

**Minutes of 1123<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 and 4.10.2016**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,  
Transport Department  
Mr K. C. Siu

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

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

Deputy Director/General / Assistant Director/Regional 3, Lands Department  
Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam (28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 a.m. and 4.10.2016 p.m.)/ Mr Edwin W.K. Chan  
(29.9.2016 p.m. and 4.10.2016 a.m.)

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

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Louis K.H. Kau (28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 p.m. and 4.10.2016 p.m.)

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam (29.9.2016 a.m. and 4.10.2016 a.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (28.9.2016)

Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (29.9.2016 a.m.)

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong (29.9.2016 p.m.)

Ms Wendy W.L. Li (4.10.2016 a.m.)

Mr K.K. Lee (4.10.2016 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present on 28.9.2016 :

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Chairman

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer/New Territories East,  
Transport Department  
Mr K. C. Siu

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

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

Deputy Director (General), Lands Department  
Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning  
Mr K.K. Ling

**Sai Kung and Islands District**

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Tung Chung Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCE/1  
(TPB Paper No. 10176)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

2. The Chairman extended a welcome and said that as 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 9:25 a.m.]

**Declaration of Interests**

3. The Secretary reported that the draft Tung Chung Extension Area (TCE) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCE/1 involved zoning of sites for proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The Conservancy Association (R53), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) (R54) and Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R58) had submitted representations to the OZP, and Masterplan Limited was the consultant of the Hong Kong Water Sports Council (R2). The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Ling<br>(as Director of Planning)         | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam<br>(as Deputy Director of Lands) | - being an alternative member of HKHA   |

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Mr H.F. Leung   | - | being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA and being a convener of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel  |
| Mr Martin W.C Kwan<br><i>(as Chief Engineer (Works),<br/>Home Affairs Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA  |
| Dr C.H. Hau   | - | having current business dealings with HKHA<br>- being Vice-chairman of the Conservancy Association   |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai  | ] |  |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu   | ] | having current business dealings with HKHA   |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau   | ] | and MTRCL  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | ] |  |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu   | - | having current business dealings with MTRCL and Masterplan Limited, and past business dealings with HKHA   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung  | - | having current business dealings with MTRCL  |
| Mr Franklin Yu  | ] | having past business dealings with HKHA and  |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam   | ] | MTRCL  |
| Professor S.C. Wong<br><i>(The Vice-chairman)</i>                                     | - | being the member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy, and being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of HKU where MTRCL had sponsored some activities |

of the Department before

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work

4. Members noted that as the proposed public housing developments in the draft OZP were related to the housing sites in general rather than housing projects proposed by HKHA, a direct conflict of interest did not arise. The meeting agreed that the above Members declaring having interests with HKHA should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Members noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr H.F. Leung and Mr Dominic K.K. Lam had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interest of Professor S.C. Wong and Mr Franklin Yu's interests were indirect, Members agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Members also noted that Mr Franklin Yu had not yet arrived to join the meeting.

5. 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.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

#### **Government representatives**

##### *Planning Department (PlanD)*

Ms. Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKI)

Ms Amy M.Y. Wu - Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/I)

Ms Katherine H. Y. Wong Town Planner/Islands (TP/I)

*Civil Engineering and Development Department(CEDD)*

Mr David K. C. Lo - Chief Engineer/Islands (CE/Is)

Mr Kenneth C. P. Wong - Senior Engineer 9 (Islands Division) (SE9/Is)

Ms Chelsey K. F. Yuen - Engineer (Islands Division)

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R1 – Coral Ching Limited

Ms Lee Mo Yi Cannis ] Representer's representatives

Ms Chan Hiu Man Ketty ]

(Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd)

R2 – The Hong Kong Water Sports Council

Mr Ian Brownlee ] Representer's representatives

Mr Benson Poon ]

(Masterplan Limited)

R8 / C11 – Fung Siu Yin

Ms Fung Siu Yin - Representer/Commenter

R9/C19 – Haster Wu

Ms Haster Wu - Representer/Commenter

R31 – Alvin Chan

R48 – Law Tammy

Mr Chang Ka Tai - Representers' representative





representatives to speak in the last meeting session on 4.10.2016.

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

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Amy M.Y. Wu, STP/I, made the following main points as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10176 (the Paper) :

Background

- (a) the Board was briefed in 2014 during the Stage 3 Public Engagement (PE3) on the draft Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) of Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE). During PE3, more than 4,000 public comments were received. The RODP was revised taking into account the departmental/public comments, and planning and engineering considerations;
- (b) an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report submitted under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) with conditions on 8.4.2016;
- (c) on 8.1.2016, three Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) including the Tung Chung Extension Area (TCE) OZP which mainly incorporated land use proposals as recommended under the Tung Chung New Town Extension Study (the Tung Chung Study) were exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). Concurrently, the reclamation scheme of TCE was gazetted under the Foreshore and Sea-bed (Reclamations) Ordinance;
- (d) the draft TCE OZP, covering an area of about 216 ha, consisted an reclamation area of 129 ha, the New Town extension (about 120.5 ha) and a planned road (about 8.6 ha). During the statutory exhibition period, 59 representations and 78 comments on the representations to the draft

OZP were received;

- (e) consultation with Islands District Council (IsDC) and Tung Chung Rural Committee (TCRC) were conducted on 1.2.2016 and 28.1.2016 respectively. Members of IsDC mainly raised comments on the cycling track and cycle park, municipal market, proposed marina club and transport connection to Mui Wo. The TCRC had no comment on the draft OZP;

#### Major Grounds of Representations, Representers' Proposal and Responses

- (f) among the 59 representations received, two were supportive representations (R1 and R2), 56 were adverse representations (R3 to R51 and R59), and one representation (R58) provided comments. The major grounds of the representations, their proposals and PlanD's responses, as detailed in paragraphs 4.3 to 4.6 and 6.10 to 6.43 of the Paper respectively, were summarised below:

##### *Supportive Representations (R1 and R2)*

##### *Retail Provision and Innovative Industries*

- (i) R1 appreciated the intention to create more jobs and business opportunities but commented that there was lack of strong justifications for the substantial provision of commercial area in view of the abundant existing and future retail supply in the region. Other uses such as Science Park (SP) and Industrial Estate (IE) for innovative industries should be considered;
- (ii) the responses to the above ground/proposal were:
- TCE was positioned as a smart commercial node. Commercial activities had taken into consideration the known and planned development projects in its surrounding

so as to achieve synergy;

