

**Minutes of the 1122<sup>nd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 18.11.2016**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

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 Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Vice-Chairman

Ms Sandy H. Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

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

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional  
Assessment), Environmental Protection Department  
Mr Louis P.L. Chan

Assistant Director/Regional 3  
Lands Department  
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

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 Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

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 Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms Doris S.Y. Ting

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr T.C. Cheng

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/30  
(TPB Paper No. 10175)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

1. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in this item :

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Dr Wilton W.T. Fok                     | - | owning a property in South Horizons and one of the representations was submitted by the South Horizons Estate Owners' Committee (SHEOC) (R605) |
| Professor S.C. Wong<br>(Vice-chairman) | - | his relative owning properties in South Horizons   |

2. Members noted that Dr Wilton W.T. Fok had tendered apology for being unable to attend the meeting. Members agreed that Professor S.C. Wong's interest was indirect and could stay in the meeting.

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

***Government representatives***

*Planning Department (PlanD)*

- |                    |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr Louis K. H. Kau | - | District Planning Officer/Hong Kong (DPO/HK) |
|--------------------|---|--|

Ms Jessica K.T. Lee - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 1  
(STP/HK1)

*Transport Department (TD)*

Mr Peter C.K. Mak - Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong  
(CTE/HK)

***Representers/Commenters or their representatives***

R8/C4 – 陳家佩議員辦事處

Ms Chan Ka Pui Judy - Representer/Commenter

R13/C7 – South Horizons Concern Group

R14 – Au Yuen Fat Joseph

Mr Au Yuen Fat Joseph - Representer and  
Representer/Commenter's  
representative

R16/C1 – Designing Hong Kong Ltd

C2 – Paul Zimmerman

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Commenter and  
Representer/Commenter's  
representative

R336/C9 – Ng Tsz Ying Monica

Ms Or Wai Ying Josephine - Representer/Commenter's  
representative

R352 – Ritko Lo

R571 – Chan Ka Lok

Dr Chan Ka Lok - Representer and Representer's  
representative

R405/C8 – Ng Wai Huk Allan

Mr Ng Wai Huk Allan - Representor and Commentor

R421/C10 – Alex Chan

R605 – South Horizons Estate Owners' Committee

Mr Alex Chan - Representor and Commentor and  
Representor's representative

Mr Chau Sze Lam ] Representor's representatives

Ms Yeung Tsz Ting ]

R458 – Chan Yun Chiu Gary

Mr Chan Yun Chiu Gary - Representor

R492 – Lam Kai Fai

Mr Lam Kai Fai - Representor

R548 – Warren Man

Mr Warren Man - Representor

R550 – Leung Bik Ching Minah

Mr Yeung Wai Kwong - Representor's representative

R566 – Law Yuk Lan

Ms Law Yuk Lan - Representor

R567 – Lam Wai Fun

Ms Lam Wai Fun - Representor

R573 – Lee Hon Chung Alex

Mr Lee Hon Chung Alex - Representor

R582 – Yu Chi Kin

Mr Yu Chi Kin

- Representer

4. The Chairman extended a welcome and informed the attendees that the meeting was a continuation of the question and answer (Q&A) session of the meeting held on 27.9.2016. At that meeting, Members agreed to defer making a decision on the representations and raised further questions on car parking provision and traffic generation, access to Mass Transit Railway South Island Line (East) (MTR SIL(E)), the operation and reprovisioning of the Hong Kong School of Motoring (HKSM) and the provision of the waterfront promenade at the future residential development. This meeting was for government departments to answer the questions raised by the Board and for Members to direct further questions to government representatives and/or representers/commenters and their representatives, where any, and to further consider the representations and comments.

5. The Chairman said that reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters who had attended the 27.9.2016 meeting, inviting them to attend the hearing. 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 Q&A session in their absence.

6. The Chairman said that the video recording of the hearing session held on 27.9.2016 had been sent to Members on 5.10.2016 and the draft minutes of the meeting had been confirmed on 4.11.2016 and uploaded to the Board's website on the same day. He then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the additional information requested by the Board.

7. On invitation of the Chairman and with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK answered the questions raised earlier by the Board, as summarised below :

Car Parking Provision and Traffic Generation

- (a) the car parking provision for residential development in Hong Kong was calculated in accordance with the requirements specified in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Factors affecting the number of car parking provision were:
- (i) global parking standard (GPS) – 1 space per 6-9 flats, which was applicable to all residential developments;
  - (ii) demand adjustment ratio R1 – an adjustment factor based on the average flat size of the proposed development. The larger the flat, the higher the adjustment ratio;
  - (iii) accessibility adjustment ratio R2 – an adjustment factor based on the proximity of the proposed residential development to rail stations. The number of car parking spaces would be reduced if the proposed residential development was located within 500m radius of rail station;
  - (iv) development intensity adjustment ratio R3 – an adjustment factor based on the development intensity of the proposed residential development. More car parking space would be provided for low-density development;
- (b) number of car parking spaces required for the proposed residential development under Item A (the Lee Nam Road site) with a plot ratio (PR) of 6, which was located within 500m of the MTR SIL(E) Station, with a variation in the adjustment factor R1 and no change to the adjustment factors R2 and R3 at 0.75 and 0.9 respectively :



<u>Average flat size (m<sup>2</sup>)</u>	<u>No. of flats</u>	<u>No. of car parking spaces</u>
50	1,416	74 to 112
100	708	112 to 167
150	472	266 to 398

- (c) the car parking requirements for the proposed residential development would be specified in the lease by Lands Department (LandsD) after consulting the Commissioner for Transport (C for T). In assessing the level of car parking provision for the Lee Nam Road site, TD would take into account various consideration including the HKPSG standard, the traffic condition of the site and its surrounding area, and the provision of public transport facilities in the area etc;
- (d) regarding traffic generation, TD advised that the vehicular flows arising from any proposed residential development would depend on the average flat size and the number of flats of the proposed residential development, i.e. the additional population, but not on the number of car parking spaces to be provided within the proposed development. For the Lee Nam Road site, the estimated peak vehicular flows were :

<u>Average flat size (m<sup>2</sup>)</u>	<u>No. of flats</u>	<u>Estimated peak vehicular flow (pcu/hr)</u>
50	1,416	102
100	708	134
150	472	125

- (e) in the traffic review (TR) conducted by TD in assessing the traffic impact of the proposed residential development on the major road junctions in Ap Lei Chau, a conservative approach (i.e. adopting the highest traffic generation figure) was taken by TD;

- (f) according to TD, the traffic condition of Ap Lei Chau was governed by the capacity of the major road junctions, rather than the capacity of the roads. A total of eight major road junctions were included in the assessment. For the five signal controlled junctions, there were reserve capacities (i.e. exceeding 15%) in the base year (2014) and the design year (2021), for both scenarios with or without the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site. Also, the design flow capacity ratios for the three priority junctions were below 1.0, indicating that those junctions were operating below their full capacities in the corresponding period;

