau;
- (e) the opening of SIL(E) could not help to relieve the traffic congestion of the Southern District. Prior to the operation of SIL(E), TD had already proposed the reorganization of the bus routes in the Southern District by merging, re-routing and deleting the existing bus routes or replacing the bus services by green minibus. Such reorganization proposal would reduce the total passenger carrying capacity and choice of public transport services. Moreover, SIL(E) which only provided 3-car train services with a maximum carrying capacity of about 700 passengers per train would be inadequate to cope with the high demand. Besides, the passengers had to take a long time for interchange at the MTR Admiralty Station during the peak hours. SIL(E) would bring no added benefit to the residents of the Southern District;
- (f) an application for rezoning the oil depot site in Ap Lei Chau was rejected by the Board years ago, inter alia, on traffic ground though such rejection reason was not supported by any traffic review conducted by the

government departments at that time. For the current rezoning, the Government had conducted a traffic review to demonstrate that the rezoning proposal would not have adverse traffic impact on the area. The different approach taken by the Government would be perceived by the general public that the traffic data would be manipulated to justify the rezoning as the Government was keen to rezone the site for residential development;

- (g) the population density of Ap Lei Chau was the highest in Hong Kong. The local residents' concern that the proposed residential development would further increase the population in the area was not properly addressed;

Local views

- (h) a survey was conducted by the Concern Group to collect views of the local residents on the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential development. Among the 1,100 completed questionnaires, 89.9% objected to the proposal. The survey findings had been submitted to DEVB, the Board and SDC for consideration. Similar surveys subsequently conducted by SHEOC and Mr Lam Kai Fai, a SDC member, also revealed that 84.8% and 95% of the surveyed residents raised objection to the proposed rezoning respectively. The above survey findings clearly reflected the very strong objection of the local residents against the rezoning. If the proposal was pushed through by the Government with no regard to the local sentiment, the harmonious relationship between the local residents and the Government would be hampered;
- (i) all the documents prepared had not mentioned how the local residents' views were collected by the Government during the planning process;

Environment

- (j) the buses and heavy vehicles travelling along Lee Nam Road had already generated noise nuisance to the residents of South Horizons Phase 4. The existing noise barrier of 2-3m in height could not effectively mitigate

the noise nuisance. The proposed residential development with increased traffic would further aggravate the noise nuisance. However, no concrete noise mitigation measures was proposed by the Government at the moment;

Undesirable precedent

- (k) the rezoning would set an undesirable precedent for other similar undeveloped sites in Ap Lei Chau which would result in further increase in population and further deterioration of the existing traffic congestion in the area. The Government had not kept its promise that the Mariner South development was the last piece of land for residential development in the area. The change in the Government's stance revealed that there was a lack of comprehensive and long-term planning for the area;
- (l) the Government should use alternative sites in other parts of the Southern District where were less densely populated for residential development;

Provision of GIC facilities

- (m) there was a severe shortage of GIC facilities, in particular library and elderly services, in South Horizons and the Ap Lei Chau area to serve the local residents of about 90,000 persons. Although there would be a number of new school developments in Wong Chuk Hang, no library facility was planned/provided in the area. Notwithstanding that concerned government departments had no plan to use Site A for GIC facilities under their respective purview, PlanD should carry out a comprehensive planning on the provision of GIC facilities for the area in consultation with concerned departments to address the needs of the local residents, irrespective of whether there would be any programme for the GIC facilities;

Conclusion

- (n) the local residents did not object to the housing development but considered that a suitable site should be identified and proper consultation should be carried out;

- (o) the Concern Group was particularly concerned about the cumulative impact on traffic and environment of the area arising from the approval of the rezoning; and
- (p) it was likely that more JRs would be lodged against the decision of the Board if it decided to approve the rezoning despite the very strong objection raised by the local residents.

R16/C1 – Designing Hong Kong Ltd.

R511 – Cody Chow

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) the waterfront of Ap Lei Chau was a public asset and every opportunity should be seized to make the waterfront accessible to the public;
- (b) there were currently two existing waterfront promenades on Ap Lei Chau, The first one started from Ap Lei Chau Praya Road through the waterfront park while the second one was at South Horizons which was a public promenade within private land. The two promenades were, however, disjointed as the existing trail through the woods along the northern waterfront was not accessible to the public. Some SDC members were exploring the possibility of opening up that trail to the public such that the two waterfront promenades would become connected;
- (c) although some parts of the waterfront along Lee Nam Road currently occupied by some uses were not accessible to the public at the moment, forward planning should be advocated to make those waterfront area accessible to the public in the long run upon redevelopment of the existing uses, such that a continuous waterfront promenade could be provided along the entire island;

- (d) the rezoning of Site A for private residential development would privatise that section of the waterfront which was undesirable. Should the rezoning be proceeded, PlanD should request the inclusion of a clause in the land sale conditions of the site, requiring the future developer to provide a public waterfront promenade, similar to some sites in Kai Tak and Yau Tong. There was no strong reason for not allowing public access to the waterfront under the current circumstances. The requirement on the provision of public waterfront promenade would not affect the future land sale of the site; and
- (e) he emphasized that as a public asset, the waterfront should be freely accessible to the general public no matter whether Site A was to be developed or not.

R133 – Yeung Wai Chun

R573 – Lee Hon Chun, Alex

13. Mr Lee Hon Chun, Alex, made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of South Horizons;
- (b) he was more concerned on the adverse traffic impact on South Horizons and the Southern District arising from the congestion of Aberdeen Tunnel;
- (c) the possibility of connecting the existing waterfront promenades with the waterfront at Lee Nam Road in the long term would be further affected if Site A was used for residential development. Site A should be developed for public open space, waterfront promenade or public facilities serving as a gateway to the future office development under Amendment Items C1 and C2;
- (d) there was no information on the design and provision of car parking spaces for the proposed residential development. As Site A was close to the sea, there was concern that the construction of basement car park for

the site might not be feasible. The construction of a car park podium might create a physical segregation prohibiting public access to the waterfront area;

- (e) as set out in his written submission, he objected to the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential development on the ground that the population density of Ap Lei Chau was already very high. Based on a total land area of Ap Lei Chau including the hilly terrain and inaccessible areas, the average land area for each resident was about 167 ft² only;
- (f) Site A was located within the 500m CZ of the LPG/oil depot and future residents might be exposed to potential risk of explosion. However, the effectiveness of the existing boundary wall of the oil depot in mitigating the explosion risk was in doubt;
- (g) there was no information on the relocation arrangement of the existing HKSM. Site B, which would be temporarily used as driving school in the interim, would affect the implementation programme of the proposed public open space. The delay in the development of public open space at Site B could not help to address the open space shortfall of about 2.8ha in Ap Lei Chau; and
- (h) Site A would be subject to a BHR of 110mPD. It was estimated that six residential blocks, each of about 34 storeys, would have to be constructed on the site in order to provide 1,400 flats. The compact layout would render the provision of car parking spaces insufficient to meet the parking demand of the future residents. He was concerned that the future residents might use the car parking spaces of South Horizons.

R254 – Yeung Pui Man

R405/C8 – Ng Wai Huk, Allan

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Wai Huk, Allan, made the following main points:

Traffic review

- (a) he was a resident of South Horizons and he would focus his presentation on the traffic and transport issues in Ap Lei Chau;
- (b) it was noted from paragraph 6.3.8 of the Paper that TD considered the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential use would not cause significant traffic impact on the nearby road network. He, however, considered that the methodology of TD's traffic review was problematic in that the vehicular traffic data collected at 08:00-10:00 in late 2015 could not reflect the real peak traffic conditions of Ap Lei Chau and the traffic projection had excluded other committed or planned developments in the Ap Lei Chau area;
- (c) peak traffic hours of South Horizons and that of Ap Lei Chau were really from 07:30 to 09:00. After 09:00, vehicular traffic leaving South Horizons reduced considerably. Using data from 08:00-10:00 while ignoring data before 08:00 would under-estimate the real peak hour traffic condition of South Horizons and was extremely misleading;
- (d) the projection had ignored other developments to be completed in the next few years, including H. Bonaire with 126 units, Marina South with 114 units, as well as a small hotel at Ap Lei Chau Main Street. Moreover, two major non-residential developments might also take place on Ap Lei Chau in the longer term, namely the redevelopment of Dah Chong Hong into office building in the Ap Lei Chau Industrial Estate and the conversion of the former Hong Kong Electric office building in the middle of South Horizons into hotel use;
- (e) TD should be requested to re-conduct its traffic flow survey and projection by using data that would more accurately reflect the real peak-hour traffic conditions of Ap Lei Chau and cover all known projects in the area;

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Aberdeen Tunnel

- (f) according to paragraph 6.3.10 of the Paper, TD noted that the proposed development would have minimal impact on Aberdeen Tunnel, which still had spare capacity. However, the congestion at Aberdeen Tunnel remained a serious problem not only for Ap Lei Chau but most of the Southern District and whether the CWB now under construction could really solve the traffic congestion of Ap Lei Chau remained to be seen;
- (g) according to TD's information, Aberdeen Tunnel went through regular intermitten closures on a daily basis. The number of intermitten closures was generally about 200-400 times a month, up to 500-600 times in high season and nearly 100 times in low season, and on average the tunnel had to be shut down temporarily more than 10 times each working day;
- (h) with the display of two charts showing the monthly intermitten closures and the duration of intermitten closure of Aberdeen Tunnel on the visualiser, he pointed out that while there was a gradual decline in the number of intermitten closures in recent years, the duration of each closure had been lengthened from about 3 minutes to about 3-4 minutes. The total time of the closures still aggregated to about 30 to 40 minutes every day. That was hardly a satisfactory situation for the commuters;
- (i) with reference to TD's report to SDC in February 2016, the v/c ratio of Aberdeen Tunnel during morning peak hours for both north bound and south bound lanes was 0.81. Although TD considered that such v/c ratio was acceptable during the morning peak hours, there were also times when Aberdeen Tunnel closures had led to congestion all the way to Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Bridge. It would be misleading if the traffic condition was assessed based on the v/c ratio alone;
- (j) when the HKSM was relocated to Ap Lei Chau in 2011, the school agreed not to allow its vehicles out of the school due to the community's concern

over traffic conditions in the area. In 2014, when the Education Bureau proposed to convert an unused primary school site in Ap Lei Chau West Estate into an international school, SDC required the school to demand all students to use either public transport or school bus because of the concerns over traffic congestion. All the above traffic management measures, which were agreed by TD, demonstrated that the road network around Ap Lei Chau Estate and South Horizons was already under severe pressure;