- while commercial developments would cluster around the proposed TCE station and along the waterfront, local retail uses along edges of residential sites fronting the linear parks were also proposed to encourage street shops. There would be diversified employment opportunities and about 40,000 additional jobs would be created; and
- the objective of TCE was to extend the existing new town into a distinct community to meet housing, social, economic, environmental and local needs. No land had been reserved for SP and IE having regard to planning and environmental considerations. Flexibility was allowed for offices related to SP and innovative industries;

*Marina and Water Sports Centre*

(iii) R2 supported the proposed marina as it would create mooring opportunities which were in short supply, however, the design and layout had to be improved. Larger marina for 200 vessels, with public park, marina support area, water sports centre and artificial beaches were proposed;

(iv) the responses to the above ground/proposal were:

- the assessments of the proposed marina were based on the assumed capacity of 95 berths. Further increase in vessel movements would lead to disruption to ship movement in the Tung Chung Channel. The proposed artificial beach at the west edge would encroach into the Tung Chung Channel and there would be compatibility problem among users;

- marina support area and water sports facilities associated with the marina development were ancillary use under the “Other Specified Use” (“OU”) annotated “Marina Club, Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development” zoning;

Adverse Representation (R3 to R57, R59)

*Oppose further development in Tung Chung (R3 to R28, R30 to R36, R54 to R47, R52, R55 to R57, R59)*

- (v) the proposed low to medium-density residential developments could not effectively address the housing problem. The Government should optimise other land resources, e.g. brownfield sites instead of reclamation;
- (vi) further reclamation and development would further worsen the air quality problem in the area. The Government should adopt the concepts of low-carbon city and people-oriented planning;
- (vii) the responses to the above grounds/proposals were:
  - the TCE reclamation was one of the important land supply sources to meet territorial housing and economic needs in medium to long-term;
  - different types of residential development were planned to ensure a balanced housing mix and different choices would be available. A public/private housing split of about 63:37 was adopted which was generally in line with the split of 60:40 as recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee;
  - the Government had been striving to increase land supply

through a multi-pronged land supply approach and had conducted comprehensive studies in areas with high concentration of brownfield sites for identifying development potential and releasing land for development;

- the environmental and ecological issues of the proposed reclamation had been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA Report;
- railway system was planned as a backbone of the passenger transport system in TCE so as to minimise road traffic and use of private cars. Comprehensive networks of cycle tracks, cycle parking facilities and pedestrian walkways were also planned to encourage cycling and promote convenient cycle and pedestrian movements. Those measures would reduce the demand for private vehicles and greenhouse gas emissions;

*Object to the proposed reclamation (R5 to R12, R15 to R57 and R59)*

- (viii) the proposed reclamation would threaten the marine habitat, Chinese White Dolphins (CWD), nearby proposed Brothers Marine Park (BMP), and ecology of Tai Ho River estuary and the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). A total of 1,592 ha of fishing ground would be lost in the Lantau waters from the concurrent projects. The proposed eco-shoreline was an untried measure in Hong Kong and should be tested before its adoption and a pilot study should be conducted. A strategic EIA for Lantau should be conducted to assess the cumulative environmental impacts arising from all the reclamation projects;
- (ix) the responses to the above grounds/proposals were:

- the environmental and ecological issues had been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA Report, reclamation constituted only a very small proportion of the overall habitat range of the CWD population and in the very low use location. The implication of habitat loss on CWD would be low;
- measures were proposed to reduce the marine traffic volume and the potential disturbance to CWD. With implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, the impacts on the functions and quality of the proposed BMP would be reduced to an acceptable level. Besides, monitoring of water quality would be carried out at the proposed BMP during construction phase;
- there would be no development near Tai Ho Stream SSSI and no adverse impact was anticipated. The potential impact of sedimentation on and hydrodynamic change to Tai Ho Wan had been assessed and found insignificant;
- fisheries impact assessment had been conducted in the EIA Report. The magnitude of the impact was not severe given the low production rate of the area;
- the feasibility of the eco-shoreline, a mitigation measure for the loss of general marine habitat, had been assessed and addressed in the EIA Report;
- a Cumulative Environmental Impact Assessment (CEIA) Study to assess the potential cumulative impacts from the implementation of the three potential reclamation sites including Sunny Bay, Siu Ho Wan and Lung Kwu Tan was completed in 2015. With implementation of appropriate

mitigation measures, there would be no major issues as regards the air quality, water quality, ecology and fisheries impacts;

*Object to the proposed marina (R5 to R11, R13, R14, R52, R54 to R56)*

- (x) the need for a marina was not clearly justified. The proposed marina at the waterfront open space would privatize the public space. The vessel movement and the underwater noise caused would have adverse impact on CWD. The proposed marina should be deleted but there was support to public typhoon shelters for small vessels and water sports activities;
- (xi) the responses to the above grounds/proposals were:
- there had been a territorial demand for marina and Tung Chung was considered a suitable location for new marina in view of the diverse facilities and activities that could be offered by its future development;
  - the proposed marina would enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront and to create a new leisure and activities node with diversified job opportunities. The majority of the waterfront was zoned “O” for the development of waterfront promenade and cycle tracks for public use;
  - the proposed typhoon shelter was not compatible with the planning intention of creating a distinct and vibrant waterfront which was a new leisure and activity node;
  - the environmental impact had been addressed in the EIA Report and no insurmountable problem had been identified. A separate EIA would be conducted for the marina to fulfil



the statutory requirements under EIAO before implementation;

*Concern on the carrying capacity (R15 to R28, R52, R56 and R57)*

- (xii) the population increase would overload the carrying capacity of Tung Chung which would lead to inadequate provision of transport and community facilities;
- (xiii) the future new job opportunities were not diverse enough and limited to retail, food beverage and professional services;
- (xiv) the Government should provide a comprehensive plan for Lantau development instead of the current piecemeal approach;
- (xv) the responses to the above grounds/proposal were:
  - a comprehensive transport network had been planned which would be mainly supported by railway transport with two new railway stations. Tai Ho Interchange and Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) connecting TCE and North Lantau Highway (NLH) were proposed. Three new public transport interchanges would be provided to facilitate the interchange between different modes of transport in the area;
  - the provision of community, social welfare, recreational and educational facilities were planned in a holistic manner. Facilities to be provided included a sports ground, indoor sports centres, post-secondary education facilities, clinic, schools, fire-station and police station;
  - under the Tung Chung Study, commercial developments

and marina were to be provided and diversified employment opportunities would be created. There would be additional 40,000 job opportunities. Local retail uses were also planned to provide opportunities to open up small business. Land for post-secondary education and school uses had been reserved to provide education and training facilities for local residents;

