

**Minutes of 1123rd 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

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Assistant Director of Lands/Regional (3)
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

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

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr K.C. Siu

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

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1123rd Meeting Sessions held on 28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 and 4.10.2016

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1123rd meeting sessions held on 28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 and 4.10.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conduct in Cantonese.]

Out-of-Time Submissions

2. The Secretary reported that ‘東涌居民張小姐’ and ‘南輦村發展及管理團體’ (R2) each submitted a letter regarding the draft Tung Chung Valley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCV/1 on 3.10.2016 and 26.10.2016 respectively, and ‘Li Chi Ho’ (R3) submitted a letter regarding the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area OZP No. S/I-TCTC/21 on 4.10.2016. As the three letters were submitted after the expiration of the 2-month exhibition period of the two draft OZPs (i.e. 8.3.2016) and the 3-week public comment period for the representations (i.e. 24.5.2016), they should be treated as not having been made pursuant to the Town Planning Ordinance. Members agreed.

Agenda Item 3

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

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

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

3. The Chairman said that the representations and comments in respect of the draft Tung Chung Extension Area (TCE) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCE/1 were heard mainly on 28.9.2016. The draft minutes of the meeting session which had been issued to Members on 11.11.2016 were confirmed at Agenda Item 1 of the meeting without amendments and the video recordings of the hearing sessions were sent to Members on 18.10.2016.

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests was reported at the hearing session on 28.9.2016, and recorded in paragraph 3 of the minutes on 28.9.2016. Subsequently, it was noted that R1 was submitted by Coral Ching Limited which was a subsidiary of Swire Properties Limited (Swire). Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho declared interests in the item for having current business dealing with Swire, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau for having past business dealing with Swire, and Ms Janice W.M. Lai for her firm being a tenant of Swire. Mr K.K. Cheung and Professor T.S. Liu also declared interests in the item for, respectively, having past business dealings with World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) (R54) and having close relative possibly owning a property in Tung Chung. Mr Alex T.H. Lai declared interest in the item for his firm having current business dealing with Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R58), but he had no involvement in the project. The updated Members' declaration of interests in the item was as follows:

- Mr K.K. Ling
(as Director of Planning)
- being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of HKHA
- Mr Martin W.C Kwan
(as Chief Engineer
(Works), Home Affairs
Department)
- being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA
- Mr H.F. Leung
- being a member of the Tender Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and being a convenor of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel
- Dr C.H. Hau
- having current business dealing with HKHA, and being the vice-chairman of The Conservancy Association (CA) (R53)
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu]
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho]
]]
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau
- having current business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and past business dealing with Swire
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai
- having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL, and her firm was a tenant of Swire
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu
- having current business dealings with MTRCL and Masterplan (representing The Hong Kong Water Sports Council (R2)), and past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr K.K. Cheung
- having current business dealing with MTRCL and having past business dealing with WWF

- Mr Franklin Yu] having past business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]
- Professor S.C. Wong - being the member of the Advisory Committee for
(*The Vice-chairman*) Accredited Programme of MTRCL Academy, and being
the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil
Engineering of HKU where MTR Corporation Limited
had sponsored some activities of the Department before
- Mr Alex T.H. Lai - his firm having current business dealing with MTRCL,
but he had no involvement in the project
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of Housing Department
but not involved in planning work
- Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative possibly owning a property in Tung
Chung

5. Members noted that as the proposed public housing developments in the draft TCE 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 Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam and Professor T.S. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had not yet arrived to join the meeting. Members also noted that interests of Mr Franklin Yu, Professor S.C. Wong and Mr Alex T.H. Lai were indirect and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

6. The meeting noted that all the Members currently present at the meeting attended the hearing session for the draft TCE OZP on 28.9.2016.

7. To facilitate the deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background of the representations and comments in respect of the draft TCE OZP as follows:

- (a) on 8.1.2016, the OZPs including the draft TCE OZP which mainly incorporated land use proposals as recommended under the Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) Study (the Tung Chung Study) were exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) during the statutory exhibition period, 59 representations and 78 comments on the representations in respect of the draft TCE OZP were received.

Supportive Representations (R1 and R2)

8. The Secretary recapitulated that the representers had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

Retail Provision and Innovative Industries

- (a) the intention to create more jobs and business opportunities was appreciated but 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 and Industrial Estate for innovative industries should be considered; and

Marina and Water Sports Centre

- (b) the proposed marina was supported as it would create mooring opportunities which were in short supply, but the design and layout had to be improved. Two options on the land use rearrangement in the area were proposed. Option 1 proposing a larger marina and waterfront park, a water sports centre and two artificial beaches was subsequently dropped at the hearing on 28.9.2016. Option 2 proposed a water sports centre and two artificial beaches with the marina location remained unchanged.

9. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during Planning Department's (PlanD's) presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the supportive views were noted;

Retail Provision and Innovative Industries

- (b) 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;
- (c) while commercial developments would cluster around the proposed Tung Chung East 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 job would be created;
- (d) 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 Science Park and Industrial Estate having regard to planning and environmental considerations. Flexibility was allowed for offices related to Science Park and innovative industries;

Marina and Water Sports Centre

- (e) the proposed artificial beach at the west edge would encroach into the Tung Chung Channel and there would be compatibility problem with users of marina and Tung Chung Channel; and
- (f) marina support area and water sports facilities associated with the marina development were ancillary uses under the "Other Specified Use" ("OU") annotated "Marina Club, Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development" zoning.

Adverse Representation (R3 to R57, R59) and Representation Providing Comments (R58)

Oppose Further Development in Tung Chung

10. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the proposed low to medium-density developments mainly for private residential use could not effectively address the housing problem. The Government should optimise other land resources, e.g. brownfield sites, instead of reclamation; and
- (b) 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.

11. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) 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;
- (b) 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 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report; and

- (c) railway system was planned as a backbone of the passenger transport system in TCE 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

12. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) 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;
- (b) 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 either at a coastal area similar to TCE in terms of water flow and wind direction, or using only a very small portion of the reclamation boundary. If the pilot study revealed that the eco-shoreline was not effective in rehabilitating the shoreline habitats, the artificial vertical seawall design was preferred as the reclamation area would then be scaled down from 145 ha to 129 ha;
- (c) a strategic Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for Lantau should be conducted to assess the cumulative environmental impacts arising from all the reclamation projects; and

- (d) the extent of the proposed reclamation for TCE should be reduced by half, in particular the northern part should be foregone since that area was subject to severe aircraft noise, close to the proposed BMP and mainly for marina club use and it could widen the Tung Chung Channel to maintain the current flow of Tung Chung Bay. In addition, it should be further set back westwards for about 50m to 100m from Tai Ho Bay.

13. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the environmental and ecological issues had been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA Report, and TCE 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. 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;
- (b) measures were proposed to reduce the marine traffic volume and the potential disturbance to CWD, and 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;
- (c) 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. The eco-shoreline concept had been thoroughly scrutinized by Advisory Committee on Environment (ACE). One of the conditions in the Environmental Permit (EP) for TCNTE required the submission of a

detailed Eco-shoreline Implementation Plan to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for approval. Concepts of bringing in various eco-features in river course design had already been implemented and demonstrated feasible. Given that TCE reclamation had a long coastline, it could have a variety of eco-shoreline designs at different sections geared for specific purposes. 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;

- (d) Cumulative EIA (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; and
- (e) the extent of the proposed reclamation had taken into account the impact on the surrounding ecologically sensitive areas including those in Tung Chung Bay, Tung Chung Stream, the proposed BMP, Tai Ho Wan and Tai Ho SSSI. The results of the hydrodynamic modelling carried out in the Tung Chung Study indicated that no significant change in hydrodynamics and water quality was anticipated for the ecologically-sensitive receivers in the vicinity, including Tai Ho Wan and Tung Chung Bay, due to the proposed reclamation for TCE.

Object to the Proposed Marina

14. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) no clear justification for the need for a marina. 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; and

- (b) objection to the proposed marina if it was a private facility. Public marina/ typhoon shelter for small vessels and water sports activities should be provided. The waterfront promenade should be set back for provision of bollards and landing facilities for boat users.

15. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) there had been a territorial demand for marina and Tung Chung was considered a suitable location for new marina. The proposed marina would enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront and create a new leisure and activity node with diversified job opportunities. The majority of the waterfront was zoned "Open Space" ("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;
- (b) 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 EIA Ordinance (EIAO) before implementation; and
- (c) 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. 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 the current stage.

Inadequate Provision of Transport Facilities

16. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the population increase would overload the carrying capacity of Tung Chung which would lead to inadequate provision of transport and community facilities; and
- (b) the MTR Tung Chung Line (TCL) was already operating at 85% of its maximum capacity at the moment. The carrying capacity of TCL would be overloaded with the proposed increase in population. The assumption of 6 persons per m² was not realistic in determining the carrying capacity of TCL. There was doubt on whether the capacity of North Lantau Highway (NLH) would be sufficient in view of the proposed property development above Siu Ho Wan Depot and other major projects in the area.

17. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) 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 NLH were proposed. Besides, Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL) to be completed in 2018 would offer an alternative route and ease the traffic flow of NLH. Three new public transport interchanges would be provided to facilitate the interchange between different modes of transport in the area. There were currently about 37 franchised bus routes serving Tung Chung; and
- (b) 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.

Inadequate Job Diversification and Community Facilities

18. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the future new job opportunities were not diverse enough and limited to retail, food beverage and professional services; and
- (b) the population increase would lead to inadequate provision of community facilities. There was no special school and municipal market in Tung Chung.

19. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) 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 businesses. Land for post-secondary education and school uses had been reserved to provide education and training facilities for local residents; and
- (b) 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. 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 would be provided within public housing

developments under construction. Public markets were always permitted in “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) sites. Relevant bureaux and departments would work closely together to follow up the issue during the detailed design and implementation stage of TCNTE.

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

Other Aspects

20. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) there was a lack of cycling facilities. A cycling track around the Lantau Island and connected with the airport should be provided;
- (b) the Pak Mong Pier was a precious public space which should not be demolished;
- (c) the Government should provide a comprehensive plan for Lantau development instead of the current piecemeal approach; and
- (d) the proposed commercial developments were required to provide noise screening for the residential development along the existing railway. 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.

21. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) a comprehensive cycle track network had been proposed to connect the major destinations and there were cycle parking facilities in various places;
- (b) 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;
- (c) 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; and
- (d) 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. Requirement for submission of Environment Assessment Study Report, covering review on potential noise impacts among others, under the leases of the property developments would be considered during the implementation stage.

Comments on Representations

22. The Meeting noted that the views and proposals of most comments were generally similar to the representations, and the responses to the representations above were relevant.

23. With regard to C27's and C76's concern on the protection of countryside and woodland, the concerned areas including the foothills adjoining the Country Park were zoned "GB" on the OZP. There was a general presumption against development within the "GB" zone. Development within the zone would be strictly controlled.

24. With regard to C78's specific comment on the development of two full-sized rugby fields in Tung Chung, it should be noted that various "G/IC" sites were reserved for the provision of sports and recreational facilities in TCE. Concerned parties might seek policy support for development within those sites.

25. The Chairman invited Members to express their views on various aspects of concerns raised by the representers and commenters.

Proposed Marina

26. Some Members raised the concern that the proposed marina might be a facility for prestige groups and would not be affordable to the wider public. A Member asked whether it was possible to relocate the marina to the proposed possible cycle park site near Tai Ho such that the northern portion of the reclamation could be foregone to make the Tung Chung Channel wider. Another Member considered that as a whole set of technical assessments and EIA were conducted for the Tung Chung Study including the marina at the current position, it would be difficult for the Board to make a decision that it would be better to place the marina to other location without the support of relevant technical and EIA studies.

27. Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, said that the management and operational mode, including whether it was a private or public facility, could be determined at the detailed design and implementation stage. As far as the OZP was concerned, Members might focus on the need for a marina in TCE.

28. The Chairman noted that insofar as clubs operating under private recreational leases were concerned, they could be required by the lease conditions to allow the public to have reasonable access to their premises and facilities which would not be confined to the sole enjoyment of club members.

29. The Vice-chairman said that the marina in the TCE was supported as it would give a positive contribution in enhancing the vibrancy of the waterfront, and as pointed out by some representers, there were already some informal boating activities near Tung Chung Bay and a proper marina facility could meet the local demand. There might be some historical reasons for the existence of some private recreational clubs which were for the exclusive use

of their members, but he understood that the current government policy was to require the private recreational clubs to open their facilities to the public in a reasonable manner. A Member said that the operators of the recreational clubs such as the Hong Kong Golf Club recognized their social responsibility and provided training course and exposure activities to the sports to members of the community from all walks of life.

30. A Member asked how the OZP could address the representers' concerns about (a) whether the marina could cater for small boats that were more affordable for the wider public, rather than only for the large pleasure crafts owned by the prestiged, and (b) whether there would be storage facilities for small boats. In response, Mr K.K. Ling said that the OZP made provision for a breakwater to create a protected water area for a marina, but would not dictate the size of the boats using the marina nor the operational mode of the marina. The "OU(Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development)" zone abutting the proposed marina was to support the proposed marina use which could accommodate landing facilities and storage of boats. The meeting noted that similar facilities on landside were common in the existing boat clubs in Hong Kong.

31. The meeting agreed with the need and provision for marina at the location as indicated on the draft TCE OZP, and requested the Secretariat to convey the Board's view to the Government that there was a need to ensure that the wider public could have reasonable access to the marina facilities to be developed at the proposed marina and the "OU(Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development)" site.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

Proposed Reclamation

32. Noting that there was a strong demand for land to meet the territorial needs, some Members said that they had no objection in principle to the proposed reclamation outside Victoria Harbour. Two Members said that there might be a need to consider whether the narrowed Tung Chung Channel upon the proposed reclamation might impact on the water quality of Tung Chung Bay.