- (k) Members were urged not to merely rely on TD's study for guidance on the likely traffic conditions in the coming years in Ap Lei Chau and the Southern District;

SIL(E)

- (l) the assumed maximum carrying capacity of SIL(E) at 20,000 passengers per hour, which was based on the MTR Corporation's assumption of carrying six passengers per m², was not realistic. According to the Secretary for Transport and Housing's reply to Legislative Councillors' questions in recent years, the actual maximum capacity for Island Line, Kwun Tong Line and Tsuen Wan Line had been reduced, which was equivalent to about four passengers per m² during morning peak hours. Based on that, the maximum carrying capacity of SIL(E) would only be about 13,000 passengers per hour. He therefore had concern on whether the traffic situation of Ap Lei Chau would improve after the opening of SIL(E);
- (m) taking into account a number of known developments in Ap Lei Chau as mentioned in paragraph 14(d) above and the Government's intention to convert 13 sites in the Southern District into residential use which would supply more than 10,000 units, the carrying capacity of SIL(E) might not be sufficient to cope with the additional demand generated by those new population; and
- (n) Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only road link between the island and other

parts of Hong Kong. Given that the road bridge and the rail link were very close to each other, it was possible that a disaster taking place on one link might affect the other, causing a total traffic shutdown for the island. Adding more population in Ap Lei Chau without a comprehensive traffic solution was unacceptable.

15. Due to some technical problems, the PowerPoint presentation of Mr Ng could not be displayed during his presentation. The hard copy of the PowerPoint presentation was subsequently distributed for Members' reference shortly after Mr Ng's presentation.

R265 – Tsui Kai Sang

16. Mr Tsui Kai Sang made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of South Horizons and he objected to the proposed OZP amendments;

Adverse traffic impact

- (b) the population density of Ap Lei Chau at about 80,000 persons/km² was the highest in the territory while the average population density for Hong Kong as a whole was only about 6,000 persons/km². Further increase of population in Ap Lei Chau would be unfair to the local residents;
- (c) Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only external link between the island and other parts of Hong Kong Island. Any traffic accident or road maintenance on the bridge would cause severe traffic congestion of the area. Besides, the congestion at Cross Harbour Tunnel would also cause traffic congestion at Aberdeen Tunnel and Ap Lei Chau. SIL(E), which only provided a 3-car train service, could not meet the demand of the residents of Ap Lei Chau during the morning and evening peak hours;
- (d) there were already a number of planned developments in Ap Lei Chau such as hotel, international school, commercial office developments which would generate additional people, traffic and logistics transport and

the existing traffic congestion of the area would be further worsened;

Alternative sites

- (e) the Government should first develop those sites in Wong Chuk Hang as it was a more developed area with better infrastructure. Moreover, there were other alternative sites in the Southern District which were currently under-utilized, such as the existing shipyard and temporary industrial area at Po Chong Wan; areas on both sides of Aberdeen Tunnel currently occupied by uses like temporary structures, cottage area, plant nursery; and Pok Fu Lam Village. Consideration should also be given to reprovisioning the existing Police Training School in Wong Chuk Hang and the large prisons in Stanley so that those sites could be released for housing development;
- (f) the possibility of developing the existing waterfront promenade at Cyberport which had only a few visitors should also be explored. There should not be any further population increase in Ap Lei Chau which was already densely populated;

Provision of GIC and open space

- (g) the local residents of Ap Lei Chau would like to develop a round-the-island waterfront promenade which would be compatible with the future development of Fisherman's Wharf in the area;
- (h) sites should be reserved in the area to meet the residents' need for more GIC facilities. In view of the hilly topography of Ap Lei Chau, different parts of the island were not well-connected. The residents of South Horizons would seldom use the GIC facilities of Lei Tung Estate which was located uphill and not easily accessible. Members should have a site visit to the area to better understand the actual situation; and
- (i) there should be a balanced provision of LOS and DOS in terms of geographical location for the Southern District which had a vast area connected with the Eastern District in the east and the Central and

Western District in the west. The assessment on the adequacy of open space on a district-wide basis was unfair to the Ap Lei Chau residents in that one-third of the population in the Southern District resided in Ap Lei Chau.

R296 – Tony Chan

R349 – Chau Kut Yu

17. Mr Tony Chan made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in South Horizons for more than 23 years and he objected to the rezoning of Site A for residential development;
- (b) the existing waterfront promenade at South Horizons was mostly used by the local residents for leisure walking or jogging and by some general public for fishing activities. However, those outsiders had created some environmental hygiene problems at the waterfront promenade;
- (c) he generally supported the elected DC members' objecting views to the rezoning mainly on grounds of adverse traffic, environmental and air ventilation impacts; and
- (d) the existing footpath along Lee Nam Road was narrow and the sites thereat were not intended for intensive development. Site A should be comprehensively developed together with the proposed open space at Site B for the enjoyment of the residents of South Horizons and Ap Lei Chau.

R336 /C9 – Ng Tsz Ying, Monica

18. The meeting noted that Ms Ng Tsz Ying, Monica, would like to make the oral submission in her capacity as R336 first and then as C9 in the later part of the meeting.

19. Ms Ng Tsz Ying, Monica, made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in South Horizons for 25 years;
- (b) the closing of Ap Lei Chau Bridge which was the only road link between the island and other areas would adversely affect the safety of local residents in case of emergency. Concerned government departments including the Fire Services Department had not provided any response on that aspect;
- (c) the population density of Ap Lei Chau was the highest in Hong Kong. The existing infrastructure, community and supporting facilities would be unable to cope with the anticipated increase in population of the area;
- (d) the newly completed residential developments, i.e. Mariner South and H Bonaire, with a total of about 220 flats, would have an estimated population of about 1,000 persons. Together with the proposed residential developments and the proposed commercial development near Lee Nam Road, with an estimated residential and working population of about 6,000 and 3,000 persons respectively, the total people on Ap Lei Chau would increase by about 10,000;
- (e) there was no information in the Paper which substantiated that Site A was suitable for residential development. When the proposed rezoning of the existing Dah Chong Hong site was approved by the Board in 2015, there was concern that sufficient buffer between the cargo handling area at the waterfront and the proposed commercial use should be maintained. Site A, which was in close proximity to the existing oil depot, was therefore not suitable for residential development;
- (f) as mentioned in paragraph 6.3.7 of the Paper, the provision of DOS was measured in accordance with DC boundary and there was an existing surplus of 12.92 ha of DOS to serve the existing population of the Southern District. Such methodology was considered unreasonable as it could not address the shortage of DOS in Ap Lei Chau which had accommodated about one-third of the total population of the Southern

District. The existing and future population of Ap Lei Chau would unlikely use the DOS in other parts of the district;

- (g) the information on the provision of open space and GIC facilities for each district was not readily available on the internet for public inspection. The transparency of those information was essential as it could facilitate the potential buyers of the proposed residential development to make an informed decision on property purchase by having a better understanding of the real situation of Ap Lei Chau;
- (h) the site should be reserved for the development of the much needed GIC facilities such as kindergarten, elderly centres or open space. The Government should engage the local residents in planning for the local area at an early stage; and
- (i) referring to the 2012 Policy Address, the former Legislative Councillor, Hon Tony W.C. Tse, also advocated the reduction in development intensity for Hong Kong Island. There was no strong justification to further increase the population density of Ap Lei Chau which already ranked first as compared with other parts of Hong Kong.

20. Dr Chan Ka Lok, R571 and the representative of a number of representers, suggested to defer his 90-minute oral submission to the last part of the presentation session in order to allow other attendees to advance their presentations. The Board agreed to Dr Chan's suggestion.

21. The meeting was adjourned for a short break at this point.

R605 – SHEOC

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alex Chan made the following main points:

Background

- (a) Ap Lei Chau had an area of about 1.3km² and a population of about 90,000 people. The population density of the island was about 60,000 people/km² which was the second highest island in the world;
- (b) South Horizons, with an area of about 0.15km² occupying slightly more than 10% of the total area of Ap Lei Chau, was the largest private housing development at the western part of Ap Lei Chau. Part of the site was originally occupied by power station and LPG depot and part was from reclaimed land. The development was completed in four phases more than 20 years ago;
- (c) South Horizons comprised 34 blocks providing about 9,812 flats with a total population of about 30,000. The existing population of the development accommodated about one-third of the total population of Ap Lei Chau. The average land area occupied by each resident was 4m² and the waterfront promenade in South Horizons was extremely crowded in the evening;
- (d) residents of South Horizons were concerned about the rezoning since Site A was only about 250m from South Horizons;
- (e) SHEOC was formed under the Deed of Mutual Covenant and operated in accordance with the provision of the Building Management Ordinance. There were more than 30 elected committee members, each representing a residential block, or commercial centre and car park. The Committee was responsible for monitoring the property management and safeguarding the welfare of local residents;
- (f) in December 2015, SHEOC was informed by the DC member of the concerned constituency that PlanD had submitted a consultation document regarding the subject rezoning to the District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC) of SDC. Having received different views from the local residents regarding the rezoning proposal, SHEOC decided

to conduct a survey to solicit the views from local residents;

Survey findings

- (g) the survey had lasted for 14 days from 2.7.2015 to 16.7.2015 and a questionnaire was sent to each individual flat. The questionnaire was so designed to facilitate the residents to freely express their own views;
- (h) out of a total of 9,812 questionnaires, 1,959 were returned representing a response rate of about 20% which was one of the issues with the highest response rate based on past record. Among the 1,959 completed questionnaires, 234 (11.9%) indicated support; 1,663 (84.9%) raised objection, 54 (2.8%) had no comment; and 8 (0.4%) expressed other views;
- (i) major supportive views included increasing housing supply; the commencement of MTR service would ease traffic problem; new residential development would provide more choices on eating place and retail facilities; and increasing the vibrancy and property value of South Horizons. Other supportive views were that the decrease in property value of South Horizons would facilitate flat purchase by others; increasing employment opportunities in the area; supporting the development of private housing but not subsidized housing; and improving the provision of public transport services;
- (j) major opposing views were over-taxing the existing road networks; over-concentration of population; insufficient community and supporting facilities; causing noise nuisance, environmental pollution, and adverse air ventilation and visual impacts, and more usage of the facilities of South Horizons by outsiders. Other objection grounds included increasing the number of future residents exposing to risk from the adjacent oil depot; causing security problem; causing the increase in the management fee of South Horizons; the site should be used for low-density residential development, municipal building, garden, cycle track, waterfront promenade and elderly homes, etc.; in lack of comprehensive planning for

the area; inadequate consultation and insufficient information on the rezoning; affecting the quality of life of residents of South Horizons; and causing more illegal parking in South Horizons area;