- a comprehensive development strategy for Lantau was proposed with a view to developing Lantau into a smart and low-carbon community for living, work, business, leisure and study while balancing and enhancing development and conservation;

*Other Aspects*

(xvi) there was no special school in Tung Chung, students had to commute to schools in other districts;

(xvii) there was no municipal market in Tung Chung to cater for local needs;

(xviii) there was a lack of cycling facilities. A cycling track around the Lantau Island and connected with the airport should be provided;

(xix) the Pak Mong Pier was a precious public space which should not be demolished;

(xx) the responses to the above grounds/proposal were :

- a site was reserved for special school use in Area 108 for children with intellectual disabilities. Subject to funding approval, construction work would commence in early 2017

for completion in 2019;

- there were two existing markets, and two new markets within public housing developments were under construction. Public markets were always permitted in “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) sites;
- a comprehensive cycle track network had been proposed to connect the major destinations and there were cycle parking facilities in various places;
- the existing Pak Mong Pier fell within the proposed reclamation area and there was a need to remove the pier. Temporary landing steps would be provided during construction phase, and new public landing steps would be provided upon completion of the reclamation ;

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

*Representation Providing Comments ( R58)*

*Railway Noise*

- (xxi) the proposed residential developments along the existing railway might be subject to railway noise impacts. The proposed commercial developments were required to provide noise screening;
- (xxii) supplementary noise reviews should be conducted by future residential development proponents if there was a programme mismatch between the commercial developments and residential sites. Those requirements should be imposed in planning briefs,

statutory plan and/or land administration documents;

(xxiii) the responses to the above grounds/proposal were :

- the proposed commercial developments along railway lines were strategically located to provide noise screening and their timely implementation was anticipated;
- detailed design study would be conducted to review the need of interim noise mitigation measures for railway noise should there be any foreseeable mismatch between the implementation programmes; and
- review on potential noise impacts among others would be considered during the implementation stage;

#### Comments on Representations

(g) the views of most commenters and their proposals were similar to the grounds of the representations. The responses in paragraph 9(f) above were relevant. In addition, two specific comments were raised:

- (i) C27 and C76 had concern on the protection of countryside and woodland. The responses to the concern was that the foothills adjoining the Country Park were already zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) in which there was a general presumption against development; and
- (ii) C78 requested the development of two full-sized rugby fields. The responses to the proposal was that various “G/IC” sites were reserved for the provision of sports and recreational facilities including an outdoor sports ground in Area 138 and two indoor sports centres in Area 102 and Area 140 respectively;

PlanD's Views

- (h) the supportive views of R1 (part) and R2 (part) and comments provided by R58 were noted; and
- (i) PlanD did not support R3 to R57 and R59, and the remaining part of R1 and R2 and considered that the draft OZP should not be amended to meet the representations.

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

R1 – Coral Ching Limited

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lee Mo Yi, Cannis made the following main points :

- (a) it was agreed that land was needed to be reserved for commercial and retail uses in order to create more jobs and business opportunities. However, there was no strong justifications for a substantial retail provision in view of the abundant existing and planned retail supply in the region;
- (b) it was proposed to release the reserved retail floor spaces for other uses. The Government should critically review the need for the 163,300m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area (GFA) of retail provision; and
- (c) instead of huge office and retail uses, some compatible uses such as Science Park (SP) and Industrial Estate (IE) for innovative industries like film making, creative, media advertising etc. should be considered.

R2 – The Hong Kong Water Sports Council

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points :

- (a) the Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC) was a voluntary group established in 2012 by a number of National Sports Associations to promote the development of water sports in Hong Kong;
- (b) one of its objectives was to identify locations to provide water sports facilities for training and competitions. The current provision was inadequate in terms of their capacity and quality. HKWSC also provided opportunities for young people to learn water sports skills and enjoy organized team sports as part of personal and community development. However, there was only one marina on the Lantau Island at Discovery Bay;
- (c) the proposed sailing centre of the HKWSC was similar to the water sports centres of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). The HKWSC had proposed a temporary water sports centre in Kai Tak, and organised the Kwun Tong Water Sports Festival in 2016. HKWSC had also carried out a Tseung Kwan O Pre-Feasibility Study for a proposed water sports centre along the waterfront. The proposed development would be community based instead of commercial in nature;
- (b) the 2015 Policy Address had made specific reference to the promotion of water-friendly culture that Hong Kong waters could be used and the Government would continue to identify desirable locations for water sports centre;
- (c) HKWSC had made submissions during various stages of the public engagement exercise of the Tung Chung Study. However, little consideration was given to the interface between land and water in the

proposed marina on the OZP. Their submissions requested for a high quality future living environment for local residents, with access to the water;

- (d) HKWSC considered the following design principles were relevant for the TCE OZP :
  - (i) waterfront as a place of interaction between land and water and a place where people could move safely and easily;
  - (ii) water sports opportunities should be designed into the land use proposals at an early stage;
  - (iii) land should be reserved for supporting facilities. The proposal should include the design of areas for recreation such as public beaches, land for water sports facilities; and
  - (iv) water sports provided great scope for public recreation while using very little land;
- (e) at present, the water sports participants used temporary access ramp for their activities in Sunny Bay due to the lack of physical connection between the land and water. Their proposal made reference to the design of Gold Coast Beach in Tuen Mun in which mixed use developments were right next to a marina;
- (f) the proposed marina was supported as it would create mooring opportunities, provide an interesting focal point on the waterfront, create business opportunities and provide employment. It would also become an important recreational facility for future residents;
- (g) the draft OZP provided a great opportunity for designing a high quality interaction between land and water, a unique opportunity for recreation

and sport. The functional requirements of the proposed marina had to be included. According to CEDD, the proposed marina would be based on the assumed capacity of 95 berths. HKWSC agreed with the proposed capacity since any increases would disrupt ship movement in Tung Chung Channel and the navigable span of Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link;

(h) HKWSC proposed two options for the proposed marina and water sports centre:

(i) Option 1 - relocated marina and improved public waterfront park

the OZP boundary would be expanded to include a portion of the sea as “Other Specified Use” annotated “Marina” (“OU(Marina)”), the originally proposed marina to be rezoned to “Open Space” for a waterfront park. Two areas along the waterfront to be zoned “OU(Public Beach)” for the provision of artificial beaches; and

(ii) Option 2 - marina location unchanged

location of the marina unchanged and was within the OZP boundary. Two areas along the waterfront to be zoned as “OU(Public Beach)” as in Option 1;

(i) HKWSC would drop Option 1 as further extension of marina would encroach on Tung Chung Channel and block the Channel and would give rise to unacceptable environmental impact on the BMP and the CWD habitat. The proposed artificial beach at the west would also encroach onto the Tung Chung Channel and would not be compatible among the beach, marina and Tung Chung;

(j) although Option 2 did not provide a large public park nor enable a better marina design and layout, it would still enable provision of all the



necessary facilities with minimal change to the OZP and would be acceptable to HKWSC;

- (k) the locality in Tung Chung was suitable for water sports and a site was proposed for a water sports centre which could be operated by LCSD or by the HKWSC. LCSD had no plans to develop water sports centre in Tung Chung, but had no strong view if HKWSC was interested in development and operation of a water sports centre;
- (l) in response to the government's response that water sports facilities associated with the marina development might be regarded as ancillary use under the current "OU" zone for the marina with commercial facilities, it should be noted that HKWSC was not a commercial operator but community based service provider. As regards the building height (BH) aspect, HKWSC had only proposed a maximum BH of 2 storeys;
- (m) the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape (CTP/UD&L), PlanD pointed out that the proposed water sports centre and public beach would add variety and vitality to the waterfront. The Architectural Services Department considered that as long as the promenade would be open and accessible, integration of the regional open space with marina and water sports facilities might have synergy effect to create an identity of the place;
- (n) HKWSC was disappointed with PlanD's comment that there was no environmental and technical assessments to support the proposed marina and public beaches. It was the role of the Government to conduct the required assessments; and
- (o) to sum up, HKWSC had knowledge regarding the planning and operational requirements for public water sports, and experience in providing courses and events for young people. The Board was invited to consider the proposed Option 2 and to propose amendments to the OZP

for the provision of a higher quality of livable environment and to improve the access to the water for the public enjoyment.

R8 / C11 – Fung Siu Yin

14. Ms Fung Siu Yin made the following main points :

- (a) she was a resident in Tung Chung and considered the local needs had not been taken into account in the planning of TCNTE. While the local retail was over-supplied, there was no wet market to cater for the local needs. There was also a lack of cycling facilities including cycle tracks and parking spaces;
- (b) majority of the land was planned for low to medium-density private residential developments which could not address the local housing problem;
- (c) the area was located on the northshore of Lantau Island with mountains to the south. Reclamation would cause adverse impacts in that the increased local wind and high humidity would affect the living quality of the existing residents;
- (d) there was an increasing elderly population and number of families seeking social assistance in Tung Chung, and most of the local population were not related to nor suitable for the jobs provided by the airport. The TCE could not solve the employment problem. The planning of TCNTE should take into account the local people in particular the under-privileged, existing resources, characteristics of the surrounding areas. It should also be community-based and sustainable; and
- (e) she did not support the OZP and requested that no reclamation nor marina should proceed.

R9/C19 – Haster Wu

15. Ms Haster Wu made the following main points :
- (a) she was a resident in north Tung Chung and her major concern was on transport capacity. Similar to the MTR West Rail Line (WRL) which was very crowded at Yuen Long Town, the carrying capacity of the MTR Tung Chung Line (TCL) would be overloaded with the proposed increase in population. The assumption of 6 persons per m<sup>2</sup> was not realistic in determining the carrying capacity of TCL. It was anticipated that the bottleneck would be at the Tsing Yi Station;
  - (b) the traffic flow of NLH would also be affected. She doubted whether the capacity of NLH would be sufficient in view of the proposed property development above Siu Ho Wan Depot and other major projects in the area;
  - (c) the air quality problem in Tung Chung New Town had just improved slightly in the past few years and it would be worsened again by further reclamation and development;
  - (d) although the majority of the waterfront was reserved for promenade and cycle tracks, she was afraid that those public space would be privatised subsequently;
  - (e) the increase in marine traffic due to the proposed marina would cause adverse impact on CWD which had not been adequately addressed nor would be effectively mitigated; and
  - (f) the retail facilities in Tung Chung were designated mainly for tourists and could not meet local needs. There should be more local retail facilities at street level, municipal market and cooked food centre to cater for the need, convenience, and affordability of the local residents.

R31 – Alvin Chan

R48 – Law Tammy

16. Mr Chang Ka Tai made the following main points :

- (a) he represented the Hong Kong Dolphins Conservation Society (HKDCS), and clarified that they did not object to all reclamation projects. Although both the historical data from the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and data adopted in the approved EIA Report had shown that the project area of the proposed reclamation constituted only a very small proportion of the overall habitat range of the CWD population, HKDCS still considered that there was insufficient protection for CWD in the area. He noted that the Government had used different data source as baseline data for assessing the potential impact of the proposed reclamation on CWD. For example, while the historical data obtained from AFCD was adopted in some scenario, the data used in the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) project was adopted in some sections of the EIA Report. The findings of the EIA Report were thus not reliable, and it appeared that the adoption of different data sets was only to justify the low occurrence of CWD. AFCD had conducted monitoring programmes and provided comprehensive and quantitative data in Hong Kong waters. According to the autonomous passive acoustic monitoring (PAM) adopted by AFCD to detect the occurrence of CWD at all times including night time, some areas, such as north of the airport, Lung Kwu Tan and Siu Ho Bay, where occurrence of CWD had not been recorded in the day time, their occurrence was recorded during night time;
- (b) he also had doubt on the adoption of the data obtained from the Sunny Bay area as the baseline data instead of using those obtained from Siu Ho Wan area, as Siu Ho Wan was located much closer to the proposed reclamation area. The conclusion of the EIA report that occurrence of CWD was infrequent during night time in the proposed reclamation area

by making reference to the Sunny Bay data was incorrect. It should be noted that even after the construction works of Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF) had commenced, the data collected from PAM had showed that there were still occurrence of CWD recorded in Siu Ho Wan;