33. Mr K.K. Ling said that the current extent of reclamation had taken into account the need to fully utilize the reclamation potential to provide land in meeting the community's

demand, and the environmental and other considerations such as aircraft noise and impact on Tung Chung Channel. The water quality of Tung Chung Bay had been examined in the approved EIA for the TCNTE. The section of Tung Chung Channel between the proposed TCE reclamation and the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF) island was slightly larger than that between the existing airport and Tung Chung New Town, and the water quality of Tung Chung Bay should still be maintained in good condition. There was no evidence to suggest that the current reclamation extent would result in unacceptable environmental impacts on Tung Chung Bay.

Effective Use of Land

34. A Member said that TCE was located near a number of cross-boundary facilities, and asked whether it was appropriate to use the land for predominantly residential development. In response, Mr K.K. Ling said that PlanD was conducting a study on the topside development of HKBCF. Given that HKBCF was constrained by the presence of aircraft noise, and could only allow development requiring large floorplate, the topside development might accommodate convention and exhibition facilities and mega retail facilities. The Hong Kong Airport Authority was also conducting a study to develop commercial and hotel uses at the North Commercial District of the airport, and an office node was proposed at the Tung Chung Railway Station. Given that there was plenty supply of commercial and retail floorspace in the surrounding areas, it was considered appropriate to provide more residential developments at TCE for a more balanced community.

Water Transport

35. A Member asked whether it could have water transport between the HKBCF island and TCE. In response, Mr K.K. Ling said that the provision of such water transport was not included in the HKBCF study. The commercial activities of the topside development of HKBCF would be located far away from the waterfront of the island and beyond the walking distance. A railway link between the HKBCF island and the airport was planned. In the longer term, there might be an opportunity for extending the railway link to Tung Chung. At present, there were ferry services provided at Tung Chung Development Pier plying to Tuen Mun, Sha Lo Wan and Tai O.

Land and Water Interface

36. Noting that the waterfront area of TCE was zoned as “O”, a Member asked whether it was possible to accommodate a variety of uses such as fishing area, apart from the eco-shoreline. In response, the Chairman said that the eco-shoreline was a mitigation measure proposed under the EIA study to compensate the loss of the natural shoreline. According to the minutes of the hearing session held on 29.9.2016, the government representative confirmed that TCE reclamation had a long coastline, and it could have a variety of eco-shoreline designs at different sections geared for specific purposes.

37. Mr K.K. Ling said that the OZP provided a broad land use planning framework and the “O” zoning could ensure that the waterfront area would be developed as a public open space. The appropriate use for different sections of the waterfront could be determined at the later detailed design stage. Given that TCE had a long waterfront, there was opportunity to accommodate a diversity of uses and design.

38. Members generally considered that the waterfront should be designed in such a way to provide a diversity of uses for the public. The meeting agreed to request the Secretariat to convey the Board’s view to the Government that apart from recreating the coastal and ecological habitats, the eco-shoreline design should cater for other functions such as access of the public to the water. The waterfront promenade should be designed to cater for diversified uses that could enhance the waterfront vibrancy and the land-water interactive activities.

Artificial Beach

39. A Member asked whether the OZP could address some representers’ request for artificial beaches. The meeting noted that apart from the departments’ responses stated in the minutes and the Paper, artificial beach was only feasible at location where the water currents could allow the retention of the deposited sand, and the representers had not submitted any technical assessment to confirm the feasibility of the proposal.

Public Car Park

40. A Member asked whether the underground space of the public open space near the MTR stations could be used for public vehicle and cycle parks. The meeting noted that

if required, the “G/IC” zone could allow the provision of public vehicle parking space upon the advice of the Transport Department (TD). Vehicle parking spaces ancillary to the development would also be provided in the residential development according to HKPSG and TD’s advice.

Water Sports Centre

41. Noting that some representers requested for the provision of a water sports centre, a Member asked whether water sports facilities could be allowed in the “OU(Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development)” zone if they were not ancillary use to a marina club. In response, Mr K.K. Ling said that the zone could allow the provision of water sports activities as ancillary uses to the main uses which were always permitted. The potential for water sports activities for the area could be explored taking into account the local water condition in the detailed design and implementation stage.

42. The meeting noted that the “OU(Marina Club, Boat Repairing and Commercial Facilities Associated with Marina Development)” zone on the OZP could allow both public and private marina club and water sports centre.

Job Diversification and Wet Market

43. A Member asked how the OZP could address the concern of some representers/commenters on insufficient job diversification and the request for public wet market to be operated by the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD). The meeting noted that according to the information provided by the government representatives, the TCNTE would create 40,000 more jobs which were substantial in number. The concern of some representers was in fact that they could not work in the airport as it took a long time to travel there even it was within sight. The provision of better transport connection upon the TCNTE could enhance the residents to work in the airport. As for the public market, the meeting noted that apart from the two existing wet markets, two public wet markets were to be provided within public housing developments.

44. The Chairman noted that the Government had publicly committed that relevant bureaux and departments, including the Food and Health Bureau, FEHD, Development Bureau and PlanD would work closely together to follow up the issue during the detailed design and

implementation stage of TCNTE. FEHD was actively considering developing a wet market in Tung Chung.

45. Members noted and agreed with the responses to the grounds and proposals of the representations and comments as detailed in paragraphs 6.10 to 6.43 and 7.1 to 7.3 of the Paper as well as those made during the hearing and deliberation sessions. Members also agreed that there were no insurmountable concerns that had not been addressed, which necessitated the amendment of the draft OZP.

46. After deliberation, the Board agreed to note the supportive views of Representations No. R1(part) and R2(part) and views of Representation No. R58.

47. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining views of Representations No. R1 and R2 and the views of Representations No. R3 to R57 and R59 and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“ For all Representations

- (a) the overall objective of Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) Extension (TCNTE) is to extend the existing TCNT into a distinct community which can meet housing, social, economic, environmental and local needs. The Tung Chung Extension (TCE) reclamation is one of the important land supply sources to meet territorial housing and economic needs in medium to long-term. The environmental and ecological issues of the proposed reclamation and new development under the TCNTE project have been properly assessed and addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report to confirm its compliance with the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) requirements and was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) in April 2016. Various technical assessments have also been conducted to confirm that the project is acceptable in terms of traffic, infrastructure, landscape, air ventilation and visual impacts;

Additional reasons on specific grounds and proposals

Review of Regional Retail Provision and Need for Innovative Industries (R1)