#### Access to MTR SIL(E)

- (g) the Lee Nam Road site was about 450m to 700m away (measured from the near and far ends of the site respectively), or about a 10-minute walk from the nearest MTR SIL(E) Station entrance located at Yi Nam Road. Half the route was almost flat at a gradient of 1:200 and the remaining half was at 1:35, which was very slightly inclined;
- (h) bus stops for the existing bus routes Nos. 95 and 671 were locating outside the Lee Nam Road site, and the buses would go pass the MTR SIL(E) Station. If necessary, additional bus service or shuttle bus service for the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site to MTR SIL(E) station would be considered by TD on application, taking into account the prevailing demand and traffic conditions. A video was shown to demonstrate the existing condition of the pedestrian footpath from the site to the future MTR SIL(E) Station;

#### Operation and Reprovisioning of HKSM

- (i) HKSM was previously operating at the Lee Nam Road site under Item A and part of the adjacent site under Item B (Site B). HKSM had

recently relocated most of the facilities from Site B to Oceanic Industrial Centre at Lee Lok Street nearby and another school premises at Tin Hau. Facilities at the Lee Nam Road site had also been relocated to Site B. The new premises for HKSM had already commenced operation on 1.11.2016;

- (j) TD was liaising closely with the relevant government departments to identify suitable temporary site on Hong Kong Island for the reprovisioning of HKSM. According to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD), there was yet a programme for the implementation of the proposed open space at Site B; and

Provision of the Waterfront Promenade

- (k) after liaising with the concerned government departments, it would be possible to incorporate a condition in the lease for the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site requiring the future developer to provide a public pedestrian passageway along the waterfront connecting to the proposed open space at Site B.

8. Mr Paul Zimmerman (C2) said that the answers just provided by the government representative orally at the meeting had not been presented in the form of a paper to the Board and made available to the public, particularly the representers and commenters, in advance. Such an arrangement might be subject to challenge. In response, the Chairman said that his observation would be duly recorded. The Chairman noted that during the Q&A session of a hearing, the Board would generally accept oral representations which could sometimes be made with the support of materials such as PowerPoint slides. This arrangement had been applied to both government representatives as well as representers/commenters. If all answers had to be submitted to the Board in the form of a written submission and oral submissions supported by PowerPoint was to be disallowed, the Board's procedures would become unduly restrictive and unfriendly to representers and commenters as well as government representatives.

The procedures for handling this Q&A session were consistent with the practice of the Board.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, the representative of SHEOC, Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) made the following main points in response to the information presented by the government representatives :

- (a) there were more than 30,000 residents in South Horizons. Based on an opinion survey, about 85% of the residents opposed to the rezoning of the Lee Nam Road site, 12% agreed with the rezoning while the remaining had no comment or had other views on the proposal;
- (b) South Horizons was located on the western side of Ap Lei Chau. There was a bus terminus at Yi Nam Road with 12 bus routes and 3 minibus routes. Incoming and out-going buses and minibuses would go through South Horizon Drive, and stop at 7 bus stops along the road. There were also 8 ingress/egress points from various car parks in South Horizons and 2 school buses loading/unloading points along South Horizon Drive. Traffic within South Horizons and along Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road was busy;
- (c) there were two MTR ventilation buildings in Lee Nam Road at the foothill of Yuk Kwai Shan, one opposite Phase 3 of South Horizons for fresh air intake and the other opposite HKSM for emitting exhaust air extracted from the MTR SIL(E) tunnels. The existing open space at the Lee Nam Road site, with an area of about the same size of the two MTR ventilation buildings, was constructed by the MTR Corporation Limited for local residents as compensation. That open space was completed recently, but would be lost if the Lee Nam Road site was to be redeveloped, aggravating the shortage of open space in Ap Lei Chau;

- (d) a narrow footpath was provided only on one side of Lee Nam Road opposite Yuk Kwai Shan. The footpath was about 2m in width. The crash barrier and lamp posts on the footpath would take up some space and hence the actual width of the footpath would be less. A section of the footpath of about 100m in length outside the Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) Depot was less than 1m wide, which was just wide enough for one pedestrian to walk through;
- (e) learner-drivers of HKSM could previously practise their driving mainly within HKSM operating at the Lee Nam Road site and would only occasionally use the public road near the industrial area for driving practice. While the HKSM operation at the Lee Nam Road site had ceased, the ramps, manoeuvring space and mock-up traffic light settings could not be reprovisioned at Site B due to its smaller area and narrow site configuration. Learner-drivers had to practise their driving on public road near the industrial area or in Ap Lei Chau. The increased number of learner-drivers using the public roads would increase the traffic on Lee Nam Road and in Ap Lei Chau;
- (f) the waterfront promenade to be provided within the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would not be useful as it could not be connected to the waterfront promenade of South Horizons due to the presence of the sewage treatment plant (STP) and the LPG Depot in between; and
- (g) there were 9,812 flats in South Horizons and about 1,900 car parking spaces, averaging 1 space for every 5 flats. Illegal parking was serious at South Horizons along South Horizon Drive. On average, the management office took enforcement action on about 100 illegally parked vehicles each month by clamping their wheels. The illegal parking problem would become worse after midnight. It was expected that car ownership of the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would be high. With a low ratio of car

parking space provision for the Lee Nam Road site, the existing illegal parking problem in the area would be aggravated.

10. Regarding Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10)'s comment that the provision for public passageway along the waterfront of the Lee Nam Road site would not be useful as the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade was constrained by the existing STP and LPG Depot, the Chairman asked Mr Paul Zimmerman (C2) for his views. In response, Mr Zimmerman said that when the society started talking about having a continuous waterfront promenades at the Victoria Harbour back in 2002/2003, it was realised that many proposed waterfront open space/promenade were disjointed and would have to look for opportunities to link them together. Similarly, the opportunity for provision of a public waterfront promenade at the Lee Nam Road site should be preserved as the existing LPG Depot and the STP might be relocated in the future. Mr Zimmerman also said that his above comments should only be considered if the Government decided to develop the Lee Nam Road site for residential use. He considered that the residents' views on whether the Lee Nam Road site should be developed for residential use were valid and should be duly considered by the Board.

11. The Vice-chairman asked the government representatives to elaborate on whether :

- (a) the traffic review (TR) undertaken by TD had taken into consideration bus and minibus operations in South Horizons and if so, the equivalent pcu for buses in the TR;
- (b) the traffic arising from operation of HKSM had been taken into consideration in assessing the capacities of the major road junctions;
- (c) the width of the footpath along Lee Nam Road met the standards of footpath design, and the narrow sections mentioned by Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) could be widened; and

- (d) the operation of the MTR SIL(E) would have any impact on the traffic condition of Ap Lei Chau.

12. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD said that the narrowest section of the footpath along Lee Nam Road was located outside the existing LPG Depot. It was about 2.3m in width, or 1.9m if the space taken up by the crash barrier was discounted. The footpath at the upper and lower sections of Lee Nam Road was relatively wider. With the aid of the visualizer showing a plan of the designated practice routes of HKSM, Mr Kau said that learner-drivers of HKSM would practise their driving skills via a designated route within the industrial area nearby. Learner-drivers were not allowed to drive up Lee Nam Road for driving practice.

13. Regarding the TR and the impact of the opening of MTR SIL(E), Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE/HK, TD said that the bus operation had been taken into consideration in the TR. For the purpose of traffic assessment, a bus was equivalent to 3 pcu. As such, the actual number of vehicles on the road would be less than the pcu figures indicated in the TR. Mr Mak also clarified that his colleague had indicated in the 27.9.2016 meeting that the opening of MTR SIL(E) would have positive traffic impact.

14. The Chairman asked Mr Lam Kai Fai (R492) and Ms Chan Ka Pui, Judy (R8/C4), the Southern District Council (SDC) members on their views regarding the traffic condition and the car parking provision in Ap Lei Chau. In response, Mr Lam said that the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would affect Ap Lei Chau as well as the Southern District. A traffic impact assessment (TIA) should be carried out by an independent traffic consultant for development proposal of this large scale. He considered that TD's assessment that there were spare capacities at the major road junctions did not reflect the real situation.

15. Mr Lam continued to say that the standards of car parking provision specified in the HKPSG was too low, resulting in an inadequate provision of car parking spaces and leading to illegal parking in Ap Lei Chau Main Street and South Horizons. Similar illegal parking problem would happen in Lee Nam Road as there would be inadequate car parking spaces for the proposed residential development. Mr Lam also said that the narrow

footpath along Lee Nam Road could not meet the future pedestrian flow. He considered that the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site was not acceptable if HKSM was still operating in Site B. Besides, the platform within the MTR SIL(E) Station in South Horizons was too narrow and would not be able to accommodate the passengers from South Horizons, Ap Lei Chau Estate, Lei Tung Estate and those from outside Ap Lei Chau. The situation would be worsened if there were more population from the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site.

16. Ms Chan Ka Pui, Judy (R8/C4) noted from PlanD's presentation that one of the road junctions had a capacity figure of 132 for the base year 2014 and the projection for year 2021 was over 116. She queried whether traffic at that road junction was saturated. The Chairman clarified that according to TD, the figures indicated were spare capacities figures. Hence, a higher figure would indicate a higher spare capacity, thus a better traffic condition.

17. Ms Chan said that no traffic data was provided in the TR to justify TD's assessment. In particular, the peak hours adopted by TD in their TR did not match the specific peak period in Ap Lei Chau, which was from 7:30am to 8:30am. She considered that for the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site, a TIA conducted by an independent traffic consultant was required. Ms Chan said that there was no data in the TR conducted by TD to demonstrate that various new or planned developments, including the student intake of a new international school in Ap Lei Chau, the proposed new green minibus (GMB) route from Sham Wan Towers to the MTR South Horizons Station, the impact of the opening of MTR SIL(E) had been taken into consideration. All the above changes would have great impact on the traffic along Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road and in South Horizons.

18. In response to the Chairman, Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) explained, with a PowerPoint presentation, that the crash barrier and the lamp post had taken up some space of the footpath outside the existing LPG Depot. The footpath was much narrower than 1.9m and was only wide enough for pedestrian to walk in a single line. There were crash barriers and lamp posts along the footpath. As such, the footpath would not be able to



cope with the pedestrian flow generated from the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site.

19. The Vice-chairman asked the government representative to further clarify the concept of junction reserve capacity and design flow capacity. Regarding a representer (R492)'s comment that the platforms of the MTR South Horizons Station was narrow and could not cope with the demand from local residents, he asked :

- (a) whether MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) had provided any responses at the SDC meeting; and
- (b) whether there was any estimate on the number of passengers that would switch from other modes of transport to patron the MTR SIL(E) and whether there would be any positive impact of the MTR SIL(E) on the traffic condition in the area.

20. In response, Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE/HK said that for non-signal controlled junctions, the capacity was measured in terms of the design flow capacity ratio. For example, a figure of 1.0 represented full junction capacity has been reached, a figure of 0.55 indicated that the junction was operating at about 55% of its capacity. Hence, the smaller the figure, the better the traffic would be. Whereas for those signal controlled junctions, the capacity was expressed in terms of junction reserve capacity ratio, e.g. a figure of 43% at the junction of Lee Nam Road and Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road indicated that the traffic flow could be magnified by 43% before reaching the full capacity of the signalized junction. The figures indicated the reserve capacity of the junction. Hence, a higher figure would indicate that more spare capacity would be available.

21. Mr Peter C.K. Mak made reference to the information provided by MTRCL, the MTR SIL(E) could have a maximum carrying capacity of about 20,000 passengers per hour. The actual number of passengers would need to be verified after the MTR SIL(E) was commissioned as passengers might need some time to switch from other modes of transport to patron the new MTR SIL(E). As a general reference, the territory-wide split

of passengers using MTR and other modes of transport in Hong Kong had been about 40:60.

22. A Member said that as there was inadequate car parking spaces in South Horizons, he wondered why residents without owning a car parking space still wanted to own a car. That Member asked the residents whether any survey had been carried out on car ownership in South Horizons. In response, Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) said that no such survey on car ownership had been carried out by the SHEOC. However, he knew that the monthly rent was about \$3,500 to \$5,500 and the selling price was about \$1.35million to \$2.5million for each car parking space in South Horizons. He considered that the car parking space issue was a question of demand and supply.

23. Mr Ng Wai Huk Allan (R405/C8) supplemented that there were about 9,800 flats and 2,000 car parking spaces in South Horizons, representing a car parking ratio of about 20%. The respective figures for Sham Wan Towers, Larvotto and Marina South were 1,040 flats and 170 spaces (16%), 715 flats and 485 spaces (67%), and 110 flats and 119 spaces (more than 100%) respectively. For the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site, a car parking ratio of less than 15% would definitely be inadequate.

24. Another Member sought further clarification from TD regarding the interpretation of a junction reserve capacity ratio of 132, the possibility of widening the footpath along Lee Nam Road, and the positive impact of MTR SIL(E). That Member also asked whether the number of train cars of the MTR SIL(E) could be increased in future. In response, Mr Peter C.K. Mak said that if the junction had reached full capacity and there was no reserve capacity, the junction reserve capacity ratio would be zero. On the contrary, if there was no traffic at the junction, full capacity could be available as a reserve and the remaining capacity would be 100%. A junction reserve capacity ratio of 132% for the Ap Lei Chau Bridge Road junction was technical in nature, but generally speaking, it indicated that there was ample spare capacity at the junction. The junction capacity presented to the Board was a conservative assessment which had not taken into account the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E). Considering that the MTR SIL(E) would attract some passengers currently taking other modes of road transport, it was expected that

there would be even more reserve capacities at these junctions after the opening of the MTR SIL(E).