- (c) the environmental mitigation measures recommended in the EIA Report were so minimal in comparing with the proposed scale of reclamation which involved about 145 ha (or 129 ha excluding the proposed eco-shoreline). Such scale would induce a huge loss of marine habitat and eco-shoreline was the only mitigation measure recommended in the EIA Report to address the loss of general marine habitat. The eco-shoreline method had never been tested in Hong Kong before and the extent of conservation outcome was unknown, it was not considered as an effective measure particularly in terms of the CWD habitat. As the usual compensation measure adopted in other similar projects in the area was to provide Marine Park, which would be more acceptable from the CWD protection perspective. He also worried that the proposed eco-shoreline would set an undesirable precedence for subsequent projects in the water of the area;
- (d) there were concerns on the cumulative environmental impacts by all the reclamation projects. The timing for carrying out the implementation work of the three potential reclamation sites including Sunny Bay, Siu Ho Wan and Lung Kwu Tan may overlap with that of other committed and planned projects. For instance, construction works of the HKBCF had commenced in 2012 and was still not yet completed, HZMB could be completed only by 2017 or 2018, while the Three Runway System (3RS) would soon commence. The implementation of the proposed new town development would further lengthen the on-going construction works in area;
- (e) the cumulative impacts of the concurrent projects in the nearby area

would degrade the conservation performance of the proposed BMP and existing Marine Parks, in particular due to rise of marine vessel traffic. According to the EIA Report, there were about 42 to 56 working vessels in the area. Although the working vessels were not allow to enter the BMP during most of the working periods, the increasing amount of vessels moving near the Marine Park boundary and Urmston Road would obstruct the CWD movement to the Sha Chau and Lung Kwu Chau Marine Park. The noise impact of the working vessels was also significant. Worst still, the EIA Report of the 3RS project had not stated that the restriction of marine vessels into Marine Parks would be adopted as a mitigation measure. There would be about 200 vessels for the 3RS project. The proposed Road P1 in TCE would also be too close to BMP, together with the silt curtains, the Marine Park would be ineffective in protecting the marine habitat. The number of CWD had already reduced from 78 in 2011 to only 41 in 2015, and would be further decreasing. Those concurrent projects would drive CWD out of Hong Kong's water. However, as the scope of reclamation in Zhuhai would be even larger, the nearby water would no longer be a suitable habitat for CWD;

- (f) as regard the impact of reclamation on the fishing capacity, the EIA Report concluded that there would be no adverse impact on fish supply. However, in view of the adverse environmental impacts of the development and reclamation works, the marine environment was deteriorating. The quality of the fish got worse, probably due to water contamination; and
- (g) he therefore urged the Government to rethink about the most suitable strategic development for the Lantau Island on the basis of its distinct local character and to make assessments for the strategic development including conducting a strategic EIA taking into account the environment, habitats and community needs instead of piecemeal assessment on individual projects.

R45 – Jeff Tam

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ma Ka Po made the following main points :

- (a) she was a graduate in biology and concerned about the relationship between human beings and the natural environment. She wondered how much longer the land of Tung Chung could sustain under human exploitation. With the proposed development plans, the beautiful and high ecological value environment of Tung Chung Bay would soon disappear. She objected to the proposed reclamation as it was close to Tai Ho Wan and the Tai Ho Stream, which was a SSSI with aquatic species of high conservation value such as the Horseshoe Crab. The reclamation area was also near the artificial island of HKBCF which had brought about a large number of working vessels and water pollution;
- (b) according to PlanD, the reclamation area constituted only a very small portion of the overall habitat range of the CWD population in Hong Kong and was at very low use location of CWD. However, PlanD had not taken into account the cumulative impacts of all the projects in the area and their proximity to the BMP. Instead, CWD were threatened away by those nearby works. Besides, the construction periods of those projects overlapped. The Government's response that the major reclamation works of the 3RS and TCE would not fall within the same period was rather misleading; and
- (c) in view of the above-mentioned adverse impacts to one of Hong Kong's most precious species, CWD, she suggested to delete the proposed marina and reduce the area of reclamation. The Government should optimise other land resources for housing such as the brownfield sites instead of reclamation in Tung Chung.

R52/C10 – Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK)

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

- (a) there was serious shortage of public storage for boats and water sports equipments along Hong Kong's waterfront. Having a long coastline and many offshore islands, water sports in Hong Kong should have been very popular. However, due to their sizes and weight, boats and most water sports equipments could not be carried along in public transport including train, bus and mini-bus, and there were even difficulties in taking them home due to the size of entrance and lift of the building. As there was no public storage area for sampan in Hong Kong, one could easily find a sampan just hidden along the water edges of Stanley, Sai Kung, Causeway Bay, and even Ma On Shan. Some of them were just being tied to the railings or wood pole and many boat owners had to climb over the high railing along the waterfront in order to get access to their boats. The railing of the promenade often prohibited public access to the waterfront;
- (b) most of the boat lovers in Hong Kong could not afford a space in the boat club or marina. With some photos, he showed how a sampan was kept in Yau Tong and how dangerous a boat owner would be when getting onto the boat along the coastline in Tseung Kwan O. The creative solution by making use of a rope ladder as landing steps in Tsing Yi demonstrated that there were insufficient mooring facilities in Hong Kong. He wondered how the proposed marine uses in Kwun Tong would be enjoyed by the public when grass plate railing was installed along the new promenade and blocking the access to the water;
- (c) there were existing mooring area in Tung Chung New Town, the proposed marina should be used as a boat shelter and mooring area as the proposed reclamation works would displace more than 150 existing boat



moorings in the area; and

- (d) to conclude, he suggested that the proposed private marina should be deleted and the area should be used as a public typhoon shelter for small vessels and for water sports activities. Marina development with the associated marina club, boat repairing and commercial facilities, as well as nearby hotel development would be for private use instead of a public facility. DHK supported the HKWSC's proposal to use the area for a public marina and a water sports centre development with beaches. However, the land and water interface would need to be addressed. The waterfront promenade which would be a public space should not be physically segregated from the water.

R54 – World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF)

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Samantha Lee Klaus made the following main points :

- (a) the WWF had the following concerns on the TCE OZP:
  - (i) the proposed reclamation would erode the integrity of the proposed the BMP and hence weaken its conservation performance;
  - (ii) there would be uncertain disturbance from the proposed marina use;
  - (iii) the conservation outcome and cost-effectiveness of the proposed eco-shoreline as a mitigation measure was questionable;
  - (iv) dolphin might be found during night time at the project area;
  - (v) the Tung Chung Study made unfair assessment on fisheries impact

evaluation;

(vi) cumulative exceedance of suspended solids level was being neglected; and

(vii) objection to the “OU” zone for the proposed marina.