- (b) the planning of the commercial activities for TCNTE has already taken into consideration other known and planned development projects on Lantau and its surrounding to achieve synergy, optimal coordination and collaboration among these developments;
- (c) TCE is positioned as a regional office and smart commercial node. No land has been reserved for Science Park and Industrial Estate in TCE having regard to planning and environmental considerations. Flexibility has been allowed in the Notes of the draft Tung Chung Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan for provision of offices related to innovative industries. The strategic linkage of Tung Chung with other areas such as Tuen Mun and Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area where land for industrial developments has been reserved would enable such synergy;

Provision of water sports centre and artificial beaches(R2)

- (d) there is no environmental and technical assessment to support the feasibility for the proposed water sports centre and artificial beaches. The proposal will encroach on the existing Tung Chung Channel and also likely give rise to unacceptable environmental impact;

Opposition to further development in Tung Chung (R3 to R28, R30 to R36, R45 to R47, R52, R55 to R57 and R59)

- (e) different types of residential development are planned in TCNTE to ensure a balanced housing mix and different housing choices. The public/private housing split adopted in TCNTE is generally in line with that recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee. The proposed densities of residential developments have taken into account individual site characteristics, local circumstances, relevant planning and urban design considerations, infrastructural capacity and the Transit Oriented Development concept;
- (f) the air quality issue of the new development under the TCNTE project has been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA Report to confirm its compliance with the EIAO requirements and was approved by DEP in April 2016. The concept of

low-carbon city has been adopted in TCNTE in which railway system is planned as a backbone of passenger transport and comprehensive networks of cycle tracks and pedestrian walkways are planned to reduce demand for private vehicles and thus reduce greenhouse gas emissions;

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

- (g) there is a territorial demand for marina and TCE is considered a suitable location. The proposed marina and its associated facilities would enhance the vibrancy of the waterfront and is compatible with the adjacent hotel and commercial developments. The waterfront promenade will remain as a public open space for public enjoyment;
- (h) the environmental impact that may arise from the proposed marina has been addressed in the approved EIA Report of TCNTE and no insurmountable problem has been identified. The operation and implementation arrangement of the proposed marina will be further looked into at the detailed design stage. A separate EIA will be conducted to fulfil the statutory requirements under the EIAO before implementation;

Overloading of carrying capacity (R15 to R28, R52, R56 and R57)

- (i) a comprehensive transport network has been planned to serve TCNTE. The design capacity of Tung Chung Line, with the two new railway stations at Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, can accommodate the planned population upon full development of TCNTE. Tai Ho Interchange and Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) connecting Tung Chung East and North Lantau Highway are also proposed to relieve future traffic demand. Besides, Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link to be completed in 2018 will offer an alternative route and ease the traffic flow of the North Lantau Highway;
- (j) the provisions of community, social welfare, recreational and educational facilities in TCTNE are planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and based on the advice of the relevant departments;

- (k) TCNTE will create an additional 40,000 job opportunities. The significant increase in commercial development will create diversified employment opportunities in the area. Other development projects in the surroundings (e.g. Three Runway System of the Hong Kong International Airport, Topside Development of Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities, Northern Commercial Development on airport island and Sunny Bay) will also bring more jobs to Tung Chung. Local retail uses are also planned along the Linear Parks and the main streets to provide opportunities for local residents to open up small businesses;

Special School (R5 to R7, R12 and R59)

- (l) a site has been reserved in Tung Chung for special school use for children with mild, moderate and severe intellectual disabilities;

Public Market (R5 to R7, R12, R56 and R59)

- (m) there are at present market facilities and other fresh provision retail shops such as the wet markets in Yat Tung Estate and Fu Tung Estate and two new public wet markets to be provided within new public housing developments. Sites have already been reserved in TCNTE for possible development of a myriad of Government, institution or community facilities in which public markets are always permitted and could be developed should the need arises. Besides, retail facilities including markets could also be provided at “Residential (Group A)” sites for both public and private housing developments. Relevant bureaux and departments will work closely together to follow up the issue during the detailed design and implementation stage of TCNTE;

Cycling Facilities (R5 to R7, R13 and R14)

- (n) a comprehensive cycle track network, cycle parking facilities and a cycle park have been proposed to connect the major destinations in TCE. The possibility of extending the cycle track to Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay would be explored when planning future developments in those areas;

Demolition of Pak Mong Pier (R5 to R7 and R13)

- (o) there is a need to remove the existing Pak Mong Pier within the reclamation area of TCE. New public landing steps will be provided upon completion of the reclamation; and

Railway Noise (R58)

- (p) The proposed commercial developments along Chung Line and Airport Express are strategically located to provide noise screening from the railway lines and timely implementation of these commercial developments is anticipated in this regard. The need for interim noise mitigation will be considered at the detailed design stage. ”

48. The Chairman also concluded that Members’ concerns with regard to the use of the proposed marina, and the design of the eco-shoreline and waterfront promenade would be referred to the Government for follow up outside the scope of the OZP amendment process. In that regard, the Secretariat was requested to consolidate Members’ views into a letter to be submitted to the Government for reference and follow up action.

[Ms Christina M. Lee and Ms Janice W.M. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tung Chung Valley Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCV/1
(TPB Paper No. 10177)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

49. The Chairman said that the representations and comments in respect of the draft Tung Chung Valley (TCV) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCV/1 were heard on 29.9.2016. The draft minutes of the meeting which had been issued to Members on 11.11.2016 were

confirmed at the meeting without amendments and the video recordings of the hearing sessions were sent to Members on 18.10.2016.

50. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests was reported at the hearing session on 29.9.2016 and recorded in paragraph 3 of the minutes on 29.9.2016. Subsequently, it was noted that R11 was submitted by Coral Ching Limited which was a subsidiary of Swire Properties Limited (Swire). Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho declared interests in the item for having current business dealing with Swire, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau for having past business dealing with Swire, and Ms Janice W.M. Lai for her firm being a tenant of Swire. Mr K.K. Cheung also declared interest in the item for having past business dealings with World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) (R33). The updated Members' declaration of interests was as follows:

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Wheelock Properties Limited (Wheelock) (mother company of Forestside Limited (R10 and C17)) and Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) (consultant of Forestside Limited (R10 and C17))

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealing with Wheelock and past business dealing with Swire

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having current business dealings with Wheelock and Swire

- Mr K.K. Cheung - having current business dealings with Wheelock, and past business dealing with WWF

- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with Wheelock and Swire, and past business dealing with Albert So Surveyors Ltd. (consultant of Uni-Creation Investments Ltd and Tung Chung Nim Yuen Cultural Institution Ltd (R7, R8, C1 and C5))

- Dr C.H. Hau - being the vice-chairman of The Conservancy Association (CA) (R32)

Ms Janice W.M. Lai - her firm was a tenant of Swire

Mr Alex T.H. Lai - involving in a legal case with Wheelock

Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative possibly owning a property in Tung Chung

51. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Professor T.S. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had already left the meeting. Members also noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai's interest was indirect and agreed that she should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

52. Members also noted that Ms Christina M. Lee, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr Franklin Yu did not attend the hearing session for the draft TCV OZP on 29.9.2016 and agreed that they should refrain from participating in the deliberation.