25. Regarding whether the number of MTR train cars could be increased, Mr Peter C.K. Mak said that MTRCL had announced that the MTR SIL(E) would operate on 3-car trains at this stage. On footpath widening, Mr Mak said that based on TD's estimate, the existing footpath could cope with the projected pedestrian flow from the proposed development.

26. A Member further asked whether the lamp posts at various locations could be shifted towards the kerbside in order not to obstruct pedestrian flow. That Member said that while the MTR SIL(E) would attract some passengers currently taking other modes of road transport and contributed to reduced road traffic, it also attracted feeder services to take residents from areas outside Ap Lei Chau to the new MTR South Horizons Station. That Member asked TD to substantiate qualitatively how the MTR could reduce road traffic and further explain how the junction reserve capacity ratio could exceed 100%.

27. In response, Mr Peter C.K. Mak said that position of lamp posts and crash barriers were designed by the Highways Department (HyD). He could convey Member's suggestion to HyD to examine the feasibility of adjusting the position of crash barriers and lamp posts to reduce obstruction to the pedestrians. As for the impact of the MTR SIL(E) on road traffic, the volume of vehicular traffic could be reduced in general if some passengers travelling in other modes of road transport and some private cars users were attracted to take the MTR SIL(E). Regarding the junction reserve capacity ratio of 132%, Mr Mak said that the figure was derived from some sophisticated computations which might be too technical to explain. Nevertheless, in qualitative term, such a figure indicated that there was ample spare capacity at the junction.

28. Another Member asked whether the road junction capacity projection for 2021 had taken into account other developments, e.g. hotels and international school mentioned by a representer (R8/C4). That Member noted that another representer (R405/C8) had mentioned that different car parking ratios were adopted for various residential

developments in Ap Lei Chau and asked whether the provision of car parking spaces in these developments had deviated from the car parking standards specified in the HKPSG.

29. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK said that the international school in question had submitted a TIA on the traffic impact of the school on the surrounding road network. According to the assessment on junction capacity conducted by TD, the junction reserve capacity ratio for the major road junctions in 2021 would be reduced under the scenario of without the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site. This indicated that other developments affecting the road junction capacities had already been taken into account in the assessment. Regarding the car parking provision for car parking provision at the Lee Nam Road site, reference would be made to the standards stipulated in HKPSG and would be specified in the respective lease. Any deviation from the car parking requirements would need to be agreed by the Director of Lands, upon consultation with TD. Excessive car parking provision would be accountable for GFA calculation, which meant a reduction of domestic gross floor area (GFA).

30. Another Member asked Mr Ng Wai Huk Allan (R405/C8) whether he had any information on the average flat size of Marina South. In response, Mr Ng said that the average flat size of Marina South would be over 100m<sup>2</sup>. Another representer, Mr Chan Yun Chiu Gary (R458) supplemented that the average flat size of that development was about 1,800 to 2,000sq.ft. That Member went on to say that those who could afford living in Marina South would probably own a car. Given that there was flexibility in car parking provision and the current market situation in speculating car parking space, that Member wondered if developers might be willing to sacrifice some domestic GFA for provision of more car parking spaces as the unit price per sq.ft. for car parking spaces might be higher than that of a flat. Mr Ng Wai Huk Allan (R405/C8) agreed with that Member's view and said that while South Horizons with an average flat size of about 50m<sup>2</sup> which was similar to that of the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site, would still have a car parking ratio of about 20%, it would be unrealistic to adopt a car parking ratio of less than 10% for the proposed residential development.

31. In response to a question raised by the same Member, Mr Warren Man (R548) said that the car parking spaces in South Horizons were rented out to residents initially and were now sold to residents in batches. That Member asked Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE/HK whether the number of train cars in the MTR SIL(E) could be increased and whether TD could confirm if there was only about 5% improvement to the road traffic after the MTR Tseung Kwan O Line commenced operation, as quoted by a representer in the 27.9.2016 meeting. In response, Mr Mak said that he had no information in hand on whether the number of train cars in MTR SIL(E) could be increased. As Tseung Kwan O was a new town, the improvement to road traffic in Tseung Kwan O upon commencement of the MTR would be compared with the actual traffic flow generated from the entire new town. However, it would not be practical to compare Ap Lei Chau with Tseung Kwan O as the latter was of a much larger scale. For Ap Lei Chau, the statistics on the improvement on road impact would only be obtained after commencement of MTR SIL(E). Although the TR had not taken into account the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E), the assessment concluded that there would still be capacity at the major road junctions in Ap Lei Chau. Traffic generated by passengers from outside Ap Lei Chau coming to take the MTR SIL(E) at the South Horizons Station would be reflected in the non-critical in-coming traffic data during peak hours and were not shown in the presentation slide, which showed the junction capacity of critical out-going traffic.

32. A Member asked whether the MTR ventilation building opposite the Lee Nam Road site would have any adverse air quality impact on the future development at the site and whether there were any criteria for the Government to determine on when a TIA would be required by an independent traffic consultant. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that for private development, the project proponent would need to submit a TIA for TD's comments. For government projects, TD would determine whether a TIA should be carried out by a consultant, taking into account the availability of resources within the department. An environmental impact assessment (EIA) was submitted for the MTR SIL(E). The EIA concluded that the MTR ventilation building opposite the Lee Nam Road site would not have any adverse air quality impact on the surrounding area.

33. The same Member further asked whether the future developer of the Lee Nam Road site would be required to submit a TIA and whether the EIA for the MTR SIL(E)

would be updated to take into account the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that there was no intention to include in the lease condition requiring the submission of a TIA by the future developer of the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site, but the future developer would be required under the lease to submit an air quality impact assessment for the proposed residential development, and to take necessary mitigation measures to minimize the adverse impact, if necessary.

34. Another Member asked even if a developer decided to provide some additional car parking spaces at the expense of some domestic GFA, whether such a deviation from the car parking standards as specified in the lease would be acceptable to government departments. That Member also asked whether there was any information on when illegal parking was observed as it might have different impact on the road traffic at different time of the day, and whether the existing enforcement action by the management office of South Horizons and/or the government department was effective. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the car parking requirements would be specified in the lease. Any deviation from the requirements would need to be approved by D of Lands, in consultation with TD. TD would assess such requests taking into account relevant consideration including local traffic condition. Regarding the illegal parking issue, Mr Alex Chan (R421/C10) said that some illegally parked vehicles did not belong to residents of South Horizons. He observed that as many as 50 cars were illegally parked at Lee Nam Road from 10:30pm until 7:00am. Police was called in regularly to issue penalty tickets. However, due to an acute shortage of car parking provision in South Horizons, i.e. a car parking ratio of 20% as against 40% car ownership, car owners were forced to park their cars illegally on the roadside while awaiting a proper parking space. He anticipated that the illegal parking problem would get worse as a result of the proposed residential development.