- (k) other views expressed by the local residents included the rezoning would only be considered if there was no adverse traffic impact; the rezoning would only be supported if Site A was developed for affordable housing but not luxury flats; providing compensation to flats with blockage of views; providing adequate supporting facilities; and due consideration should be given to the environmental impacts. Two of the questionnaires indicated both supportive and adverse views in that the rezoning would allow better utilization of land but would overburden the existing traffic network;
- (l) in August 2015, the above survey findings together with copies of all completed questionnaires were submitted to SDEV for information. The same survey findings together with the originals of all completed questionnaires were submitted to the Chairman of the Board on 12.1.2016 during the statutory publication period of the OZP amendments;

Local forums and consultation

- (m) in December 2015, two forums were jointly organized by the local residents and the two DC members of the concerned constituency, Ms Chan Judy Kapui and Mr Lam Kai Fai,. The forums were attended by government representatives from PlanD, EMSD and TD and about 150 residents of South Horizons. About 14-15 residents had also expressed their views at the forums. However, the attendees were unconvinced by the justifications put forth by government representatives at the forums and the residents' concerns remained unaddressed. The rezoning proposal was unanimously objected to by all attending residents;

Classification of survey findings

- (n) in April and May 2016, SHEOC wrote to the Chairman of the Board raising objection to classify the survey findings of the 1,959

questionnaires as providing comments on the OZP amendments. The grouping of the survey findings under the category of providing comments was misleading when more than 85% of the completed questionnaire objected to the rezoning. Moreover, it was also inaccurate to summarise the survey findings as ‘to rezone Site A for low-density residential development’;

- (o) SHEOC also objected to treating the 1,959 questionnaires with different views of local residents as one single representation. Each questionnaire expressing views of each residents should be treated as a separate representation;
- (p) the majority of the local residents of South Horizons opposed the current rezoning proposal. Concerted effort was made previously by the local residents against two major development proposals in the area, namely, the proposed rezoning of the LPG transfer station for residential use and the proposed hotel development at the carpark area of the Hong Kong Electric site. Finally, the former development proposal was rejected by the Board and the design of the proposed hotel development was revised to address the concerns of the local residents; and
- (q) noting the two successful cases as mentioned above, the Board was urged to carefully make a decision on the rezoning taking into account the views of the residents of South Horizons.

R421/C10 – Alex Chan

23. Mr Alex Chan, made the following main points:

- (a) he was a retired civil servant and had been living in South Horizons for more than 20 years;
- (b) the rezoning of Site A, which was in close proximity to the existing LPG and oil products transit depot, for residential development was not in line

with the principles of risk management as set out in paragraph 4.3 of Chapter 12 of HKPSG in that any development proposals that would result in an increase in the number of persons living within the CZ of the potentially hazardous installations (PHI) should be avoided in order to protect the lives and property of general public;

- (c) there was concern that the carrying out of a quantitative risk assessment by EMSD with a view to justifying the rezoning proposal might set an undesirable precedent of other private developers to adopt the same approach for their private residential developments within the CZ. The argument that there was no insurmountable problem for the proposed residential development under current rezoning was also unconvincing and the private developers might use the same excuse to justify their development proposals;
- (d) the rezoning of Site A for residential development would increase the number of persons exposed to the potential risk by about 6,000 persons. Given that Ap Lei Chau was only accessible by the Ap Lei Chau Bridge, a comprehensive evacuation and rescue plan during emergency situation should be worked out by the Emergency Monitoring and Support Centre involving departments such as Hong Kong Police Force and the Fire Services Department, etc.;
- (e) according to paragraph 11.2.9 of Chapter 11 of HKPSG on Urban Design Guidelines, special considerations should be given to the appropriate scale, height and disposition of building blocks along the waterfront to avoid blockage of sea/land breezes and prevailing wind. The proposed residential development at the waterfront with five residential blocks and a maximum BHR of 110mPD would adversely affect the air ventilation of the inland area and was inconsistent with the guidelines of the HKPSG. The non-compliance with the said guidelines by the Government itself might have a precedent effect on other private developers;
- (f) the existing magnificent views of the residents of 11 blocks of South

Horizons would be blocked by the proposed residential development. It was unreasonable for PlanD to treat the existing views of those local residents as private views which might not be protected. According to the relevant guidelines, the visual appraisal report should comprehensively and objectively reflect the potential visual impact of the proposed development on the surrounding areas. In this regard, the views of the residents of South Horizons in the vicinity of the site should be taken into account in the visual appraisal; and

- (g) the commencement of SIL(E) with limited carrying capacity of about 700 passengers per 3-car train could not cope with the transport demand of the residents of Ap Lei Chau. In the event of emergency situation, it was estimated that two hours would be required to evacuate all the residents of Ap Lei Chau by the MTR services even if the frequency of train services was increased to a 1-minute interval.

R423 - 李俊諺、羅惠嫻

R435 – Kwok Wai Tak

R492 – Lam Kai Fai

24. Mr Lam Kai Fai, a SDC member, made the following main points:

- (a) he attended the meeting in the capacity of the Chairman of DDHC of the SDC and the DC member of the concerned constituency as well as the representatives of a few residents of Southern Horizons;

Inadequate local consultation

- (b) on 18.5.2015, the District Development and Environment Committee (DDEC) of SDC was consulted on the proposed rezoning of Site A for residential development with about 1,500 flats. As the rezoning proposal was an issue of great importance to the area and PlanD and TD could not provide sufficient information to DDEC for reference and discussion, DDEC decided to terminate the discussion and requested that the

Government should provide further information for DDEC's consideration as soon as possible. DDEC also reiterated that the Board should not support the project unless the rezoning proposal had been endorsed by the Committee. However, no detailed information was available before the end of the preceding term of SDC in September 2015 and only brief written information was provided for DDEC's reference. Letters were subsequently sent to DEVB and concerned departments raising strong objection in that respect;

- (c) DDHC was consulted on the rezoning proposal in February 2016. Due to insufficient information on the traffic and environmental assessments of the proposal, the rezoning was not supported by DDHC and a motion raising strong objection to the proposed rezoning was passed, with 15 members voted in favour of the motion and one abstained from voting;
- (d) he considered that the concerned government departments had failed to provide sufficient and objective information for DC consultation and the general remarks made by concerned departments that the proposed rezoning would not have insurmountable problems or significant impact on the surrounding areas were not acceptable;
- (e) concerned departments should carry out site survey to better understand the existing traffic and environmental problems of the local residents of Ap Lei Chau;
- (f) given the extremely high population density of Ap Lei Chau and a number of ongoing redevelopment projects at Ap Lei Chau Main Street, the rezoning proposal which would further increase the population of the area was considered unreasonable;

Adverse traffic impacts

- (g) the additional public transport demand generated by the proposed developments could not be met by SIL(E) which had limited carrying capacity of about 700 passengers per train. The three exits of the MTR

terminus at South Horizons serving about 50,000 people (30,000 from South Horizons and 20,000 from Ap Lei Chau West Estate) would be very congested during the peak hours. It was likely that the residents in other parts of Ap Lei Chau would be aggrieved as they might not be able to board the train at MTR Lee Tung and Wong Chuk Hang stations during morning peak hours. The problem of insufficient public transport services to serve the residents of Ap Lei Chau West Estate, Ap Lei Chau Main Street, Lee Tung Estate and Wong Chuk Hang would remain unaddressed;

- (h) TD's traffic review demonstrated that the proposed residential development would have insignificant impact on the existing road network and all major road junctions in Ap Lei Chau would still have spare capacities. He considered that the conclusions of the traffic review were due to the extremely low provision of car parking spaces in the new development. The provision of 80 to 120 car parking spaces serving 1,400 units of the proposed residential development was unproportionally low and could not meet the parking demand of its future residents. As such, majority of the future residents of the proposed residential development would have to rely on public transport in their daily commuting thus further aggravating the existing problem;
- (i) there was a very high parking demand from the residents of South Horizons which resulted in a surging increase in the price of a car parking space at South Horizons up to \$1.4 to 1.5 million. Under the existing circumstances, there would not be any surplus car parking space at South Horizons to serve the residents of other developments. It was anticipated that illegal on-street car parking along Lee Nam Road at night would be further aggravated. Moreover, the existing problem of illegal motorcycle parking at the bus terminus of South Horizons also remained unresolved unless sufficient parking spaces were provided in the area;
- (j) whenever there were any traffic accident or road works on Ap Lei Chau Bridge, the traffic of the area would become paralyse. That might affect

the efficiency of the emergency operations;

Environmental nuisance

- (k) Lee Nam Road was a narrow road sandwiched between some residential blocks of South Horizons Phases 3 and 4 in the west and Yuk Kwai Shan in the east creating a canyon effect. Based on his traffic count for 8 hours in a day, the traffic flow at Lee Nam Road was about 7,000 vehicles during that surveyed period. The residents of South Horizons were exposed to significant traffic noise impact which had been further magnified by the canyon effect of Lee Nam Road;

Insufficient open space

- (l) the assessment on the adequacy of open space provision which was based on the DC boundary was unreasonable. The open space at Repulse Bay and other parts of the Southern District could not serve the residents of Ap Lei Chau; and
- (m) Members were urged to listen to the views of the local residents instead of merely relied on the data and assessments provided by concerned government departments in making a decision.