53. To facilitate the deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background of the representations and comments in respect of the draft TCV OZP as follows:

- (a) on 8.1.2016, the OZPs including the TCV OZP which mainly incorporated land use proposals as recommended under the Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) Study (the Tung Chung Study) were exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) during the statutory exhibition period, 38 representations and 87 comments on the representations in respect of TCV OZP were received;

Supportive Representations (R1, R2, R11 (part), R28(part), R30(part), R32(part) and R33(part))

54. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the designation of Nim Yuen Village, a recognised village, as “Village Type Development” (“V”) was supported;
- (b) the draft OZP in general and the proposed “Residential (Group C)2” (“R(C)2”) zone in Area 61A for its close proximity to railway station were supported. The provision of flood control system on Tung Chung Stream and the establishment of a river park were appreciated as they would preserve the natural environment and ecology of TCV area; and
- (c) the gazettal of the draft OZP was generally supported/welcomed as it enabled statutory enforcement action against eco-vandalism in the TCV area.

55. Members noted the supportive views.

Adverse Representations (R3 to R12, R14 to R38 and those providing views on similar issues R11(part), R28(part), R30(part), R32(part) and R33(part))

Private columbarium developments in Nim Yuen and Shek Mun Kap

56. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) some representers opposed converting “V” area in Nim Yuen for columbarium use but some others supported private columbarium developments in Nim Yuen and Sincerity Park at Shek Mun Kap on the following grounds:
 - there was no Small House demand in Nim Yuen Village. The columbarium was an ‘Existing Use’ (‘EU’) operated prior to the gazettal of the draft Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan. The private columbarium development at Nim Yuen was compatible with the surrounding land uses and rural character of the area; and

- the columbarium in Sincerity Park had been built for more than decades and the land owner had no intention to develop his land for any uses permitted under the “V” zone; and

- (b) the “V” zone covering the private columbarium development and private land in Nim Yuen should be rezoned to “Institution or Community” (“IC”) use to reflect the existing columbarium use, and other community uses such as elderly home and religious institution should also be always permitted.

57. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during Planning Department’s (PlanD’s) presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) ‘Columbarium’ use was not permitted within the “V” zone. Even if the columbarium developments were ‘EU’ tolerated under the Ordinance, they were not compatible with the surrounding area and long-term planning intention of the area for village type development;
- (b) the proposed road network was not designed to cater for the heavy traffic conditions induced by the columbarium developments. Upgrading of the proposed roads might not be possible due to environmental constraints; and
- (c) there were no details in the rezoning proposal to ascertain the potential visual impact of the proposed developments.

Provision of elderly care facilities

58. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) there was a lack of elderly care facilities in Nim Yuen in view of the increasing aging population and frequent shortage in public-sector elderly care facilities; and

- (b) Area 67 should be rezoned from “R(C)2” to “IC” use for the development of community care and elderly supporting services;

59. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) provision of community and social welfare facilities in Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) was planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole New Town in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and departmental advice;
- (b) within TCV, a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site in Area 36A was reserved for a government, institution or community (GIC) complex, in which elderly care facilities could be accommodated as need arose. A residential care home for the elderly and neighbourhood elderly centre were planned in the proposed public housing developments in Areas 39 and 42 within the adjoining Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) OZP; and
- (c) flexibility had already been allowed in the “V” and “R(C)” zones to provide for ‘Residential Institution’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ under the planning application mechanism.

“V” zone boundary of Ngau Au Village

60. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the size of “V” zone at Ngau Au Village was insufficient. The inclusion of areas within the village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) of Ngau Au Village into the “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zone would deprive the development right of indigenous villagers; and
- (b) the “V” zone boundary of Ngau Au Village should be enlarged.

61. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) in designating the "V" zone, considerations including the existing 'VE', outstanding Small House applications, the existing settlement pattern, 10-year Small House demand forecast, the topography and the natural environment had been taken into account. The concerned "CA" zone covered relatively large and intact mature woodland with records of floral species of conservation interest. The "CA" zone was considered appropriate to better preserve the ecologically important woodlands and Tung Chung Stream;
- (b) 'Agricultural Use' was always permitted within the "CA" zone, there was no deprivation of the development rights of the indigenous villagers; and
- (c) cross-village application was allowed for villages under the same Heung. The proposal to enlarge the "V" zone boundary of Ngau Au Village was not supported as there was still land available in other "V" zones within Tung Chung Heung to meet the Small House demand.

Residential Development

62. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) there was inadequate provision of transport and community facilities. The development intensity and population of TCNTE should be reduced;
- (b) the proposed development intensities for housing sites in TCV were too low. There was an imbalance housing mix and a disparity of development intensities between public housing and private housing. The high-rise public housing blocks in the inland, being located on the eastern side of the Tung Chung Stream estuary, were out of context with the village setting in Tung Chung Valley. An asymmetric built form, instead of a stepped development profile, was created for Tung Chung West (TCW); and

- (c) a low-carbon community should be established.

63. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the provision of community, social welfare, recreational and educational facilities was planned in a holistic manner in accordance with the requirements under HKPSG and based on the advice of the relevant departments. A comprehensive transport network had been planned to serve TCNTE. There were two new railway stations proposed to connect Tung Chung with other parts of the territory, Tai Ho Interchange, Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) and new public transport interchanges (PTIs);
- (b) TCNTE was one of the land supply sources to meet territorial housing demand in medium and long-term. Taking into account the ecologically sensitive areas and rural character of the area, only low-density developments were proposed in TCV;
- (c) different housing choices were made available for different social groups. A public/private housing split of about 63:37 was currently adopted for TCNTE as a whole which was generally in line with the public/private housing split of 60:40 as recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee;
- (d) the concerned high-rise public housing blocks were located within the area covered by the Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) OZP, rather than the TCV OZP. In general, higher plot ratio (PR) and building height (BH) were allowed for public housing development to achieve more efficient use of government resources. Only sites which were suitable for high-density developments would be considered for public housing use. The two proposed public housing sites were adjacent to the mountain backdrop and located along Tung Chung Road with relatively good accessibility. TCV

OZP covered the area to the west of Tung Chung Stream where the indigenous villages were located, a lower stepped height profile descending from the mountain side towards the waterfront was considered more appropriate in the rural setting; and

- (e) railway system was planned as a backbone of the passenger transport system in TCNTE and a comprehensive network of cycle tracks and pedestrian walkways was also planned to reduce private vehicles and green house gas emission.