35. The Vice-chairman asked Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE/HK to elaborate on the standard applied in assessing the adequacy on the width of the footpath in Lee Nam Road to cope with the pedestrian flow generated from the proposed residential development, and the relationship between the number of car parking spaces and traffic generation. In response, Mr Mak said that the estimated pedestrian flow was deduced from surveys on nearby residential developments of similar scale. Based on TD's standard on pedestrian

flow, the level of service was considered acceptable to the extent that pedestrian could walk freely along the footpath and irreconcilable head-on conflicts between pedestrians were unlikely. Vehicular flows would depend on the average flat size and the number of flats which were more related to the number of residents. There was no direct relationship between the number of car parking spaces and traffic generation.

36. Noting that many representers/commenters raised their hands to express their intention to give their views, the Chairman reminded the attendees that the meeting was a continuation of the Q&A session of the 27.9.2016 meeting and that representers/commenters would speak in response to questions raised by Members. This was not an occasion for everyone wishing to do so to make a fresh round of representations.

37. The Chairman then asked Dr Chan Ka Lok (R571) to share his observations on the traffic aspects affecting the OZP. In response, Mr Chan said that the additional information presented to the Board was not available in advance to enable representers/commenters to prepare a thorough response. That arrangement was unfair to the residents.

38. With the aid of the visualizer, Dr Chan showed a photograph of traffic congestion at Lee Nam Road and said that the picking up/setting down of students in the two kindergartens in South Horizons had caused traffic congestion. While Members had raised questions on the impact of the MTR SIL(E) on road traffic and the change in the mode of public transport taken by the local residents, such information would only be available after the commencement of the MTR SIL(E). According to some SDC papers, TD would carry out a study in consultation with public transport operators, relevant stakeholders and SDC members after the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E) to examine its impact on the overall traffic in the Southern District. The findings of the study would be used for the rationalization of bus routes. As the study was forthcoming, the Board should make a decision on the rezoning of the Lee Nam Road site based on the actual data collected in the traffic study instead of the traffic projection based on various assumptions and subject to uncertainties.

39. Dr Chan said that SDC was liaising with TD on providing a new GMB route No. 36M from Aberdeen to the MTR SIL(E) at South Horizons Station, which would be a terminal station. That GMB route would increase the traffic in Lee Nam Road and Yi Nam Road. Besides, SDC would shortly discuss with TD its proposal to conduct a comprehensive traffic and transport review for the Aberdeen Centre. SDC was also considering a proposal by TD on a one-year regional traffic study to examine the overall change in travel pattern, taking into account the impact of the MTR SIL(E). As about 80% of workers and 60% of students in Ap Lei Chau would commute to other districts daily, the traffic impact should be examined on a wider scale. In view of the above reviews which would provide concrete data on the overall traffic situation of the district, he urged the Board not to make a decision on the rezoning of the Lee Nam Road site until such relevant information was available. If a decision had to be made at this stage, he requested Members not to approve the rezoning for the sake of meeting government's land sale target. Dr Chan also said that the proposed open space at Site B would not be implemented as HKSM would continue to operate there given there was no definite programme on the re-provisioning of the HKSM at this stage.

40. A Member noted that illegal parking was an illegal act and asked Dr Chan Ka Lok to elaborate on the illegal parking issue in Ap Lei Chau. In response, Dr Chan said that illegal parking occurred throughout the day near the kindergartens for picking up/setting down of students, and around the industrial-business area for shopping. He considered that providing adequate car parking spaces would have a better effect on discouraging illegal parking than issuing fixed penalty tickets. The same Member considered that the feeder bus connecting residents to the MTR South Horizons Station would increase the road traffic of that area. Dr Chan agreed with the Member's view and considered that incoming feeder buses to the South Horizons Station would have to leave the area and hence would also affect the out-going traffic capacity of road junctions.

41. Another Member asked whether there was any information on the regional traffic study mentioned by Dr Chan Ka Lok (R571). In response, Mr Peter C.K. Mak, CTE/HK said that the TR carried out by TD had already taken into account the future developments in Ap Lei Chau, including feeder bus services to the South Horizons Station, which was reflected in a decrease in capacities in 2021 at various road junctions. He



reiterated that TD had adopted a conservative approach in the TR which had not included the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E). In view of the carrying capacity of the MTR SIL(E), the positive impact of the rail service was expected to far exceed the road traffic generated from feeder bus services coming to the South Horizons Station. Even if the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E) had not been taken into consideration in the TR, the traffic condition as reflected in the junction reserve capacities of major road junctions were considered acceptable.

42. In response to a Member's question on the timing of traffic congestion in Lee Nam Road, Mr Chan Yun Chiu, Gary (R458) said that the photograph shown previously was taken at about 10:00am on a weekday. He said that TD's figures on junction reserve capacity was misleading as it was an average figure for a day and they did not reflect traffic congestions at specific periods.

43. The Chairman said that the Q&A session 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 and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. They all left the meeting at this point.

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

#### Deliberation

45. The Secretary reported that after the Q&A session, the representative of the South Horizons Concern Group (R13/C7), Mr Au Yuen Fat Joseph (R14) had expressed that he had not been invited to present the information he had prepared to respond to TD's assessment on junction capacity. The Secretary said that he had explained to Mr Au that the meeting was not a session for all attendees to make a new round of presentation, but a continuation of the Q&A session. He further told Mr Au that while the Chairman was aware that some representers/commenters had raised their hands to indicate their wish to speak, the Chairman had also explained that the Q&A session was not for attendees to make representations as they wished, but for Members to direct their questions to relevant

parties on aspects that Members required clarifications. While Mr Au noted the above explanation, he requested the Secretariat to report the matter and submit the information they prepared, including charts illustrating results of traffic count to the Board for consideration. The Secretary reported Mr Au's request to the Board for its consideration.

46. The meeting noted that according to the established practice, the Board would only consider the representations and comments received during the statutory period and the oral submission made in the hearing sessions. Further submission received after the hearing sessions would not be considered. Members agreed that Mr Au's submission should in consequence not be considered. It was also noted that Mr Au's concern on the morning peak hours in the TR adopted by TD had already been raised by the concern group in the 27.9.2016 hearing.

47. The Chairman said that the meeting would continue the consideration of representations and comments on proposed amendments to the OZP. He briefly summarized that the Q&A sessions had mainly focused the discussion on traffic and car parking issues arising from the proposed residential development under Item A, and the views expressed on the implementation of the open space under Item B.

48. In response to two Members' questions on the meeting procedures, the Chairman said that for hearing of representations/comments on OZPs lasting more than one day, it was understandable that some Members might not have attended every minute of all hearing sessions in person. The practice had been for those Members to apprise themselves of the hearing sessions through the relevant minutes and video recordings.

#### Item A

49. The Chairman recapitulated and Members noted the following main supportive views :

- (a) the proposed residential development would better utilize the land, increase flat supply and stabilize property price;

- (b) the proposed residential development with new shopping facilities would attract more shops and dining facilities and enhance diversity in the area, thus promoting positive competition for improvement to the existing shopping malls in Ap Lei Chau;
- (c) the increase in population would induce better transport services;
- (d) as the traffic congestion problem would be improved with the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E), traffic congestion should not be a reason to object the proposed development; and
- (e) the survey prepared by a DC member opposing the OZP was not representative as the sampling method might be biased.