(b) according to CEDD, eco-shoreline had been proposed as a mitigation measure at suitable seawall locations for the loss of general marine habitat utilised by marine fauna, including intertidal and sub-tidal epifauna and juveniles of marine fauna due to the proposed reclamation. The area to be reclaimed at the eastern part of TCE would be about 120 ha, and the area for extension of Road P1 from Tung Chung to Tai Ho would be about 9 ha. However, the total area of the seabed footprint would be sized to 145 ha instead of 129 ha. The discrepancy of 16 ha (i.e. an increase of 12% in area when compared with the original proposal) was because of the inclined seawall, and part of it would be used for the construction of eco-shoreline;

(c) she had doubts on the effectiveness of eco-shoreline as an enhancement measure. The design of eco-shoreline was to provide suitable habitats for colonisation of organisms and would effectively enhance the ecological function of the new seawalls. According to CEDD, a similar design had been adopted at Shan Pui River, where mangroves were planted along the extended embankment. The geographical conditions at the waterfront of TCE differed substantially from Shan Pui River. As the waterfront of TCE was facing mainly north and northeast and would be subject to strong winds, the suitability of an eco-shoreline at that location was questioned in the meeting of the EIA Subcommittee of the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE);

(d) the WWF had the following concerns on eco-shoreline :

- (i) it would be very risky to sacrifice that extra 16 ha seabed for the construction of eco-shoreline on the artificial seawalls with unknown performance and conservation outcome;
  - (ii) although there were some overseas eco-shoreline examples, however, that new concept had never been implemented in Hong Kong, and the extent of conservation outcome in bringing benefits to the nearby ecosystem was still unknown;
  - (iii) the potential impacts caused at the donor and recipient site(s) should be considered if transplantation of flora and fauna was necessary, however, those were not assessed in the EIA Report; and
  - (iv) substantial cost would be involved in the design, construction, monitoring and maintenance of the eco-shoreline, with no guaranteed outcome;
- (e) WWF would request that a pilot study on eco-shoreline be conducted first on the existing artificial sloping seawalls to test out different designs and their conservation performance and effectiveness before adopting it as the mitigation measure for any development project. The eco-shoreline proposal should not be implemented if the result of the pilot study was unsatisfactory, and the reclamation footprint should be reduced accordingly.

R56 – Save Lantau Alliance

20. Mr Wright Fu Ka Ho made the following main points :

- (a) the Save Lantau Alliance had concerns on the development of Lantau Island. They considered that the Government should give priority to address community problems and adopt a people-oriented approach in

planning to meet the local needs, stakeholders in particular local residents should be involved in the planning of an area;

- (b) the Government claimed that it would need a planned population of more than 200,000 for a sustainable new town. However, the figure was not justified and there were concerns that such population increase in Tung Chung would overload the community facilities in the area. Besides, the scale of reclamation had not been justified either;
- (c) further reclamation and development in Tung Chung would further worsen the air quality problem in the area. The new town development should adopt the new Air Quality Guidelines by the World Health Organisation (WHO) in evaluating the cumulative impacts on the existing and future residents, which were more stringent than those currently adopted by the Environmental Protection Department, in order to safeguard the health of the residents;
- (d) the increased construction vessel traffic due to reclamation and the overlapping period of construction works in the area would impose serious adverse environment impact;
- (e) the Government considered that the proposed marina was acceptable and there would be no adverse impact on the public usage of the promenade. However, based on past experience, the management by private developer of the adjoining commercial uses would be undesirable as in the cases of Avenue of Star, Kai Tak and Central Military Dock where the uses were mainly tourism-oriented instead of meeting the local needs, and public usage of the promenade was limited;
- (f) it was mentioned that TCNTE was expected to create an additional 40,000 job opportunities, but there was no details on how the figure was derived. It was doubtful whether the new jobs would meet the local needs. If the jobs were taken up by people living in the urban area, it

would cause adverse traffic impact; and

- (g) they supported provision of local street shops and municipal markets in Tung Chung instead of regional shopping centres and shops for tourist.

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

21. As the presentation from the government's representatives, and the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairman briefed attendees that the Q&A session was for Members to better understand the draft OZP and the subject matters of the concerns of the representations/comments. Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

#### Proposed Public Marina and Typhoon Shelter

22. The Chairman asked the representative of R52 how his proposal could improve the anchorage/berthing problem of boats in the Tung Chung area. In response, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed public marina and typhoon shelter could allow the general public to moor their boats properly. The only issue was how the boats could be tied to the shoreline as the waterfront promenade would be managed by LCSD who had no responsibility for providing bollards for boats along the promenade. One possible solution was to set back the waterfront promenade by one meter for installation of bollards and access facilities for boat users. Such arrangement could be found in Yau Ma Tei Typhoon Shelter; and
- (b) despite HKWSC and his organization had submitted their proposals to the

Government during the Tung Chung Study, CEDD did not follow up nor take their proposals on board. As such, the future seawall of the TCE reclamation would likely be sterilized without water activities. A private marina could not address the need of small boats.

23. Two Members asked Mr Zimmerman how the proposed public marina/typhoon shelter would be managed/operated and marine access could be provided. The two Members also asked the government representatives whether the proposed marina was planned to be a private or public facility and whether there were overseas examples for stacking up small boats, and the possibility of setting back the waterfront promenade as suggested by Mr Zimmerman.

24. In response, Mr Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) a typhoon shelter and its seawall was designed to meet the government's standard to keep the vessels/boats safe during inclement weather. Within the typhoon shelter, vessels/boats could freely drop their anchors, but mooring was not allowed. The design of the edge of the shelter was important and if waterfront promenade was managed by LCSD, he proposed to set back the promenade for installation of bollards and landing facilities for boat users. A public typhoon shelter of such design could be self-managed to a great extent and would incur minimal cost to the Government;
- (b) to increase the efficiency of utilising the space, a pontoon for berthing of boats or a boat staking area on landside could be provided and a non-governmental organization (NGO) could take up the management of the facilities. The Aberdeen Boat Club had similar arrangement where the mooring of the boats was managed by the Club and boat users only paid a low rent to the Government. The landside of the marina could be granted to a sports club such as HKWSC or a private operator by short term tenancy; and
- (c) based on the Government's current plan, it appeared that the proposed

marina was going to be associated with the private hotel development. It meant that the seabed would be sold to a private land owner with market premium which would make the use of marina expensive and not affordable to the general public. Members should oppose to the development of a private marina.