R436 – Ng Mei Lan

R459 – Dennis Leung

25. Mr Dennis Leung made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in South Horizons for more than 20 years and had previously participated in a number of campaigns relating to the planning and development projects near South Horizons including the planning application for hotel development; rezoning of LPG depot for residential development, and other proposals like the setting up of off-course betting centre and the development of international school, etc;
- (b) the Board's previous decision to reject the rezoning of the LPG depot

about 10 years ago was supported;

- (c) 98% of the representations received by the Board during the statutory publication period were against the rezoning of Site A for residential development. It was clearly beyond doubt that the proposed rezoning was strongly objected to by the majority of the local residents of South Horizons;
- (d) he raised concern on who the decision-maker was in rezoning the site for private residential development irrespective of very strong local objections. He also doubted if that decision-maker had ever paid any site visit to the South Horizons area or carried out any informal consultation with the relevant stakeholders before pushing through the rezoning proposal;
- (e) the information contained in the consultation document prepared by PlanD was incomplete and inadequate resulting in the termination of the discussion of the rezoning proposal by the DC members. Similarly, the information provided by PlanD's representative in a local forum was also insufficient to address the concerns of local residents;
- (f) Members should gain first-hand experience of the traffic situation of the area such as traffic congestion and illegal on-street parking problems by paying a visit to South Horizons. The connectivity of Ap Lei Chau with other areas had not been improved over the past 20 years and the existing Ap Lei Chau Bridge remained to be the only road link notwithstanding that many new residential developments had been developed on the island. For unknown reasons, the proposal of building another bridge for Ap Lei Chau which was proposed more than a decade ago was not pursued; and
- (g) the local residents of South Horizons were very furious about the rezoning in particular when the Government was contemplating to rezone Site A notwithstanding very strong local objections against the proposal. He was dubious on whether the rezoning of Site A for private residential

developments would involve any collusion between the Government and the private developers.

R453 – Lo Allie

26. Ms Lo Allie made the following main points:

- (a) she had lived in South Horizons for more than 20 years;
- (b) Site A was next to Yuk Kwai Shan where hill fires occurred from time to time. The smoke emitted from the hill fire was harmful to the health of local residents of South Horizons. The construction of high-rise developments at the site would prevent the dispersion of smoke thus causing adverse health impacts on the local residents;
- (c) a number of roads in Ap Lei Chau were single lane roads and any traffic accident or road works on those narrow roads would cause severe traffic congestion prohibiting the timely arrival of emergency vehicles. Citing a recent incident that the roads of the Ap Lei Chau area were blocked by a number of fire engines when they were putting out a fire near Ap Lei Chau West Estate, she considered that all the existing single lane roads should be widened to at least two lanes before the rezoning should take place in order to minimize the impact on emergency services for local residents;
- (d) it was noted from the annual reports of various major developers that they had substantial land reserve for housing development. Instead of pursuing the subject rezoning which were strongly opposed to by the local residents, the developers should be requested to use the land reserve to develop additional private housing to compensate for the loss of 1,400 flats;
- (e) alternative sites or development options should also be explored such as redevelopment of Pok Fu Lam Estate or other cottage area or the joint

vertical development of fire station and police station in order to release some under-utilised GIC sites for residential uses;

- (f) it might be difficult for Members to make an informed decision about the rezoning if they had not visited the area to experience the severe traffic congestion of Ap Lei Chau. It was undesirable to have a decision merely based on the results of the technical assessments which might be manipulated to achieve a specific objective; and
- (g) it was a waste of resources for the Government to push through the rezoning proposal when land was readily available in the developers' hands which could easily provide sufficient number of flats to meet the target.

27. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:45 p.m.

28. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 27.9.2016.

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

Mr Michael W.L. Wong Chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Richard W.Y. Wong

Deputy Director of Lands

Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Presentation and Question Sessions

[Open Meeting]

30. The following representatives of the Government, representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong
(DPO/HK)
- Ms Jessica K.T. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong (1)
(STP/HK(1))

Electrical & Mechanical Services Department (EMSD)

- Mr Mok Hing Man - Senior Engineer/Gas Standards B1
(SE/GS)B1
- Mr Tse Chun Wah - Engineer/Land Use Technical Support
(E/LUTS)

Transport Department (TD)

- Mr Chan Chung Yuen - Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong
(CTE/HK)

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R16/C1 – Designing Hong Kong Ltd

R511 – Cody Chan

- Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representers' and Commenter's
representative

R254 – Yeung Pui Man

R405/C8 – Ng Wai Huk, Allan

Mr Ng Wai Huk, Allan - Representer and Commenter and
Representer's representative

R336/C9 – Ng Tsz Ying, Monica

Ms Ng Tsz Ying, Monica - Representer and Commenter

R287 – Fung Mei Ping

R352 – Ritko Lo

R411 – Lo Kwai Fun, Mable

R432 – Tse Wai King

R542 – Lai Kai Fan, Melvin

R543 – Fung

R544 – G. Fung

R545 – J. Fung

R546 – A. Chow

R567 – Lam Wai Fun, Edith

R571 – Chan Ka Lok

R580 – Li Shuk Fan

R581 – Lau Wai Yee

Dr Chan Ka Lok - Representer and Representatives'
representative

R421/C10 – Alex Chan

R605 – South Horizons Estate Owners' Committee

Mr Alex Chan] Representer and Commenter and

Mr Chau Sze Lam] Representer's representatives

R436 – Ng Lee Lan

R459 – Dennis Leung

Mr Dennis Leung - Representer and Representers'
representative

R458 – Gary Chan Yun Chiu

Mr Gary Chan Tun Chiu - Representer

R540 – Yeung Chun Kit

Mr Yeung Chun Kit - Representer

R548 – Warren Man

R549 – Vikki Fung

Mr Warren Man - Representer and Representers' representative

R550 – Minah Leung

Miss Minah Leung - Representer

R566 – Law Yuk Lan

Ms Law Yuk Lan - Representer

R582 – Yu Chi Kin

Mr Yu Chi Kin - Representer

R600 – Li Frazer Tsz Yan,

Mr Li Frazer Tsz Yan - Representer

C3 – 柴文瀚、徐遠華、羅健熙及區諾軒議員聯合辦事處

Mr Yim Chun Ho - Commenters' representative

C16 – Nip Chi Keung

Mr Nip Chi Keung - Commenter

31. The Chairman extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. He then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R458 – Gary Chan Yun Chiu

32. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Gary Chan Yun Chiu made the following main points :

- (a) traffic congestion problem at Lee Nam Road was a major concern but the government only focused on and responded to the traffic condition at Ap Lei Chau Bridge and Aberdeen Tunnel;
- (b) traffic congestion occurred at 3 locations, namely near a kindergarten (International Montessori School) near Lee Nam Road, a bus stop at Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road opposite The Oasis, and at Lee Nam Road near the junction of Lei Wing Street;
- (c) it was expected that the proposed residential development would cost over \$30,000 per square foot and those who could afford living there would certainly own a car. The maximum number of car parking spaces (i.e. 70-110) did not truly reflect the possible number of car ownership in the development, and only represented the suppressed the traffic generation figure. The traffic congestion problem would get worse;
- (d) with the additional traffic generated by the proposed residential development, Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road and the entire Lee Nam Road would be blocked and it would be impossible for emergency vehicles to pass through Lee Nam Road in case of accident, hence putting residents' life at risk; and

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

- (e) the Government had previously indicated that Marina South was the last residential development in Ap Lei Chau. However, the Hong Kong School of Motoring (HKSM) site was now rezoned for residential development. Such ad hoc rezoning was undesirable, not well-planned

and should not be approved. If the HKSM moved out, the site should be rezoned for open space for recreational use with walking/cycling trails.

R548 – Warren Man

R549 – Vikki Fung

33. Mr Warren Man made the following main points :
- (a) the Government did not plan the HKSM site in accordance with the Town Planning Ordinance (Cap 131) in that the rezoning would not promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community and the response given by the Government were vague and broadbrush, which could not address the specific concerns of the residents;
 - (b) Ap Lei Chau was only about 2.5% of the land area of the Southern District but accommodated one-third of its population. It was densely populated with over 60,000 persons in a square kilometre. The rezoning would add further population and extra burden to the already overloaded sewerage and waste treatment facilities. That contravened the principal of promoting the health of the community. The Government had not explained why further development was necessary in an area as densely populated as Ap Lei Chau;
 - (c) Ap Lei Chau Bridge was the only connection between Ap Lei Chau and the urban area. Traffic congestion at Ap Lei Chau Bridge occurred frequently and emergency vehicles could not take those persons in need to the hospital in a timely manner. The rezoning of the HKSM site for residential development under Item A would put additional population at risk and contravene the principal of promoting the safety of the community. Although the Emergency Transport Coordination Centre (ETCC) of Transport Department (TD) would coordinate relevant parties

in handling emergency situation, it could not make emergency vehicles go through the congested Ap Lei Chau Bridge any quicker;

- (d) there was a deficit of about 2.8ha of open space for a planned population of about 159,200 in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau. The proposed residential development would generate additional population and aggravate the open space deficit situation. The open space provision should not be assessed on the basis of District Council boundary as open space provided elsewhere could not serve the local residents in Ap Lei Chau;
- (e) based on an assumption of a carrying capacity of 700 passengers per car, the 3-car train of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) with a frequency of 3-minute could not meet the demand of the 50,000 working population in Ap Lei Chau during rush hours; and
- (f) the Government was trying to deceive the residents by saying that there would be no significant adverse traffic impact as only about 100 car parking spaces would be provided in the proposed development. Likewise, the Government had stated that Marina South would be the last residential development in Ap Lei Chau, but the HKSM site was now rezoned for residential development. The residents could not be sure whether there would be more rezoning in the future for residential development. The site should be developed as a fishing ground to provide some recreational facilities for the residents.

R582 – Yu Chi Kin

34. Mr Yu Chi Kin made the following main points :

- (a) Ap Lei Chau accommodated one-third of the population in the Southern District and the population density was high. There was inadequate

provision of open space and community hall to meet the demand from the local residents and the situation would get worse;

- (b) the only access to Ap Lei Chau was through Ap Lei Chau Bridge. The traffic was heavy and congestion occurred frequently. Lee Nam Road serving the proposed residential development was narrow and could not cope with the additional traffic. The future MTR SIL(E) would use 3-car trains and would not have adequate capacity to meet the demand as there was a limitation on the frequency of the train service. The TIA had not taken into account the new residential developments at Ap Lei Chau Main Street and near Lei Tung Estate. The traffic congestion would aggravate upon population intake of those new developments; and
- (c) the site under Item A was not suitable for residential development. The site should be developed into open space to provide more recreational area for the residents.