50. The meeting then continued to consider the following main opposing views.

*Traffic and Infrastructure Provisions*

51. A Member said that the current meeting was a continuation of the last meeting on 27.9.2016 in which the Board had a thorough discussion on the OZP and decided that additional information on traffic and other aspects was required. The answers on car parking provision and road junction reserve capacities provided by the government representatives had satisfactorily addressed Members' questions and concerns.

52. That Member said that TD had advised the overall ratio of passengers taking MTR and other modes of transport in Hong Kong was 40:60. In view of the carrying capacity of the MTR SIL(E), it was expected that the MTR service would have positive impact on the traffic condition in Ap Lei Chau though the actual statistics would only be available upon commissioning of the MTR SIL(E). The junction reserve capacities of major road junctions in Ap Lei Chau were acceptable without taking into account the positive traffic impact of the MTR SIL(E). Considering the carrying capacity of the road network, a maximum number of car parking spaces to be provided should be specified in the lease. That Member also considered that the impact of illegal parking on the existing

traffic condition was not a relevant consideration. The use of the proposed open space in Site B for the temporary reprovisioning of HKSM was acceptable and there would still be opportunity to consider the relocation of the HKSM during the development of the Lee Nam Road site. As planning was often based on projections/assumptions and best available information at the time, it was not necessary for the Board to withhold a decision on the rezoning amendments pending availability of all data. Also, a TIA to be conducted by an independent traffic consultant would not be a pre-requisite in the land use planning of an area. That Member considered that the previous concerns of the Board had been addressed and the rezoning of the Lee Nam Road site for residential development should be supported.

53. A Member said that the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E) would certainly have positive impact on the road traffic, as passengers of other modes of transport and road users would choose the most convenient service. That Member considered that it was a territorial phenomenon that congestion occurred near schools and kindergartens before and after school hours for picking up/setting of students, and such congestions only occurred in a specific time period of the day. In anticipation that the existing traffic condition of the area would be improved with the opening of the MTR SIL(E), the proposed residential development would not have adverse traffic impact.

54. The Vice-chairman agreed with the views of the above Members and said that the TR prepared by TD had adopted a conservative approach in that the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E) had not been taken into account. While about 40% of passengers would take the MTR on a territorial basis, it was revealed that about 30% to 50% of passengers taking road transport had been switched to rail service when the Ma On Shan (MOS) Line and the MTR Island Line was commissioned. Moreover, with the commissioning of new rail service, there would be a reduction in the number of private cars on the road by at least 15%. The MTR SIL(E) was expected to have similar positive impact. The situation would be further improved upon the removal of temporary structures on completion of the construction works of the MTR SIL(E). The future residents of the Lee Nam Road site would be attracted to take the MTR as the development was within a 500m radius from the MTR South Horizons Station. The Vice-chairman considered that traffic should not be an insurmountable issue in the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site.

55. Another Member also supported the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site and said that the proposed number of car parking spaces to be provided in the future residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would be in accordance with the HKPSG. Future residents should take into consideration the car parking provision in determining whether to own a car or buy a flat in that development. The Vice-chairman supplemented that there was a tremendous growth in car ownership in Hong Kong during the past decade at about 3% per annum while that for South Horizons and Chi Fu Fa Yuen was 4% per annum. However, the rail service would have an impact on car ownership as illustrated by the negative growth in car ownership in Wu Kai Sha after the commissioning of the MOS Line. A similar trend could also happen to Ap Lei Chau after the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E) and ease the demand for car parking space in South Horizons. The car parking ratio for the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site was relatively low as a lower provision rate was adopted in view of the small average flat size and its proximity to the MTR station. The car parking standard specified in the HKPSG was applicable to all developments, and there was no justification to deviate from that standard. The Vice-chairman considered that there was no strong reason to reject the proposed rezoning on traffic grounds.

56. Another Member said that having regard to the traffic congestion in Happy Valley, most of the residents in Happy Valley would prefer walking about 3km to Causeway Bay to take the MTR as the environment en-route was pleasant. A pleasant walking environment should be provided to future residents of the Lee Nam Road site to encourage them to walk to the MTR South Horizons Station instead of driving. That Member considered that the walkability of the Lee Nam Road site to the MTR station should be improved to make the area more livable.

57. A Member said that the representative of TD had explained TD's traffic assessment to the Board clearly and considered that the assumption and approach adopted by TD were acceptable. That Member said that apart from improving the walking environment, the traffic could be further improved if a 'smart' signal-controlling system could be installed to automatically adjust the traffic light cycles at the signal junctions in Ap Lei Chau according to the traffic flow.

58. Another Member also agreed that Members' concern on traffic had been addressed. The MTR SIL(E) should have an overall positive impact on the traffic. Since Ap Lei Chau was well-served by infrastructure and there would not be any traffic problem, the Lee Nam Road site should be developed to fully utilize the valuable land resource. The Member also wondered if it was possible to provide some public open space within the site in order to address local concerns on the lack of open space. Moreover, the Government should be requested to redesign the crash barrier and lamp posts along the footpath of Lee Nam Road for better pedestrian movements. Opportunities should be taken to exploring the provision of other amenities, e.g. open space and pavilion to improve the walkability so as to encourage walking to the MTR South Horizons Station. The Chairman noted that the Government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply. Apart from the Lee Nam Road site, no other site in Ap Lei Chau had been identified for housing development at this stage.

59. A Member said that apart from improving the pedestrian walking environment along the waterfront of the Lee Nam Road site, consideration should be given to improving the walking environment between South Horizons and the proposed public open space at Site B. The Chairman noted that the representative of TD had indicated that he would convey Members' views on relocating the crash barrier and lamp posts in Lee Nam Road to HyD for consideration. To enhance public access to the waterfront as well as the future public open space at Site B, the requirement for providing a public passageway accessible to the waterfront at the Lee Nam Road site could be considered for inclusion in the lease.

[Professor T.S. Liu left the meeting at this point.]

60. Another Member noted the need to address the residents' concerns on air quality, traffic, provision of a continuous waterfront promenade and open space. Noting that the future developer would be required to conduct an air quality impact assessment and that the MTR SIL(E) would bring improvement to the road traffic, the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site was supported. To address the local concerns on traffic impact, subject to the findings of the regional traffic study on the

impact of the MTR SIL(E), that Member wondered whether consideration might be given to requiring the future developer to conduct a TIA for the Lee Nam Road site and improve the pedestrian accessibility under the lease.