25. In response to Members' questions above, Ms Donna P.Y. Tam, DPO/SKIs, said that the draft TCE OZP had reserved two sites as "OU (Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities associated with Marina Development)" zone. The design and operational arrangement of the proposed marina would be subject to further study, including whether it would be a private or public facility, or operated by a government department, NGO or private organization. Mr David K.C. Lo, CE/Is, supplemented that eco-shoreline was proposed along the waterfront promenade in accordance with the approved EIA Report. The design of the eco-shoreline would be subject to further study and approval by DEP. Whether the eco-shoreline would allow the berthing of boats could not be determined at this stage.

26. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether the detailed design of the marina would be considered by the Board, Ms Tam said that a submission would be made to the Board if the zoning and provision in the Notes of the OZP for the marina club site were to be affected during the detailed design of the proposed marina.

#### Tung Chung Channel and Marina

27. A Member asked whether Tung Chung Channel would be better protected if the opening of the marina was relocated to its east. In response, Mr Lo made the following main points:

- (a) there were ferries plying along Tung Chung Channel adjacent to the northwest of TCE reclamation area. Although the detailed design of the marina would be subject to further study, the findings of the preliminary study revealed that based on the current configuration of the marina, administrative measures could be employed to minimize the conflict between the vessels of the marina and the ferries travelling along the

Channel; and

- (b) the marina was initially proposed at the east of the proposed reclamation. The operation of the marina would have adverse impact on the inlet of ecologically sensitive Tai Ho Bay nearby. Also, a marina at that location would not allow convenient access to the navigation channel located at the north given the navigation restrictions posed by the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link. This option was pursued eventually.
- (c) the proposal to locate the marina to the east of the reclamation had been considered. It was not pursued because the operation of the marina might have adverse impact on the nearby inlet at Tai Ho Bay. Also, a marina at that location would not allow convenient access to the navigation channel of the Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link located at the north.

#### Eco-shoreline

28. The Chairman asked the representative of R54 to clarify whether it was the WWF's stance that eco-shoreline would be acceptable if it was proved to be successful at a testing site in Hong Kong proposed by WWF, and whether WWF would prefer artificial vertical seawall to eco-shoreline if the eco-shoreline had not yet been tested. In response, Ms Samantha Lee Klaus said that the eco-shoreline would take up a vast sea area of 16 ha. The Government should identify either a site similar to TCE in terms of water flow and wind direction, or use only a very small portion of the reclamation boundary for pilot study to test the feasibility of the eco-shoreline concept. If the pilot study revealed that the eco-shoreline was not effective in rehabilitating the shoreline habitats, the Government should not proceed with the entire eco-shoreline as proposed in the draft OZP, and in such case, WWF would prefer the vertical seawall design as the reclamation area would be scaled down from 145 ha to 129 ha.

29. Two Members asked whether there was any successful example of eco-shoreline overseas and what the requirements for eco-shoreline were under the Environmental Permit. In response, Mr David K.C. Lo said that although application of eco-shoreline in coastal area



was new to Hong Kong, the eco-shoreline had proven to be feasible and successful in overseas countries including the Netherlands, Singapore (Semakau Island) and Australia (Sydney harbour). Eco-shoreline would help provide beneficial functions to the local ecosystems through suitable design, whilst providing coastal protection. It could have various designs, including one that its intertidal zone was in the form of sloping boulder seawall and incorporated tidal pools that could accommodate habitat for intertidal organisms and attract foraging birds. It could also be a vertical seawall with various forms of caves and protrusions to facilitate rehabilitation of a variety of marine habitats. Mr Kenneth C.P. Wong, SE9, supplemented that details of the overseas examples for eco-shoreline and how it could enhance the biodiversity of the coastal ecosystem were set out in an appendix of the approved EIA report. The eco-shoreline concept had also been thoroughly scrutinized by ACE. One of the conditions in the Environmental Permit (EP) for TCNTE required the submission of a detailed Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan to DEP for approval. The Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan should include details of indicators for assessing the success of the eco-shoreline. An academic expert would be engaged in the detailed design stage to work out a scheme that could optimize the performance of the eco-shoreline. A working team would be set up and the stakeholders would be consulted during the detailed design stage.

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

30. The Chairman asked whether the public could have access to the eco-shoreline. In response, Mr Wong said that public access to the eco-shoreline could be allowed where appropriate. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Ken Y. K. Wong, Principal Environmental Protection Officer, said that the EIA Report for TCNTE was assessed in accordance with the EIA Ordinance while the EP was granted on 9.8.2016. Given that TCE reclamation had a long coastline, it could have a variety of eco-shoreline designs at different sections geared for specific purposes. There was a condition in the EP, having regard to ACE's endorsement conditions, requiring CEDD to submit a detailed Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan for DEP's approval before commencement of construction of the eco-shoreline. The Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan would also include detailed management arrangements and a monitoring programme with indicators for assessing the performance of the eco-shoreline. The design of the eco-shoreline had clear objectives of

enhancing its ecological, landscape and visual functions; and that, subject to other engineering and safety considerations, there might be opportunities for providing public access to the eco-shoreline at suitable locations for enhancing a water friendly culture.

31. A Member asked how the water-friendly culture would be incorporated in the eco-shoreline. In response, Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, said that PlanD had all along advocated the eco-shoreline design along new reclamation area and river courses, such as the revitalization of Kai Tak River and the channelized river courses in the new development areas. Concepts of bringing in various eco-features in river course design had already been implemented and demonstrated feasible. With such a long shoreline in the TCE reclamation area, there would be opportunity to allow public access to the eco-shoreline at appropriate locations but a delicate balance needed to be struck between protection of coastal ecosystem and public enjoyment. The draft OZP provided a broad planning framework and was not appropriate to include detailed design features of the eco-shoreline which was still subject to further study. The Study team should take into account the views of Members and representers/commenters and there would be scope for cooperation between the Green Groups and the Study team in making the eco-shoreline a success.