R566 – Law Yuk Lan

35. Ms Law Yuk Lan made the following main points :

- (a) she agreed with the views of other residents on traffic, population and development density;
- (b) there were inadequate shopping facilities in Ap Lei Chau to meet the demand of the increasing population, e.g. there were always long queues in the supermarket and the market was crowded with people;
- (c) the 2m high boundary wall of the existing LPG/oil depot was inadequate in terms of protecting the residents. The podium at Blocks 22, 23 and 23A in Phase 3 of the South Horizons was located above the boundary wall and overlooked the LPG/oil depot; and

- (d) the traffic in Ap Lei Chau was adversely affected by activities such as horse-racing, football and rugby held in Happy Valley. It took residents working outside Ap Lei Chau a long time to return home. Those were real and practical issues that could not be reflected by data and figures in the technical reports. Members were invited to visit Ap Lei Chau to find out the truth.

R287 – Fung Mei Ping

R352 – Ritko Lo

R411 – Lo Kwai Fun, Mable

R432 – Tse Wai King

R542 – Lai Kai Fan, Melvin

R543 – Fung

R544 – G. Fung

R545 – J. Fung

R546 – A. Chow

R567 – Lam Wai Fun, Edith

R571 – Chan Ka Lok

R580 – Li Shuk Fan

R581 – Lau Wai Yee

36. Dr Chan Ka Lok made the following main points :

- (a) town planning should adopt a bottom-up and people-oriented approach and local residents should be consulted on their visions on development whenever a site became available;

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (b) he had arranged public forums/workshops to solicit views of the local residents on the rezoning sites at the waterfront along Lee Nam Road. There was consensus that those sites should belong to the public and not be developed for luxurious housing for only a few thousand people. That amounted to privatisation of the site without meeting the housing need of the general public. Local residents in the area requested for more community facilities, open space for recreation and social gathering for families with elderly and the youth, and cycle path. The government should provide a liveable and sustainable city rather than seizing vacant sites for in-fill residential development;

[Mr Franklin Yu returned to join the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the identification of 150 sites for residential development, including the proposed rezoning site in Lee Nam Road, was a top-down approach adopted by the government. PlanD should adopt a bottom-up approach, putting the residents and the local community first in planning their district;
- (d) the Southern District Council (SDC) was unanimous in objecting to the proposed residential development in Lee Nam Road and would not accept a waterfront promenade within the development as a compromise. Proper public open space should be provided as the provision of a waterfront promenade within a private development would create problems related to maintenance, management, security and right of use;
- (e) it was a government policy that one motor driving school each should be provided for Hong Kong Island, Kowloon and the New Territories. There was no reprovisioning site for HKSM and no programme for the implementation of the proposed open space at the “Open Space” (“O”) zone under Item B while HKSM would continue to operate there. That was undesirable and should not be accepted;
- (f) as shown on Plan H-4 of the Paper, there was an existing open space next to the HKSM site which was provided as a compensation of the loss of open space as a result of the MTR SIL(E) development. That open space would be lost permanently as it fell within Item A for residential development;
- (g) according to Attachment XI of the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) Paper No. 14/15, there was a deficit of 4.15ha of district open space (DOS). The surplus of local open space (LOS) in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau should not be used to offset the deficit in DOS. If HKSM moved

out, the site should be returned to the residents as a DOS for Ap Lei Chau and the Southern District;

- (h) Ap Lei Chau was only about 1.32km² in size but had a population of over 80,000, with cross-district commuting by lots of workers and students. The long travelling time due to traffic congestion was not acceptable. The capacity of the MTR SIL(E) was inadequate. As the outward bound MTR SIL(E) train would be fully loaded, residents who could not board the train at Lei Tung Estate would take an inward bound train to South Horizons in order to board the MTR train at the terminal. Residents from as far away as Aberdeen Centre would likely be attracted to the MTR South Horizons terminal;
- (i) although the number of car parking spaces would be restricted to about 100 for the proposed residential development, developers could negotiate for more car parking spaces. Once the rezoning was approved, there would not be any planning mechanism to restrict the number of car parking spaces;
- (j) private cars and nanny vans waiting to pick up students of the kindergarten at Lee Nam Road would queue up at Lee Nam Road, causing congestion. Also, learner drivers using Lee Nam Road would also block the road. The problem could not be resolved through any traffic management. The Board was urged not to make a hasty decision in rezoning the site;
- (k) the “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) site in Wong Chuk Hang was a sizeable site for development that could provide 357,500m² of domestic gross floor area (GFA) and 47,000m² of commercial GFA. The “CDA” site should be developed first before other sites in Ap Lei Chau were considered for development;

- (l) a research was carried out by the Department of Real Estate & Construction of the University of Hong Kong on “Repeated Planning Applications by Developers under Statutory Zoning : a Technical Note on Delays in Private Residential Development Process”. The research report released in January 2016 concluded that there were delays in the implementation of “CDA” sites as a result of developers making changes to the development proposals for those “CDA” sites by submitting planning applications repeatedly. Such a practice was an abuse of the planning application system. Yet, residents did not have a second opportunity in the rezoning of the Lee Nam Road site once the Board made its decision;

- (m) land could be released for residential development upon the relocation of the Police Training School in Wong Chuk Hang. Despite repeated request from SDC in the past 4 years, the government had no plan for its relocation;

- (n) in 2010, the Board rejected an application made by two SDC members to rezone the site now occupied by the Marina South from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “O”. The Board and the residents were persuaded into believing that the site was the last piece of land zoned “R(A)” in Ap Lei Chau. Residents could not be sure whether there would be more rezoning for residential development. The Board should not agree to the government’s endless requests to rezone land for residential development in Ap Lei Chau;

- (o) Ap Lei Chau was packed with new developments, e.g. Marina South, Larvotto, hotel developments/redevelopments at Wai Fung Street, Dah Chong Hong Motor Service Centre, and H.Bonairs and the redevelopment of the Hong Kong Electric Ex-operational Headquarters. While some had been completed, others would commence construction in the near future and construction vehicles would pose traffic problem in Ap Lei Chau;

- (p) the LPG/oil depot was a potentially hazardous installation and development within the 500m radius consultation zone (CZ) of the depot was prohibited. The LPG/oil depot had been there for a long time to serve Ap Lei Chau. The principal of prohibiting new development within the CZ should be strictly followed as human lives were at risk, despite the quantitative risk assessment (QRA)'s conclusion that the risk was low and acceptable;
- (q) although there was abundant of open space in the Southern District, Ap Lei Chau was densely populated and had deficit in DOS provision. Any land available for development should be for open space use to make up the deficit. Waterfront sites should be developed for the use of all residents and not be sold to developers for residential development. The Board was urged not to take side with the government in rezoning land for residential development to meet the housing target that could otherwise be developed as a community open space.

R540 – Yeung Chun Kit

37. Mr Yeung Chun Kit made the following main points :

- (a) a rezoning proposal for residential development at a smaller scale than the current proposal in the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Liquefied Petroleum Gas and Oil Products Transit Depot” zone was considered by the Board in 2005. That rezoning proposal was rejected by the Board for reasons, inter alia, that there was inadequate information to demonstrate that the traffic impact arising from the rezoning proposal on the local traffic network and the Aberdeen Tunnel was acceptable;
- (b) residents in Ap Lei Chau had been suffering from the traffic congestion at the Aberdeen Tunnel, which resulted in long travelling time to work during the morning peak hours for over 20 years. Yet, regarding the

traffic congestion and the traffic impact generated by the proposed development, TD responded that traffic assessment on a wide area was not necessary as the proposed residential development was small in scale. The proposed residential development was the largest in Ap Lei Chau in the past 10 years. Together with the completion of Sham Wan Towers, Larvotto, H.Bonaire and Marina South in the past 5 years, the cumulative traffic impact was significant;

- (c) TD's assessment on the road junction capacity projection based on the growth rate of traffic flow was crude and inaccurate. The local demographic and the actual traffic demand arising from new development should be examined. The Aberdeen Tunnel, which was a major artery for vehicular traffic movements between the north and south of Hong Kong Island, was already congested. New developments in Ap Lei Chau, Aberdeen and the Southern District had put extra traffic burden on the already congested Aberdeen Tunnel. The assessment that Aberdeen Tunnel had not reached its capacity and TD's findings on the cause of traffic congestion in Aberdeen Tunnel could not help resolve the traffic problems faced by the local residents daily; and

- (d) given that the sale price and rental cost of the proposed residential development would be high, the future residents would likely be those in the high income group and the car ownership rate would also be high. TD's assessment that 170 passenger car units (pcu) per hour would be generated from the proposed residential development on the basis of about 100 car parking spaces was doubtful. Assuming that 80% of those 170 pcu would use the Aberdeen Tunnel, the amount of traffic would be equivalent to about 5-7% of the morning peak traffic of 2,454 pcu per hour, or the target traffic reduction with the MTR SIL(E) in place. The traffic congestion problem would get worse. If the Board rejected a proposed residential development of a smaller scale in 2005, the Board should also not approve the current proposed rezoning for a larger scale residential development since there was no improvement in

transportation infrastructure and there had proven records of more traffic than the original estimate due to new developments in the past decades.

R405/C8 – Ng Wai Huk, Allan

38. With the aid of the visualise, Mr Ng Wai Huk, Allan made the following main points, in addition to his earlier presentation made in the morning session :

- (a) in the Board's meeting held on 27.3.2015 to discuss a rezoning proposal of a piece of land near Dah Chong Hong (Motor Service Centre) from "Industrial" ("I") to "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)"), Members considered that there might be interface problem between the proposed commercial use and the cargo handling area nearby, and that a buffer should be required. The then Vice-chairman concurred that the rezoning should be considered in a comprehensive manner. While comprehensive consideration was required for the rezoning of that site, the proposed residential development near the LPG/oil depot would also need to be considered carefully;
- (b) the existing LPG/oil depot was located adjacent to the South Horizons and was only about 20m away from the residential block. The 500m radius of the CZ of the LPG/oil depot would cover more than half of the South Horizons. Such an arrangement should not be acceptable by today's standard. PlanD's response in paragraph 6.3.44 of the Paper that the LPG/oil depot was strategically located for security and reliability of LPG supply and that there was no suitable reprovisioning site was not acceptable; and
- (c) PlanD's response that there was a surplus of 12.9ha of open space in the Southern District was misleading. According to the information available in the internet, there was a surplus of open space in all 18 districts in Hong Kong in 2008, with 44ha of surplus in open space provision in the Southern District and ranked 12. The surplus of open

space had dropped to 12.9ha in eight years' time. At that pace, there would soon be deficit in the open space provision. The reason that there was surplus in open space was due to the adoption of a relatively low standard of open space provision in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) as compared with other cities such as Shanghai, Singapore and New York.