61. A Member said that the MTR service at Whampoa had greatly reduced the number of passengers queuing up for mini-buses during peak hours. That demonstrated that provision of MTR service would have a positive impact on road traffic. The MTR service would only be sustainable if there were adequate passengers in the catchment areas and the currently proposed 3-car train for the MTR SIL(E) would be adequate. The number of 3-car train deployed and frequency of services could be adjusted depending on demand in future. That Member believed that as MTR trains ran on electricity and would not produce exhaust fumes, the MTR ventilation building would mainly function to facilitate the exchange of air from the MTR tunnel.

62. Regarding a Member's question on the possible inclusion of the requirement for a TIA by the future developer of the Lee Nam Road site, the Vice-chairman said that it was very unusual to require under the lease the submission of a TIA subject to the future findings of a regional traffic study. He also considered that the footpath in Lee Nam Road should be improved as it would serve the future residents of the Lee Nam Road site as well as providing an access for residents of Ap Lei Chau and South Horizons to the proposed open space at Site B and the workers of the industrial/business area nearby. The provision of a public passageway along the waterfront of the Lee Nam Road site was supported and should be specified under the lease.

63. The Chairman noted that certainty was important for land leases and for the Lee Nam Road site, it would be up to Members to consider whether the TR carried out by TD was adequate. Mr Edwin W.K. Chan, AD(R3), LandsD said that the lease conditions should be clear and implementable, and not be subject to uncertainties. The requirement to conduct a TIA under the lease would seldom be incorporated unless for large-scale comprehensive development. On the other hand, the requirement for a public passageway along the waterfront could likely be included in the lease condition for the proposed private residential developments.

64. Members generally agreed that, with regard to aspects regarding traffic, car parking and the operation/reprovisioning of HKSM, there was no insurmountable problem regarding the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site. Members were also of the view that it would be desirable for the walking environment along the footpath connecting the Lee Nam Road site and the MTR South Horizons Station be improved, although this would have to be dealt with outside the context of the OZP. The Secretariat would relay the Board's view regarding walking environment to the relevant government departments for consideration.

65. In response to a question from the Vice-chairman, the Chairman noted that the government had committed to including the requirement for a public passageway along the waterfront in the lease. It should be possible for flexibility to be provided so that the public passageway could be passed back to the government for development into a landscaped area in conjunction with the proposed open space at Site B should such an opportunity arise in future.

#### *Regional Traffic Study*

66. As an observation, the Vice-chairman said that the regional traffic study mentioned covered a wide scope and the impact of the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would unlikely be significant in the context of the regional traffic study. The regional traffic study could also regard the development of the Lee Nam Road site as a given, should the Board agree to rezone it for development. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan supplemented that the regional traffic study was to review the overall traffic pattern of Aberdeen and the Southern District upon the commissioning of the MTR SIL(E), taking into account the future developments in the Southern District.

67. Another Member said that TD had adopted a conservative approach and the positive impact of the MTR SIL(E) had not been included in the TR. As the MTR service would bring about improvement to the road traffic condition, it would not be necessary for the Board to wait for the regional traffic study given the findings of the TR.



68. Members noted the following opposing views and generally agreed that the government's responses on various aspects as detailed in the Paper were adequate in demonstrating that development of the Lee Nam Road site would not lead to insurmountable difficulties in the relevant aspects :

#### Housing Needs

- (a) residential development should be built in other sites in Wong Chuk Hang, the Hong Kong Police College, areas near Wah Fu Estate or in the less densely populated areas in the New Territories; and
- (b) the proposed luxurious residential development would not meet the housing demand for the general public.

#### Responses

- (c) the government had adopted a multi-pronged approach to increase land supply in the short, medium and long term. The Lee Nam Road site was identified as one of the 150 potential housing sites for expediting housing supply;
- (d) various sites in Wong Chuk Hang had been committed for development and the Hong Kong Police College was still being used to meet the training needs of the Hong Kong Police Force;
- (e) a target of 60:40 public-private housing split had been set for the 10-year housing supply target of 460,000 units. The Lee Nam Road site would contribute towards the private housing target and would help maintain a healthy and stable property market;

#### Development Density

- (f) Ap Lei Chau was too densely populated and the proposed plot ratio

(PR) of 6 contradicted the intention for medium-density development in Ap Lei Chau;

Responses

- (g) the PR of 6 for the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site was in line with the 2014 Policy Address in increasing the development intensity in suitable sites in the territory and was comparable to other developments in Ap Lei Chau;

Provision of Facilities and Open Space

- (h) there was inadequate community facilities such as library and elderly services, and open space in Ap Lei Chau while some facilities in Lei Tung Estate were not easily accessible to residents of South Horizons;

Responses

- (i) according to HKPSG, there was no shortfall on government, institution or community (GIC) facilities and open space provision. Members had no comments on the government's response on this aspect;

Environmental Aspect

- (j) the increase in population and traffic in Ap Lei Chau would cause air pollution, noise nuisance, sewerage impact, health hazard problems and heat island effect. The Lee Nam Road site was located near an existing STP and not suitable for residential development;

Responses

- (k) the proposed residential development would not result in insurmountable adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas. The future developer of the Lee Nam Road site would be required to carry out noise, air quality and sewerage impact assessments and to implement mitigation measures identified, if any;

Risk Aspect

- (l) the existing LPG/oil depot would pose safety hazard to the future residents at the Lee Nam Road site. Also, the residents' lives would be at risk as the congested Ap Lei Chau Bridge would block the access of emergency vehicles to and from Ap Lei Chau;

Responses

- (m) a Quantitative Risk Assessment (QRA) had been carried out, which confirmed that the risk levels were at a reasonably acceptable low level and was in compliance with the Government Risk Guidelines of the HKPSG. The Security Bureau would activate the Emergency Response System and the Contingency Plan for Disaster in the event of any critical incidents and disasters;

Air Ventilation Aspect

- (n) the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would cause wall effect and affect the air ventilation;

Responses

- (o) an Air Ventilation Assessment by Expert Evaluation had been carried out and concluded that the proposed residential development would

unlikely impose significant adverse ventilation impact on the surrounding;

#### Visual Impact

- (p) the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site would block the views of South Horizons. The views from South Horizons had not been taken into consideration in the visual appraisal;

#### Responses

- (q) the proposed residential development was visually compatible with the developments nearby. 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). Five vantage points were selected for the protection of key public views, including that at the waterfront promenade of South Horizons;

#### Other Aspect

- (r) SHEOC considered that the 1,959 questionnaires collected by them should not be treated as one representation. The identification of those 150 potential housing sites was a top-down approach and planning should adopt a bottom-up and people-oriented approach;

#### Responses

- (s) the 1,959 questionnaires were collected by SHEOC. The Paper had clearly stated the different views of those residents. The 150 potential housing sites identified were in line with the multi-pronged approach adopted by the Government;

### Representers' Proposals

- (t) some representers proposed to rezone the Lee Nam Road site to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") for the provision of community, recreational, leisure or sports facilities, or to develop the site as an open space and to provide a round-the-island waterfront promenade. Three representers proposed that the site should be developed for low-density residential development; and

### Responses

- (u) taking heed of the need for more housing land, the proposed residential development had optimized the land utilization taking into account the site context, land use compatibility, infrastructural capacity and technical feasibility. There was no shortfall in GIC and open space provision in Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau area.