#### Water Sports Centre

32. A Member asked whether large-scale water sports facilities would be planned at Kai Tak while the TCE would accommodate a small-scale facility. In response, Ms Tam made the following main points:

- (a) while she had no information in hand regarding the proposed water sports facilities in Kai Tak, there were water sports facilities operated either by private organizations or public bodies at various locations in Hong Kong. HKWSC had also submitted a proposal to the Government to develop a water sports centre in Tsueng Kwan O; and
- (b) the draft TCE OZP had designated two sites as “OU(Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities associated with Marina Development)” zone. Water sports facilities associated with the marina development might be regarded as ancillary use under the zone. As the operational arrangement and the activities of the marina were still subject

to further detailed study, it would not pre-empt any opportunity for incorporating water sports facilities in the marina at the moment. However, when considering the suitability of developing a water sports centre in the area, its compatibility with the nearby land uses and impacts on the environment should be taken into account.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left this session of the meeting at this point.]

### Impacts on CWD

33. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry on the impact of the TCE development on CWD and the Chairman's enquiry on the relevant condition imposed in the EP, Mr Lo made the following main points:

- (a) the information on CWD in Hong Kong had been comprehensively reviewed which included AFCD's long-term survey data since 1990s, data from the monitoring under HZMB Project and the CEIA Study for the Three Potential Near-shore Reclamation Sites in the Western Waters of Hong Kong. In the EIAs for HKBCF of HZMB and the 3RS of the HKIA, apart from dolphin counts at the monitoring stations on sea and land, autonomous PAM was conducted to detect the occurrence of CWD at all times including night time;
- (b) data collected from the monitoring stations in Sunny Bay revealed that if the waters were of very low use by CWD in daytime, there was no obvious change in the usage at night time and significant CWD activities at the waters were not expected. Given the consistently low dolphin use of TCE area in the daytime, the potential of having significant night time activities in the waters was highly unlikely. In addition, the TCE reclamation area had a very shallow water of 2m to 4m deep which was unlikely a habitat of CWD. In fact, according to the CWD surveys in the CEIA Study, the distribution of CWD matched the seabed profile, with most sightings in deeper waters (about 7m to 12m deep); and

- (c) one of the conditions imposed in the EP required the submission of a Works Vessel Travel Route Plan to DEP for approval before commencement of the reclamation works at TCE. The works vessels were also restricted from travelling close to the core area of the proposed BMP and their speeds would be limited to 8 knots, even lower than the statutory limit of 10 knots for the Marine Park. The number of works vessels to and from the works site daily would also be capped.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok left this session of the meeting at this point.]

34. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Cheng Ka Tai, R31 and R48, made the following main points :

- (a) while CWD might not swim to the TCE reclamation area, the area could be part of its habitat. Large marine animals like CWD did not have any boundary of its habitat. CWD might swim close to Tung Chung Bay when entering from Urmston Road channel via the Brothers islands to Sunny Bay. As revealed from the data of PAM, CWD visited Siu Ho Wan in the night time. The possibility that CWD might also swim close to Tung Chung Bay should not be precluded;
- (b) the statutory speed limit for motor vessels in the proposed BMP was 10 knots. While there were studies to confirm that such a speed limit could reduce the hazard for CWD to collide with the vessels, it was doubtful whether a lower speed limit of 8 knots was more beneficial to CWD as a lower speed limit would mean that the vessels would stay longer in the water area and create more noise disturbance to CWD; and
- (c) eco-shoreline might be a compensation for wetland or other coastal ecosystems but not for CWD's habitat.

35. A Member asked the representative of R31 and R48 to elaborate the baseline survey for CWD in North Lantau waters and the observed discrepancy in the data of the EIA Report. In response, Mr Cheng made the following main points:

- (a) a baseline survey for CWD using the waters in North Lantau could not be carried out as the waters were being disturbed by the construction works for HZMB. It was agreed that information on the importance of North Lantau waters as a habitat of CWD could only be collected from various reports and sources; and
- (b) the EIA Report had adopted different sets of data in drawing the conclusion that CWD did not use the TCE reclamation area. The data for year 2011-14 in paragraph 6.4.6.4 of the EIA Report likely came from the 3RS project while those for year 2014-15 in paragraph 6.4.6.6 of the EIA Report were from HZMB project. Such data could not be used as baseline since the waters had already been disturbed by the on-going reclamation projects. The EIA should use AFCD's monitoring data over the years.

#### External Transport

36. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry on the capacity of the external transport of Tung Chung, Mr Lo said that a comprehensive transport network had been planned to serve TCNTE. With the proposed Tai Ho Interchange and Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) connecting TCE to NLH, the road traffic to the urban areas did not need to go into the existing town centre area. Two new railway stations would be added along MTR TCL. Improvement works of the TCL would be carried out to increase the carrying capacity of its urban section from 26,700 to 47,000 passengers per hour per direction (pphpd) assuming 4 persons (standing) per square meter (ppsm) in the train. It was anticipated that the forecast patronage at the critical section of TCL in 2036 taking into account the TCNTE would be 41,700 pphpd during the peak hour, which would be about 90% of its carrying capacity assuming 4 ppsm.

#### Others

37. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry on the provision of wet market and accessibility to the waterfront, Ms Tam made the following main points:

- (a) the provision of community facilities were planned in a holistic manner to serve the population of the new town and its extension area in accordance with the requirements under HKPSG and as advised by relevant departments. There were at present two wet markets in existing public housing estates while two new ones would be provided within new public housing developments under construction. The need for provision of additional wet markets for new development areas would be considered with reference to relevant factors, including population, the presence of public and private market facilities, fresh provision shops available in the vicinity, etc. Sites had already been reserved in the whole Tung Chung area for possible development of a myriad of GIC facilities in which public market was always permitted and could be developed should there be a need. Besides, retail facilities including markets could also be provided at “R(A)” sites for both public and private housing developments; and
- (b) a public waterfront promenade was provided along the whole reclaimed area of TCE for the public to enjoy an open sea view. It was well connected to the transport node such as the new railway station, the Central Green and development parcels via a wide network of public open space. The waterfront promenade and the open space would incorporate pedestrian walkways and cycle tracks to enhance the connectivity of the entire area as well as to the coastal area.

38. As Members did not have any further questions, 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 on the representations and comments in their absence after completing all the hearing sessions for the three draft OZPs for Tung Chung, and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board’s decision in due course.

[The meeting was adjourned at 12:35 p.m.]