C3 – 柴文瀚、徐遠華、羅健熙及區諾軒議員聯合辦事處

39. Mr Yim Chun Ho made the following main points :

- (a) 4 SDC members of the Democratic Party objected to the proposed amendments;
- (b) Residents in Ap Lei Chau had legitimate expectation on the development/redevelopment in the area. While technical assessments regarding environmental and traffic impacts had been carried out, impacts on the community should be assessed and taken as a planning consideration;
- (c) many representers had talked about population density and the provision of open space in Ap Lei Chau. Residents there had previously objected to the development of Marina South with about 100 flats, but the government indicated that it would be the last piece of land for residential development in Ap Lei Chau. There would certainly be a great social uproar that the government broke its promise by further rezoning land for the development of 1,400 flats in Ap Lei Chau;
- (d) Lee Nam Road was only a narrow road serving an industrial area. The road could not accommodate the additional traffic generated by the proposed residential development. Political parties across the board in the SDC had reached a consensus that it would be more suitable to

develop the “CDA” site and to relocate the Police Training Ground in Wong Chuk Hang for residential development; and

- (e) according to the traffic data provided by TD to SDC regarding the temporary closure of the northbound traffic lane of the Aberdeen Tunnel in the past 10 months, there was an average of 8-10 temporary closures everyday, each lasting for about 4 minutes. As such, residents of the Southern District would not agree that Aberdeen Tunnel had not reached its capacity. Further rezoning for residential development in Ap Lei Chau would not meet the residents’ reasonable expectation for a well-planned community for living and working.

R336/C9 – Ng Tsz Ying, Monica

40. Ms Monica Ng Tsz Ying supplemented her submission made earlier in the morning session and made the following main points :

- (a) Ap Lei Chau residents generally objected to the proposed residential development under Item A. The industrial buildings would also be rezoned to “OU(B)” for conversion to commercial use under Item C. While she was not against the developments, she was concerned about emergency vehicles being not able to pass through the congested Ap Lei Chau Bridge. The Fire Services Department and other relevant departments should come up with a practical rescue plan before further development should be allowed in Ap Lei Chau;
- (b) there was inadequate shopping facilities in Ap Lei Chau. The shopping mall in the South Horizons was being transformed into a shopping outlet, which was not in line with the planning intention of the “Commercial” zone to develop the area as a local and district commercial/shopping centres serving the immediate neighbourhood of the South Horizons and the Southern District. More than 50% of the shops had been vacant for over 2 years and the quality of living of the residents was adversely

affected. Apart from offices, the future developments in Item C should provide retail and restaurant facilities to serve the Southern District;

- (c) there were uncertainties to the positive traffic impact brought about by the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E) and the rationalisation of bus routes. Also, there was no development programme of the MTR SIL western line. As such, the proposed rezoning should not be approved; and
- (d) residents of the South Horizons were willing to participate in the planning of Ap Lei Chau for proposals that would be acceptable to all parties.

C16 – Nip Chi Keung

41. Mr Nip Chi Keung made the following main points :

- (a) he had been living in the South Horizons for over 20 years and the number of residents there had increased overtime. When commenting on the traffic issues, a number of representers and commenters had provided very detailed information to demonstrate that the MTR SIL(E) would not relieve the traffic congestion problem. If the information provided by them was accurate, the Board should not approve the rezoning proposals. Relevant government departments should provide corresponding traffic data to the Board for consideration;
- (b) he objected to the proposed rezoning for development of luxurious flats. While new developments in Ap Lei Chau, e.g. H.Bonaire and Marina South, were selling at about \$20,000 per square foot, it was expected that the proposed residential development under Item A would be selling at a higher price, considering its magnificent sea view. The proposed residential development would not help meeting the housing demand of the general public. It would only benefit the developers;

- (c) the government's response that the Aberdeen Tunnel had not reached its capacity was not acceptable as the calculation could be manipulated. Also, there was no practical emergency plan to handle serious accidents in Ap Lei Chau that might block the Ap Lei Chau Bridge and cut off the service of the MTR. The conclusion of the QRA regarding the low risk levels for the proposed residential development was also not acceptable; and
- (d) the site should be developed for community facilities such as home for the aged, place of recreation, sports or culture and library as there was inadequate provision of such facilities in Aberdeen and the Southern District.

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

42. As the representers, commenters and their representatives had completed their presentations, the Chairman invited questions from Members. He said that Members might direct their questions to the government representatives, the representers, the commenters or their representatives for responses.

Traffic Aspect

43. A Member said that some representers had argued that car ownership would be high for the proposed residential development, and they considered that the proposed number of car parking spaces of the proposed residential development was unrealistically low, which would distort the traffic assessment. The Member asked whether the traffic assessment was based on the estimated number of car parking spaces and the standards of car parking provision. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen, CTE/HK, said that in accordance with the standards specified in the HKPSG, the minimum and maximum number of car parking spaces were calculated based on the number of flats, the average flat size and the type of development of the site. Based on the planning parameters provided by PlanD, about 70-110 car parking spaces was estimated for the proposed development. Should there be

any changes in the development parameters, the number of car parking spaces might need to be adjusted.

44. In response to another Member's question on the carrying capacity of the MTR SIL(E), Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that he had no such information on the hourly passenger throughput.

45. Another Member said that some representers disagreed with adopting the time period of 8:00am to 10:00am as the morning peak hours in the traffic survey in the TIA and asked TD for his response. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that TD normally adopted 8:00am to 10:00am and 5:00pm to 7:00pm as the respective morning/evening peak hours. The peak traffic volume in some places might appear earlier. However, rather than relying on the average traffic volume during the peak hours, the TIA was based on the actual peak volume observed. The representers' proposal of adopting 7:00am to 9:00am as the peak hours would not make any significant difference.

46. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Chan Chung Yuen elaborated on the factors considered in the Traffic Review and explain why the positive effect of the MTR SIL(E) had not been taken into account in the Traffic Review. In response, Mr Chan said that with the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E), the MTR would take over some passengers from other modes of transport, e.g. minibus, bus etc. As a result, buses would be less crowded and it would be easier for passengers to board the buses/minibuses, resulting in a shorter travelling time in general. However, there would still be the same number of minibuses or buses travelling on the road. Hence, the MTR SIL(E) would not have significant effect in terms of reduction in the total traffic volume. The Traffic Review had reflected this scenario.

47. A Member said that while the Traffic Review concluded that the traffic impact of the proposed residential development on Aberdeen Tunnel was minimal, some representers considered that the traffic capacity had reached saturation. The Member asked whether a detailed TIA would be carried out and how the residents' concerns on traffic congestion could be addressed. The Member also asked whether the traffic problem would be resolved with the commissioning of MTR SIL(E), and whether the congested Ap Lei

Chau Bridge, which was the only access to Ap Lei Chau, would affect the emergency rescue operation.

48. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that for a private development, the project proponent would be required to commission consultants to carry out a detailed TIA. For the proposed residential development, TD had carried out a Traffic Review to preliminarily assess the traffic impact of the proposed development. The Traffic Review concluded that from a macro perspective, the traffic problem in Ap Lei Chau was relatively less serious than that encountered in other districts. As road junctions would carry the traffic loads of several roads, whether traffic could flow smoothly at signal-controlled road junctions was a good indication on whether there was traffic congestion. The Traffic Review concluded that the road junctions between Lee Nam Road and Ap Lei Chau Bridge would still have spare capacities after adding the traffic from the proposed residential development into the junctions. At a critical junction, the turning vehicles could make their turn simultaneously in the time slot allocated for pedestrian crossing, it was not anticipated that the proposed residential development would have significant adverse impact on the road junction. While the Traffic Review was a preliminary assessment and only contained limited data, TD had provided responses to local residents and SDC members on the matter. The only road access to Ap Lei Chau was through Ap Lei Chau Bridge. It was not possible to estimate the delay to emergency vehicles due to traffic accidents. Nevertheless, relevant government departments responsible for rescue and emergency operations including the Fire Services Department and Hong Kong Police Force had been consulted on the proposed rezoning and they had no adverse comments.

[Dr C.H. Hau left the meeting at this point.]

49. The same Member said that TD had made their assessment based on various data and their knowledge of the local traffic conditions as well as that of other districts. As local residents and SDC members might not have the same kind of data and knowledge, the Member asked whether such information could be provided through better communication. The Member also enquired whether the Traffic Review had taken into consideration the additional traffic generated from planned developments such as the “CDA” site in Wong Chuk Hang and those being implemented. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that TD

had attended a number of meetings with the local residents and provided the traffic data requested. On traffic forecast, TD would adopt an annual growth factor in making traffic projection based on information in the Territorial Population and Employment Matrices (TPEDM) provided by PlanD. A higher growth factor had been adopted to take into account the redevelopment projects in the area.

50. Another Member sought confirmation from TD that there would still be spare capacity in the road junctions by 2021 even if the positive effect of the MTR SIL(E) had not been taken into consideration in the Traffic Review. Noting that local residents considered the traffic was congested, the Member asked how spare capacity in traffic terms could be better explained to facilitate easy understanding by layman. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that traffic was considered smooth if vehicles could pass through road junction in a free-flow manner. The traffic would be considered as congested if vehicles could not pass through the junction after several traffic light cycles. Normally, it would be acceptable if most vehicles could pass through the road junction within one traffic light cycle. When the traffic volume was approaching the capacity of the junction, the traffic might have to wait longer in front of the junction. However, as junction capacity was an average figure over a period of time, occasional congestion did not necessarily mean that the junction capacity had been reached.

51. A Member asked how the traffic congestion problem in Ap Lei Chau compared with that in other district and whether the government had made any promise that Marina South was the last piece of land in Ap Lei Chau for residential development. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that he did not have information on whether any other district had suffered from traffic congestion of similar nature. He pointed out that all road junctions had different configuration and the cause of traffic congestion would be different from district to district. A practical way to judge whether there was any traffic congestion was to count the number of traffic signal cycles for a vehicle to pass through the junction.