### Item B

69. The Chairman said that some representers supported the item and considered that the proposed open space would better utilize the waterfront site and the much needed open space would improve the quality of life of Ap Lei Chau residents. Members noted the above supportive views.

70. Regarding the opposing views, the Chairman recapitulated that some representers/commenters considered that the proposed open space was meant only for the proposed residential development at the Lee Nam Road site. The proposed open space would not be implemented as HKSM would continue its operation at the site. Some representers/commenters considered that there was already sufficient open space in the area and that there were few visitors to that area and it would be a waste of public money to develop an open space there. The meeting noted the government's responses that there was an overall surplus of about 5.56ha of open space in the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau area. The proposed open space under Item B would help provide an additional local open

space in that area for enjoyment of workers, visitors and the existing and future residents nearby. While HKSM had rearranged its operation to optimize the use in Site B since 1.11.2016, TD was liaising with relevant departments to identify suitable temporary site on Hong Kong Island for the reprovisioning of HKSM.

71. A Member said that Dr Chan Ka Lok (R571) and some representers considered that although the site under Item B was zoned “Open Space” (“O”), it would not be implemented as the site would continue to be used by HKSM and there was no reprovisioning programme of HKSM. That Member suggested that the representers’ views could be conveyed to the relevant bureaux/departments to urge them to take expeditious action to relocate HKSM and implement the proposed open space. The Chairman requested the Secretariat to follow up the matter with the relevant bureaux/departments.

#### Item C

72. The Chairman said that some representers supported the item and considered that the proposed rezoning would provide additional resources for commercial businesses and more job opportunities. Revitalisation of industrial buildings would give new life to the existing building. Members noted the above supportive views.

73. Regarding the opposing views, the Chairman recapitulated that some representers/commenters considered that traffic in the Southern District was very congested. The rezoning would result in new developments, which would aggravate the traffic situation. There were already opportunities to rezone the old industrial buildings in Wong Chuk Hang for business and commercial uses. The meeting noted the government’s response that the rezoning of the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area was to reflect the on-going transformation of the area into business uses and provide more flexibility in the use of land in the area.

74. Regarding some representers/commenters’ proposal that the site should be rezoned to “G/IC” to provide more recreational facilities, e.g. a cycle park, or to revert the sites to their original uses, the meeting noted the government’s response that there was no

shortfall of GIC and open space provisions in the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau area. The Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area had already been undergoing active transformation to a business area. The rezoning was to facilitate the continuous transformation to provide more flexibility in the use of the land in the area.

### General Views

75. The Chairman recapitulated that some representers/commenters considered that local residents had not been consulted on the proposed rezoning and there was insufficient information on the traffic aspects. They regarded the public consultation period inappropriate and that the government had not provided detailed report on the planning proposals. They also argued that the majority of Ap Lei Chau residents objected to the proposed residential development and the government should listen to the views of the residents. The meeting noted the government's response that PlanD had followed the established procedures to solicit public views, including consultation with DC and gazetting under the Ordinance. Besides, PlanD, TD and Electrical and Mechanical Services Department (EMSD) attended meeting/forum to consult the local residents 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 rezoning amendments. The relevant government departments had examined the proposed developments and confirmed their technical feasibility.

### Procedures of Q&A Session

76. The Chairman noted that some representers were of the view that there was procedural flaw as the additional information requested by the Board and provided by government representative had not been submitted to the Board in advance in the form of a paper and made available to the public in advance. In this connection, the Chairman had explained to the representers/commenters concerned that the Q&A session was a continuation of the Q&A session on 27.9.2016; that the Board allowed oral answers supported by PowerPoint to be given; that the same practice was applied equally and fairly to both oral answers given by representers/commenters and government representatives alike; and that this was consistent with the Board's previous practice.

77. The Secretary supplemented that reference could be made to the procedures of conducting a meeting to continue the consideration of the representations to the draft Pak Shek Kok OZP. In that case, the Q&A session was continued and held on a separate date at which answers to the Board were provided with the aid of PowerPoint. Government representatives, representers and commenters were also invited to orally answer further questions from Members. Members noted the above and agreed that the procedures adopted by the Board for the continuation of the Q&A session, including those for submission of oral answers, were in line with the Board's practice and were procedurally proper.

78. Members went on to consider all the grounds and proposals of representations and comments as summarised in paragraphs 4.2 to 4.11 of the Paper and the responses in paragraphs 6.3 to 6.4 of the Paper.

#### R1 to R7

79. After deliberation, the Board decided to note the supportive view of R1 to R6 and the no objection view of R7.

#### R8 to R607

80. After deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold R8 to R607 and considered that the Plan should not be amended for the following reasons :

“(a) planning is an on-going process and there is a need to optimize the use of land available. The Government will continue to review land uses and rezone sites as appropriate to meet the pressing demand for various development needs, particularly housing need; (R8 to R607)

#### **Amendment Item A**

(b) rezoning of government sites held under short-term tenancies is one of



the measures of the Government to increase the housing land supply. As the subject site is located close to the existing developed area and adjacent to existing infrastructures, it is considered suitable for residential development; (R8 to R607)

- (c) the proposed residential development under the zoning amendment would not generate unacceptable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas on traffic, infrastructural, environmental, risk, air ventilation and visual aspects; (R8 to R9, R11 to R15, R17 to R345, R347 to R403, R405 to R426, R429, R431 to R433, R435 to R436, R438 to R444, R446 to R456, R458 to R489, R491 to R529, R531 to R553, R555 to R560, R562 to R571, R573, R575 to R599 and R601 to R607)
- (d) there is no shortfall of government, institution or community (GIC) and open space provisions as per Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirement in the area. Moreover, there is no request from the relevant government bureaux/departments to use the subject site for GIC uses; (R11 to R404, R406 to R432, R435 to R450, R452 to R458, R460 to R473, R476 to R485, R487 to R497, R499 to R503, R506 to R507, R509, R513, R515 to R517, R519, R521 to R540, R543 to R553, R555 to R562, R564 to R590, R592, R594, R598 to R601 and R603 to R607)
- (e) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the proposed zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of Outline Zoning Plan for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations/comments form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance; (R533 and R585)

#### **Amendment Item B**

- (f) the zoning amendment of the site will help provide an open space for

the relatively isolated Ap Lei Chau West area for the enjoyment of the workers, visitors and residents of the nearby existing and future developments; and (R571 to R573, R575 to R583, R585 to R591, R593 and R595)

**Amendment Items C1 and C2**

- (g) the zoning amendments of the Ap Lei Chau West Industrial Area are to facilitate the continuous transformation of the industrial area to business use and to provide more flexibility in the use of the land in the area. (R591 to R593, R595 to R599 and R601 to R604)”

81. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 2:15pm.