Specific Proposals

64. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) R10's land use proposal in respect of his Site A:
 - mangrove at Sha Tsui Tau should be included into the OZP and zoned "Coastal Protection Area" ("CPA");
 - the boundary of the "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") zone in Areas 36A and 36B should be extended to cover part of the "O" zone in Area 36E and the "CPA" zone in Area 98A. Hau Wong Temple fell within a "G/IC" zone of substantial size. The "O" zone in Area 36E surrounding the "G/IC" zone for Hau Wong Temple covered a large area and its eastern portion on private land was neither used for festival activities nor accessible to the public. The rezoning would allow the private land owner a reasonable use of the private land and meet the community need;
 - 'Flat' use should be added under Column 2 of the Notes for the "G/IC" zone to allow a reasonable use of the private land and keep the Notes consistent with those of the other "G/IC" zones; and

- two non-building areas (NBAs) should be added to safeguard the scenic view from Hau Wong Temple towards the Tung Chung Bay and to act as a buffer to protect mangrove and stream course from future development of the “G/IC” site. The NBAs could be up to 15m wide as required by the Government;

(b) R10’s land use proposal in respect of his Site B:

- the “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Pond” (“OU (Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Pond)”) site in Area 45D and the “CPA” site in Area 98D should be partly rezoned to “R(C)2” and partly to “OU (River Park)”;
- the original proposed stormwater and treatment ponds should be relocated underground to the “Open Space” (“O”) site in Area 80 which should be rezoned to “O(1)” with ‘Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Pond’ use added under Column 1 use in the Notes of the “O(1)” zone;

(c) R11 had the following proposals in relation to his sites:

- Area 60 should be rezoned from “R(C)2” to “R(C)1” with corresponding increase in PR and BH. ‘Shops and Services’ use in “R(C)” zones should be allowed;
- the two NBAs of 20m and 30m in Areas 60 and 71A should be removed; and
- areas that were unnecessary for “OU (Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Ponds)” use should be rezoned to other appropriate land use zones.

65. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

R10's Site A

- (a) mangrove area in the river estuary at Sha Tsui Tau and Tung Chung Bay were located below high water mark. In preparing the statutory plans, the established practice was generally not to include area below high water mark, which was covered by seawater most of the time, into the OZP;
- (b) from urban design perspective, it was more desirable that Hau Wong Temple, a Grade 2 historic building, be enveloped by open space to allow flexibility for provision of space in respect of the temple's cultural and historical significance. The proposed rezoning of "CPA" area to "G/IC" was not in line with the conservation intention for the area. The proposed inclusion of the mangrove area at Sha Tsui Tau into the "CPA" zone while reducing its surrounding coastal portion of "CPA" zone might not be able to provide sufficient buffer for the mangrove;
- (c) according to the Master Schedule of Notes for the "G/IC" zone, 'Flat' was a use to be included in Column 2 only if it was appropriate to do so. It meant that whether 'Flat' use should be included in the "G/IC" zone should be assessed on a case-by-case basis taking into account the local circumstances. For the draft TCV OZP, the sites zoned "G/IC" were all designated/reserved for specific uses without any intention for residential development;
- (d) no visual material had been submitted to demonstrate the effectiveness of the visual corridor, and the "CPA" zone on the draft OZP was more appropriate to protect the mangrove area and streamcourse;

R10's Site B

- (e) the stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds in Area 45D were required to regulate stormwater peak flow and to treat the surface runoff from adjacent roads and developments. They were intended to serve as a buffer to protect

the ecologically important Tung Chung Stream. There were no assessments to substantiate that there would be no adverse impacts from the proposals for the additional residential population arising from the rezoning to “R(C)2”;

- (f) Area 80 was zoned “O” to reflect the existing temporary soccer field and plant nursery. Subject to further study, there might be scope to develop that area as part of the River Park. The proposal of putting stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds underground was not feasible;

R11’s Proposal

- (g) the proposed rezoning of Area 60 from “R(C)2” to “R(C)1” with higher PR and BH would have implications on the planning, environmental and infrastructural capacity which had not yet been properly tested by relevant technical assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) under the Tung Chung Study. As Area 60 was located near the waterfront and adjacent to the “CPA” zone along the river channel, a higher development intensity for the area would upset the design concept. ‘Shop and Services’ use in “R(C)” zone was a Column 2 use which might be permitted upon application to the Board;
- (h) the NBA in Area 60 was part of a breezeway acting as an extension of Yu Tung Road for a continuous air corridor towards Area 61A, and the NBA in Area 71A was an essential part of a view corridor to preserve the monumental visual relationship from Shek Mun Kap Village to Tung Chung Bay; and
- (i) the “OU(Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Ponds)” zone for the development of stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds was essential to alleviate flood risk along Tung Chung Stream. No technical assessment was submitted by the representer and no alternative measures were proposed to replace the said facilities.

Employment opportunities and economic development

66. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) the low-density private residential developments could not help the employment of the local residents who were mainly low-skill labour. There was a need for economic developments to provide more diversified job opportunities;
- (b) agricultural development could support local economy and provide more local job opportunities for low-skill workers. The land zoned for low-density development should be used for community farming to promote local economy and realize urban-rural symbiosis. The Government should resume private land to develop agriculture; and
- (c) part of Areas 36D, 36E and 98A near Hau Wong Temple should be rezoned from “G/IC”, “CPA” and “O” respectively to “Commercial” (“C”).

67. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) commercial developments including offices, retails, hotels and marina were to be provided in TCNTE and diversified employment opportunities would be created. Other development projects in the surroundings (e.g. Third Runway System of the Hong Kong International Airport, Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities of Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau Bridge, North Commercial District and Sunny Bay) would also bring more jobs to Tung Chung;
- (b) according to the Tung Chung Study and site investigation, majority of the agricultural land in TCV area was abandoned farmland and/or unmanaged orchards. Appropriate zonings were formulated on the draft TCV OZP with reference to the existing character and land uses. Relevant departments including Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) had

also been consulted on the ecological value and rehabilitation potential of the agricultural land in the area. The concerned departments had not indicated any policy or plan to resume private land for government-led agricultural development in the area. 'Agricultural Use' was always permitted within the "V" and "Green Belt" ("GB") zones; and

- (c) the "G/IC" zone in Area 36D was currently in use by the Tung Chung Outdoor Recreation Camp and Area 36E was an existing open space. The "CPA" was intended to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and sensitive coastal natural environment with a minimum of built environment. Furthermore, "C" sites were proposed in Areas 38A, 38B and 38C to capitalise on their proximity to the proposed TCW Railway Station and PTI.