52. Regarding whether the government had promised that Marina South was the last piece of land in Ap Lei Chau for residential development, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang, DPO/HK said that at the Board meeting held on 19.8.2011 to consider an application submitted by individuals to rezone the Marina South site from “R(A)” to “O”, a representative of PlanD

had said that apart from redevelopment, there was no other “R(A)” site in Ap Lei Chau that had yet to be developed. That was a statement of facts reflecting the situation of Ap Lei Chau at that time. In response to a Member’s earlier question on the capacity of the MTR SIL(E), Ms Kiang supplemented that the MTR SIL(E) was a medium capacity system (about 20,000 passengers per hour in each direction) with 3-car train at a frequency of approximately 3 minutes during peak hours.

53. A Member said that residents in Ap Lei Chau considered that the traffic was congested in the area and asked the representers’ views on that aspect. Mr Gary Chan Yun Chiu (R458) said that it was inaccurate to claim that the main traffic bottlenecks were at Aberdeen Tunnel and Ap Lei Chau Bridge. In fact, Lee Nam Road was very narrow with one lane for each traffic direction and it would be a major bottleneck for traffic. TD under-estimated the impact of the additional traffic generated by the proposed residential development on the junction of Lee Nam Road/Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road as a maximum of about 100 car parking spaces and 170pcu was used for the assessment. He estimated that there would be about 1,000 cars in the proposed residential development as those who could afford living there would own a car. The road junction could not handle such an increase in traffic. Lee Nam Road would be completely blocked as it was not wide enough for vehicles to pass through, causing knock-on effect to other road junctions in Ap Lei Chau.

54. Mr Dennis Leung (R459) supplemented that TD did not know the location of traffic congestion black spots in the area. He said that one of the congestion spot was at the bus stop outside the South Horizons Phase 4/The Oasis. Vehicles could not pass through the road junction for at least 2-3 traffic light cycles. Also, vehicles queued up along Lee Nam Road in the afternoon to pick up students from the kindergarten after school, causing serious congestion.

55. Mr Li Frazer Tsz Yan (R600) said that residents in South Horizons were aware of the traffic congestion problem in Ap Lei Chau and would stagger their departure time in the morning peak. The Traffic Review was undertaken based on a traffic condition with adjustment by local residents as mentioned. If the adjustment factor was taken out and South Horizons residents would go to work together during the morning peak hours, the situation would be far worse. Lee Nam Road had no spare capacity to accommodate

additional traffic. Most of the workers in the industrial area at Lee Nam Road would travel to the South Horizons and walk to their work place. The road and footpath were so narrow that buses/coaches travelling in opposite directions could not pass through the same point and pedestrian could not walk side by side. As Lee Nam Road could not be widened, it could not cope with the additional traffic generated from the proposed residential development and the conversion of the industrial area to a business area.

56. Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) said that he had to leave home very early in the morning for attending the representation hearing. It took him 40 minutes by car to reach North Point. Apart from having problems getting out of Ap Lei Chau in the morning, residents there also experienced difficulties in getting home after work as traffic congestion occurred in Wong Chuk Hang Road due to tourist coaches tailing back from Ocean Park. He urged the Board to note the SHEOC's survey that about 85% of South Horizons residents objected to the proposed residential development on traffic grounds. Amongst the questionnaires collected, 1,663 raised objection and 1,378 of them mentioned the traffic problem.

57. In response to a Member's question on the rationalisation of bus routes after the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E), Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that the issue was being examined by TD and he did not have any information at the moment. TD would consult relevant District Councils on the rationalisation proposals. In general, long-distance bus or minibus routes that overlapped with the MTR catchment would be rationalised. The rationalised bus services would be redeployed for feeder services connecting to the MTR stations.

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

58. A Member asked whether the road leading from Lee Nam Road near the MTR station plant building/vent building uphill towards the service reservoir could be widened to provide an access to Lei Tung Estate to the north, thus resolving the traffic bottleneck problem at Lee Nam Road. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the road in question was only a service road for the service reservoir.

59. Another Member recalled from earlier presentations by some representers that even though only about 110 car parking spaces would be provided in the proposed residential development, the actual number of cars to be owned by residents living there would be more. That Member asked if there was a threshold of the number of cars in the proposed residential development, beyond which the traffic would become unacceptable. In response, Mr Chan Chung Yuen said that the estimated car parking provision was based on the standards set out in the HKPSG. For the subject residential development, a range of 70-110 car parking spaces was estimated for 1,400 flats with an average flat size of 50m². In general, a higher ratio for car parking provision would be required for larger flat size. With the total GFA remained unchanged, an increase in the average flat size would result in a reduction in the number of flats and the resultant car parking provision would be increased. Generally, the variation in the number of car parking spaces required as a result of increasing the average flat size would be about 20%.

60. Mr Chan Chung Yuen further explained that there was no direct relation between the number of parking spaces and the estimated vehicular flows. For examples, residents living in larger flats tended to use taxis for transportation even if they did not own any private car. Hence, the traffic generation was not directly related to the number of car parking spaces provided.

61. A Member asked whether the relevant government department could specifically restrict the number of car parking spaces to be provided in the proposed residential development, e.g. through the land sale or lease conditions. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that the lease would normally state that the number of car parking to be provided should comply with the requirements in the HKPSG or to the satisfaction of the Commissioner for Transport. The developer would have to demonstrate to TD that the proposed development would not generate any adverse traffic impact. Mr Chan Chung Yuen supplemented that the standards of car parking provision for different flat sizes were stated in the HKPSG. For the proposed residential development with a maximum PR/GFA restriction, the developer could have the flexibility in increasing the flat size with a corresponding reduction in the number of flats. In this regard, he could not provide the specific number of car parking spaces to be provided in the proposed residential development.

[Dr F.C. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

Provision of Open Space and Community Facilities and Other Issues

62. In response to a Member's question on the open space provision, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that in general, sites with areas larger than 1ha were classified as DOS while smaller sites in the neighbourhood were LOS. The provision of DOS is measured in accordance with District Council boundary. The open space provision mentioned in the MPC Paper No. 14/15 (i.e. a deficit of 2.83ha of DOS and a surplus of 8.36 ha of LOS) was based on the planning scheme boundary of the Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP. For Ap Lei Chau alone, there was a surplus of 4.58ha existing LOS and a deficit of 3.61ha existing DOS. Hence, there was still a surplus of 0.97ha existing open space.

63. Another Member asked PlanD on (a) the type and location of open space and community facilities provided in Ap Lei Chau; (b) whether a promenade in the area, with cycle path, could be provided in the long-term; (c) whether the MTR station plant building/vent building near the Lee Nam Road site under Item A would create noise nuisance to the future residents there; and (d) whether developments proposed under Items A and B could be swapped and reclamation be carried out in Item B for residential development.

64. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that there were community halls at Ap Lei Chau Estate, Lei Tung Estate and the South Horizons. For parks and gardens, with a plan shown on the visualiser, Ms Kiang pointed out that there would be a new DOS at a MTR works area on the northeastern tip of Ap Lei Chau. Existing DOS included Ap Lei Chau Park, and Ap Lei Chau Wind Tower Park on the north shore, and LOS was located within Ap Lei Chau Estate, San Shi Street, Yue On Court and the Ap Lei Chau Service Reservoir Playground near Yuk Kwai Shan.

65. The Chairman asked Dr Chan Ka Lok (R571) where the residents in Ap Lei Chau would go for community facilities and open space. In response, Dr Chan Ka Lok said that as pointed out by many representers, there were inadequate open space and community facilities in Ap Lei Chau. The existing South Horizons Neighbourhood Community Centre

was very small in size. It was co-managed by the Home Affairs Department and a local organisation, whilst the managing organisation had priority over the use of the community centre. It was very difficult for residents to make reservation for the community centre. As there was deficit in open space provision in Ap Lei Chau, opportunity should be taken to develop the Lee Nam Road site, which was of suitable size, for a DOS to meet the needs of the local residents.

66. Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang continued to say that there were two waterfront promenades in Ap Lei Chau, one in the northern shore of Ap Lei Chau and another one at the South Horizons. Due to topographical and site constraints, the two waterfront promenades were separated by the existing LPG/oil depot and a sewage treatment plant and could not be connected. As an alternative, a waterfront park was proposed under Item B to serve the future residents in the proposed residential development under Item A and the workers/visitors to the new business area under Item C. As for the MTR station plant building/vent building, the relevant parties consulted advised that it would not generate any noise nuisance. On the question of swapping the proposed development under Items A and B, Ms Kiang said that the site under Item B was too narrow and would pose greater constraint for residential development. There was no plan or any study for reclamation to extend the land area of Item B. Any reclamation proposal would have to be dealt with under the Foreshore and Seabed (Reclamations) Ordinance (Cap. 127).

67. In response to questions raised by the Chairman and a Member on the provision of a waterfront promenade within the proposed residential development and the possible conflict between future users and residents of the proposed residential development, Mr Paul Zimmerman (R16/C1) said that a continuous waterfront promenade could likely be put in place in the long-term future as those incompatible uses, e.g. the LPG/oil depot, could be relocated in the future. The public waterfront promenade could be provided by setting back the site boundary of the proposed residential development under Item A. Alternatively, it could be incorporated into the private residential development and provided and maintained by the developer for public use. Pedestrian and cyclists using that waterfront promenade would mostly be residents in Ap Lei Chau. They would know each other and the risk of having conflict was small. Examples of public open space within private developments

resulting in conflicts between residents and users were not relevant. Rather, the principle of reserving the waterfront for the public should be considered.

68. A Member asked PlanD on the methodology for open space calculation, and the timing for reprovisioning of HKSM and implementation of the waterfront park. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that it was an established practice to calculate the DOS provision in accordance with the District Council boundary. The existing sitting-out area on land covered by Item A had been accounted for in the calculation of existing open space provision. However, as it would be redeveloped for other uses, the respective area had not been accounted for in the planned open space provision. The planned population of Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau was projected on the basis of the population figure of the 2011 Census. The site under Item B was rezoned to “O” to reflect the planning intention for open space development. The implementation programme of the waterfront park was yet to be decided by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. There was thus no information on the implementation programme for the open space at the current stage.

Development Parameters

69. In response to a Member’s question, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang confirmed that a building height restriction of 110mPD and a GFA, which was equivalent to a PR of 6, were stipulated on the OZP for the proposed residential site, which would be incorporated into the lease. With reference to other residential developments in the area, an average flat size of 50m² was assumed, which would result in the provision of about 1,400 flats.

70. In response to another Member’s question, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that residential developments on the northern shore of Hong Kong Island had a maximum PR ranging from 8 to 10, whilst most of the residential development in Ap Lei Chau had a PR of about 5 and 6, which was planned for medium-density development. The development intensity of the proposed residential site was comparable to that in the Ap Lei Chau area. As for the possibility of releasing the Hong Kong Police College site for development, the site was still required at the moment for the operational need of the HKPF. However, future redevelopment of the Hong Kong Police College site could not be ruled out, and the development process would be long and complicated.

LPG/Oil Depot

71. In response to a Member's question on the LPG/oil depot, Mr Tse Chun Wah, E/LUTS, EMSD, said that the existing LPG/oil depot had a high storage capacity and hence was included in the list of potentially hazardous installations. According to HKPSG, development within the 500m-radius CZ of the LPG/oil depot would need to be considered by the Coordinating Committee on Land-use Planning and Control relating to Potentially Hazardous Installations (CCPHI). For the proposed residential development, EMSD had carried out a preliminary risk assessment based on the worst case scenario. Also, a QRA carried out by consultants concluded that the level of potential risk of the proposed residential development was acceptable and met the standard specified in the HKPSG. The QRA was examined by relevant departments and was endorsed by the CCPHI.

Public Consultation

72. Noting that some representers considered that inadequate information was provided to the SDC in the consultation, a Member asked PlanD to elaborate on the information provided to SDC. In response, Ms Ginger K.Y. Kiang said that PlanD, TD and Development Bureau (DEVB) briefed SDC on 15.5.2014 regarding the potential housing sites in the Southern District in the next 5 years. For the proposed residential development at Lee Nam Road, PlanD, TD and EMSD attended meeting/forum on 20.5.2015 and 23.12.2015. After the gazetting of the OZP on 24.12.2015, SDC was consulted on the proposed amendments on 1.2.2016. DEVB, PlanD and the relevant departments had provided written responses to questions raised by SDC on the proposed development and endeavoured to provide as much information as possible.

73. As Members did not have any further questions and the representers, commenters and their representatives had nothing to add, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure on the day had been completed. He thanked the representers, commenters and their representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate the representations in their absence after completing all the

hearing sessions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

74. The Secretary reported that Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam were only present in the afternoon session and had not heard the presentations made by representers in the morning session. Members agreed that the above Members should refrain from taking part in the deliberation on the OZP.

Traffic Aspect

75. A Member said that while the car parking provision should be provided in accordance with the standards stipulated in the HKPSG, the developer might adjust the car parking provision to respond to the market demand. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan, explained that the HKPSG set out the standards of car parking provisions for different flat sizes. While a higher car parking ratio would be accorded to larger flat size, as the maximum GFA of the proposed residential development would remain unchanged, an increase in the flat size would correspondingly reduce the number of units and the resultant variation in the number of car parking spaces should not be great. He noted TD's view that the difference in car parking provision should not exceed 20% resulting from such a change. If the number of car parking spaces exceeded the standards of the HKPSG, the exceeded car parking spaces would be GFA accountable, resulting in a reduction in domestic GFA. In response to the same Member's concern that the developer might still want to provide more car parking spaces to respond to market demand, the Chairman said that the actual number of car parking spaces would be provided to the satisfaction of TD. Developers could not drastically change the number of car parking spaces as they wished.

76. Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam, Deputy Director of Lands said that advice from TD would be sought in specifying the car parking requirement in the lease. Normally, the level of car parking provision would be specified in a range corresponding to different flat sizes to allow

flexibility. In general, developers would not give up any domestic GFA for providing more car parking spaces. A Member said that in view of the current market situation, developers might be willing to sacrifice some flats for more car parking spaces as the unit price per square foot for car parking spaces might be higher than that of a flat.

77. Another Member considered that more information on the effect of the MTR SIL(E) should be provided. While DPO/HK had previously said that the MTR SIL(E) would be operated with 3-car train at a frequency of 3 minutes having a capacity of 20,000 passengers per hour, there was insufficient information on whether that carrying capacity could relieve the traffic congestion problem. The Chairman drew Members' attention to the Paper which mentioned that even though the positive effect of the MTR SIL(E) had not been taken into account, the traffic volume of the road networks in Ap Lei Chau was expected to be lower in the design year of 2021 when the MTR SIL(E) was in place. TD's representative had also confirmed at the meeting that the number of vehicles on the road would not be significantly reduced, but it would be easier to board the buses as they would be less crowded.

78. A Member said that it was mentioned by a presenter that the MTR SIL(E) would reduce the traffic by 6-7% and the MTR Tseung Kwan O Line had reduced the traffic by 5%. Another Member said that according to TD, the number of buses on the road would not be reduced significantly as buses would be redeployed for feeder service to serve the MTR.

79. A Member said that according to Attachment V of the MPC Paper on the proposed amendments to the OZP, the junction capacity of Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road near Ap Lei Chau Estate during the morning peak hours was 132% in 2014 and 116% in 2021, which had not taken into account the positive effect of the MTR SIL(E). However, there was no information to demonstrate that there would not be any adverse traffic impact arising from the rezoning proposals under Items A, B and C. Two other Members also considered that more information on the traffic situation would be required.

[Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

80. Another Member said that the provision of 70-110 car parking spaces for 1,400 flats was equivalent to one space for every 20 flats, which was rather low and might lead to illegal parking. The Member was particularly concerned about the lack of information on the number of car parking spaces within the proposed residential development beyond which the traffic would become unacceptable.

81. A Member said that while representers speculated there might be a high car ownership ratio, it could also be possible that future residents might decide not to own a car in view of the limited number of car parking spaces and the availability of MTR service. The Traffic Review concluded that the MTR SIL(E) would have positive effect. As buses routes would be rationalised and buses would also be deployed for feeder service locally, there would be less traffic in the Aberdeen Tunnel, hence the traffic condition could be improved.

82. Regarding the provision of car parking spaces, a Member said that while it would be more acceptable to limit the number of car parking spaces for public housing development, the proposed private residential development under Item A would attract middle-income buyers who had a higher car-ownership ratio. The future residents would be deprived of their rights to drive if adequate car parking spaces were not provided, which was not desirable. The Chairman noted that the standard for car parking provision was based on the transport policy of encouraging the use of public transport. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan supplemented that it was a global trend for developing sustainable and green cities and to restrict the growth in the number of private car. Another Member supported the policy for green living and said that the well-developed transportation infrastructure in Hong Kong could encourage the use of public transport, but considered that more information on the traffic assessment should be provided on the proposed residential development. Two Members considered that TD should advise on the maximum number of car parking spaces that could be provided within the proposed residential development and the level of traffic generation that would be acceptable.

Risk Aspect

83. A Member noted that the existing LPG/oil depot was located closer to the South Horizons than to the site proposed for residential development under Item A. The Board should consider why the LPG/oil depot would pose a hazard to the proposed residential development under Item A but not the South Horizons. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan said that the LPG/oil depot was mainly to supply LPG to the South Horizons. A QRA was carried out according to the methodology widely adopted internationally for risk assessment and the risk level was expressed in the number of possible casualty in an incident. The QRA concluded that the risk level of the existing LPG/oil depot on the proposed residential development was within a reasonably acceptable low level.

Waterfront Promenade

84. A Member agreed with some representers/commenters' views that the waterfront should not be privatised and should be reserved for use by the public. Another Member said that the site configuration of the proposed residential site was long and narrow, and the feasibility of providing a waterfront promenade would need to be considered in greater detail.

85. The Chairman asked the Secretary to brief Members on the possible mechanism to require the provision of a waterfront promenade at the proposed residential site.

86. The Secretary said that the provision of a waterfront promenade could either be incorporated in the Notes of the OZP for the "R(A)" zone under Item A, or be stated as a land sale condition under the lease. A Member suggested that an alternative approach would be excluding the waterfront promenade from the sale site, while keeping the "R(A)" zoning on the OZP unchanged as open space was always permitted in "R(A)" zone. The waterfront promenade could then be implemented and maintained by the government. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan, said that as the future residential development would need to set back from the sea wall, such area could be specified in the lease as a waterfront promenade and be open for the public's enjoyment. In view of the relatively remote location of the site, future users of the waterfront promenade would likely be the local residents. The sites under Items A and B were originally zoned "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Cargo Handling Area". As there was no demand for such use, it was proposed to develop the Item A site for residential use while reserving the Item B site for open space development. Although the

Item B site would continuously be used for HKSM on a temporary basis, it should be zoned “O” first to show the planning intention, notwithstanding that the open space could not be implemented for the time being.

87. A Member said that the coastline in that part of Ap Lei Chau was not natural and wondered whether the waterfront promenade could be built on stilt structure along the coastline, and whether the proposed developments in sites under Items A and B could be swapped. The Chairman noted such site swapping would involve many technical issues and whether this would provide a pragmatic way forward could be uncertain.

88. A Member suggested that the MPC Paper for the proposed amendments to the OZP should be provided to Members for background information.

89. The Chairman noted that Members generally considered that more information on the traffic aspect would be required in considering the representations on the OZP, particularly on Item A, and asked the Secretary to advise on the procedure to follow. The Secretary said that in considering the representations on the Pak Shek Kok OZP in 2014, the Board had also deferred making a decision pending additional information on the Science Park development be provided. The representers/commenters were invited to attend a subsequent meeting in which relevant government representatives presented the additional information and to answer Members’ questions, if any. To be prudent, the Chairman asked the Secretariat to seek legal advice, if necessary, on the matter.

90. After some discussion, Members agreed that the following additional information would be required for further consideration of the representations :

- (a) the maximum number of car parking space that could be provided within the proposed residential development and the threshold of traffic volume beyond which the traffic condition in the area would be considered unacceptable;
- (b) the distance between the proposed residential development in Item A to the nearest MTR SIL(E) station entrance, the gradient of the access

route and whether there would be any means of connection, e.g. shuttle bus service;

- (c) whether HKSM could operate on a reduced site and the schedule of its reprovisioning for the implementation of the open space under Item B; and
- (d) possible measures to safeguard the provision of a public waterfront promenade at Item A site.

91. After further deliberation, the Board decided to defer making a decision on the representations pending provision of further information by relevant government departments.

92. The meeting was closed at 7:40 p.m.