Ecological conservation and environmental concerns

68. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

Adverse impacts of developments

- (a) the proposed residential and village type developments would affect the ecology and the natural environment. Species of conservation importance and native mature and large trees were found in the area. Active farm land was found in the "V" zone;
- (b) the Habitat Map of the approved EIA report omitted two streamcourses in Mok Ka and Shek Lau Po. It would result in an inappropriate land use zoning of the OZP. The streamcourses and woodland within "V" zone should be rezoned to "CA" or "GB(1)";
- (c) the habitat of the fireflies in Shek Lau Po might be destroyed by future village type developments in the "V" zone. Some areas in Shek Lau Po originally proposed for "Agriculture" ("AGR") zone in the Tung Chung Study but were zoned "V" in the OZP;

- (d) Area 61A was largely an orchard with Romer's Tree Frog. It was originally proposed for "GB" zone on the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) of the Tung Chung Study were zoned "R(C)2" on the OZP. The ecology in Area 61A was linked to the eco-system of TCV and Tung Chung Bay. Area 61A should be reverted to "GB";
- (e) proposed commercial and PTI developments at Area 38A would encroach onto the mangroves on the western bank of Wong Lung Hang estuary. The proposed PTI in Area 38A should be relocated to the "G/IC" zone in Area 107 or the "Residential (Group A)1" ("R(A)1") zone in Area 39 on the draft TCTC OZP; and
- (f) the proposed roads, fencing of the proposed stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds in Area 45B and existing illegal bridges would intercept and block the potential wildlife corridors. A wildlife corridor fell within the "V" zone of Mok Ka Village while another one near Shek Mun Kap was very narrow.

69. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the environmental and ecological issues of the TCNTE project had been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA for TCNTE to confirm its compliance with the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) requirements. There would be no reclamation in Tung Chung Bay to preserve the marine habitats. Only sites of low ecological value were for low-density residential development;
- (b) the Habitat Map in the EIA report only showed the main stream courses while the concerned 'stream courses' were very small in size. Preservation of trees and streamcourse in "V" zone would be overseen by relevant government departments during Small House Grant application;

- (c) there was no published data/official report on fireflies at Shek Lau Po. The concerned areas in Shek Lau Po were abandoned farmland and/or unmanaged orchards with only limited agricultural activities at the peripheral of the existing village, and 'Agricultural Use' was always permitted in "V" zone;
- (d) the majority of the "R(C)2" site in Area 61A was covered by orchard and abandoned farmland which was ranked as having low ecological value and Romer's Tree Frog was recorded outside the concerned "R(C)2" site, but within the nearby "CPA" zone. Besides, as an approval condition of the EIA for TCNTE, a detailed Habitat Enhancement and Translocation Plan for the amphibian species of conservation importance, including Romer's Tree Frogs that would be affected by the TCNTE project, would be submitted to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) for approval before commencement of construction works at TCW. To meet public views received in Stage 3 Public Engagement of Tung Chung Study that areas in TCV with low ecological value should be used for residential development to meet the strong housing demand in Hong Kong, the area in Area 61A covered with abandoned farmland or unmanaged orchard was recommended for low-density residential development while the remaining area covered with reed and mangrove which was of ecological value was retained as "GB" zone on the draft OZP;
- (e) as shown in the approved EIA, the proposed commercial and PTI developments at Area 38A would not encroach onto any mangroves including those at Wong Lung Hang outlet. The public housing development at Area 39 was already under construction and there was no scope to include the PTI in the site; and
- (f) the road network proposed for TCV had been minimised taking into account the natural and rural environment of the area. As for the concerns that the surrounding fencing of the proposed stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds might block the passage of wildlife, the detailed design of the facilities would take into account the additional functions as habitats for the wildlife according to the approved EIA Report. The Tung Chung Stream together

with its buffer zone which were zoned “CA” or “OU(River Park)” would serve as accesses between habitats.

Conservation Zonings

70. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) a recommended DPA Plan was submitted by the joint green groups with the following proposals:
- a “Site of Special Scientific Interest” (“SSSI”) covering river courses and banks of Tung Chung Stream (30m on either side of major course and 20m for tributaries) and Tung Chung Bay should be designated. Mudflat and backshore of Tung Chung Bay should be zoned “CPA”;
 - the River Nature Park should be extended to the western section of Tung Chung Stream. The private lots concerned should be resumed and the River Park should be managed by the Government; and
 - the Wong Lung Hang area should either be covered by a DPA Plan or included as Country Park Extension.

71. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the same recommended DPA Plan was submitted in relation to the EIA report and the previous draft DPA Plan. The proposals had already been taken into account in preparing the draft OZP;
- (b) the AFCD currently had no plan to zone the streamcourse or its riparian zone as “SSSI”. Tung Chung Stream and its riparian area of 20m to 30m wide were already zoned “CA” whereas the coastal areas of Tung Chung Bay were zoned “CPA”;

- (c) “OU(River Park)” was designated along the eastern section of Tung Chung Stream. The streamcourses in the western section were narrow and ran along mostly agricultural land/less disturbed natural habitats. River Park was for recreational use of the public and might attract large influx of visitors which was incompatible with the rural setting of the western tributary area. Moreover, the rural roads could not cope with a large influx of visitors. “CA” zoning was more appropriate to provide buffer for protecting the Stream and to conserve its ecological integrity. The continuous zoning of “CPA” along the coast of the estuary of Tung Chung Stream and the “CA” and “OU(River Park)” zones along the stream and its riparian zone were considered appropriate to serve as a buffer to protect Tung Chung Stream and its estuary; and
- (d) the Wong Lung Hang area was mainly government land and the only access was via a single-lane service road of the Water Supplies Department (WSD). Vehicular access to the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream was restricted rendering the area subject to a relatively low development threat. Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian area of 30m wide had already been zoned “CA”.

Tung Chung Stream and Woodland

72. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) the ecology and the value of Tung Chung Stream should be considered as a whole river system. Designating only the river estuary area as “CPA” had limited value to the conservation of Tung Chung Stream and the “CPA” would become commercialized. All private land lots in Tung Chung River Valley should be resumed and managed by the Government as public open space or River Nature Park; and
- (b) the zonings of *fung shui* woodlands were not consistent with some fell within “V” zone. Without “CA” zoning, the woods would receive no proper

control against development and ecological vandalism. Some of them would be affected by “OU (Polder)” zoning. All *fung shui* woodlands and mature woodlands should be zoned “CA”.

73. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the Government would resume and clear the private land on a need basis planned for public works projects, public developments, carry out site formation works, and provide infrastructure. The Drainage Services Department (DSD) would take up the management of the River Park; and
- (b) the majority of *fung shui* woods were covered by “CA” and “GB” zones. Only a minor area of *fung shui* woods would be unavoidably lost due to space constraints in Shek Mun Kap Road widening and the construction of polder system for flood protection.

Eco-tourism and eco-education, eco-vandalism and planning controls

74. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) land around Tung Chung estuary should be designated as “OU (Conservation, Ecotourism and Ecological Education)” ;
- (b) there was a lack of land use control and enforcement power against waste dumping, discharge of waste water, incompatible development, etc. Tin Sam/San Tau Beach SSSI area which was of high ecological value should be included in a DPA Plan or in the Country Park extension;
- (c) the mudflat and mangroves along the coastline of Tung Chung Bay should be included in the OZP and zoned “CPA”; and

- (d) the Notes of the OZP should be amended to prohibit or control uses and activities with adverse ecological and environmental impacts.

75. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) education and research uses could be accommodated in the proposed River Park. Under the "OU(River Park)" zone, 'Field Study/Education/Visitor Centre' use was always permitted. The tourism and recreational potential in TCV was being studied under the "Recreation and Tourism Development Strategy for Lantau – Feasibility Study". Eco-tourism proposals would be put forward to capitalize on the natural and cultural heritage assets of TCV;
- (b) with the publication of the draft DPA Plan covering the TCV area on 21.8.2015, the Planning Authority might take enforcement and regulatory actions against unauthorized developments in respect of land use in TCV. Tin Sam fell outside TCNTE. Owing to its remote location and the lack of existing vehicular access and large scale developments planned in the surroundings, the area was subject to relatively low development threat and hence there was no urgent need for preparing a statutory plan covering the area for planning control purpose;
- (c) under the established practice in drawing up the planning scheme boundary of OZP, only coastal areas above the high water mark would be included. Furthermore, the "CPA" zone was designated along the coastline of Tung Chung Bay to offer planning controls to protect the ecology of the bay; and
- (d) there were already adequate provisions under the Notes of the draft OZP to prohibit or control uses and activities with potential adverse impact on the ecology and environment as follows:

- under the Notes of the “GB”, “CA” and “CPA” zones, diversion of streams, filling of land/pond or excavation of land required planning permission from the Board;
- according to the covering Notes of the draft OZP, temporary uses for open storage and port back-up purposes were prohibited in “CA” and “CPA” zones, and other temporary uses or development not exceeding a period of three years required permission from the Board; and
- according to the covering Notes of the OZP, any material change of existing uses (except minor alteration and/or modification to the development of the land or building in respect of such use which was always permitted) must be permitted in terms of the draft OZP.

Air, sewerage and drainage pollution

76. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) measures should be suggested to improve the air quality for the growing population. The low-density private residential developments would increase the number of private car ridership leading to environmental pollution and destruction of the natural environment; and
- (b) no sewerage or stormwater of developed areas should be drained into the river courses and estuary of Tung Chung Stream. The connection rate of communal sewers to village houses should be of a satisfactory level.

77. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) according to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the potential air quality impacts

from the proposed reclamation and construction and operation phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under the EIAO;

- (b) a series of stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds was proposed in TCV to treat surface runoff from adjacent roads and developments before discharging to Tung Chung Stream;
- (c) new public sewerage system would be provided to serve the proposed development in Tung Chung and the existing village areas in TCV; and
- (d) with respect to geotechnical stability, no insurmountable problems had been identified and appropriate mitigation measures had been proposed.

Other Aspects

78. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) some considered that the Government should tackle the serious flooding problem in TCV while some considered that it was not worthwhile to build polders for low-rise residential developments at the cost of the natural ecology. The polder system and stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds were very land extensive. There was lack of information to justify for not adopting the traditional drainage system approach;
- (b) the existing burial areas of villagers of San Tau Village would be affected by the “GB” zoning; and
- (c) there had been major destructive landslides incidents occurred in Tung Chung, in particular, the eastern slope of Nei Lak Shan to the west of TCV was prone to geotechnical risks. Geotechnical stability should be taken into account. The existence of marble caverns and land fault in Tung Chung Bay might result in high building construction cost and a detailed geotechnical investigation should be carried out.

79. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) it was not desirable to employ the traditional method of widening and straightening the river with concrete river bank or provision of large underground floodwater storage tank as in the urban area for flood control as it would adversely affect the river ecosystem. Therefore, a sustainable urban drainage system comprising plodder system and stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds which was more environmentally friendly in design was adopted in TCV area for flood control and pollution control to Tung Chung Stream/Bay;
- (b) according to the Notes of the OZP, existing permitted burial ground within the "GB" zone would not be affected, while new burial ground required planning permission from the Board; and
- (c) according to the geotechnical and natural terrain hazard assessments carried out in the Tung Chung Study, there were no insurmountable geotechnical problems for the new development areas in TCNTE. Suitable types of foundation could be employed to tackle the local ground conditions of individual sites.

Comments on Representations

80. The Meeting noted that the views of the 87 comments received were generally similar to those of the representations and the responses to the comments were similar to those to the representations as detailed above. With regard to C20's boardwalk proposal through TCV and across the mudflat at Tung Chung Bay, Members noted that the coastal areas at the estuary of Tung Chung Bay was zoned "CPA", and 'Nature Trail' and 'Nature Reserve' uses were always permitted in the "CPA" zone.

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

81. The Chairman invited Members to express their views on various aspects of concerns raised by the representers and commenters.

Residential Development at the estuary of Tung Chung Stream

82. Two Members raised questions about the development scale of the two residential developments at the estuary of Tung Chung Stream. The meeting noted that according to paragraph 64(b) of the minutes of the hearing on 29.9.2016, about 1,800 private residential flats would be provided in the area covered by TCV OZP. According to the Explanatory Statement of the TCV OZP, “R(C)2” zone had a total area of 19.31 ha, and there were seven “R(C)2” sites. It was noted that the development scale of the two concerned “R(C)2” sites would not be massive and would not result in unacceptable urban design impact.

Western Section of Tung Chung Stream

83. A Member agreed that it might not be necessary to designate the western section of Tung Chung Stream as River Park, but asked whether there were any measures to ensure that the water quality of the stream would not be affected by the nearby developments.

84. In response, Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, said that the area was zoned “CA”, and the TCV area was previously covered by a DPA Plan which would empower the Planning Authority to take enforcement action against unauthorized development. Unlike the eastern section of Tung Chung Stream which was close to the town centre and designated as River Park for conservation and public recreational purpose, the western section was farther away from the town centre and would have less influx of visitors. The polder system would to a certain extent separate the stream from the surface discharge of the developments and offer protection to the stream water.

85. The Vice-chairman said that the design of the River Park should put emphasis on public accessibility to facilitate public enjoyment. The stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds were an innovative approach to address the flooding risk and were appreciated, but the design of the ponds should be in harmony with the rural setting of the area.

86. Members noted and agreed with the responses to the grounds and proposals of the representations and comments as detailed in paragraphs 6.16 to 6.69 and 7.1 to 7.3 of the Paper as well as those made during the hearing and deliberation sessions. Members also agreed that

there were no insurmountable concerns that had not been addressed, which necessitated the amendment of the draft OZP.

87. After deliberation, the Board agreed to note the supportive views of Representations No. R1, R2, R11 (part), R28 (part), R30 (part), R32 (part) and R33 (part).

88. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining views of Representations No. R11, R28, R30, R32 and R33 and the views of Representations No. R3 to R10, R12 to R27, R29, R31, R34 to R38 and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“ For all Representations

- (a) the overall objective of Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) is to extend the existing TCNT into a distinct community which can meet housing, social, economic, environmental and local needs. The Tung Chung East reclamation is one of the important land supply sources to meet territorial housing and economic needs in medium to long-term. The environmental and ecological issues of the proposed reclamation and new development under the TCNTE project have been properly assessed and addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report to confirm its compliance with the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) requirements and was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) in April 2016. Various technical assessments have also been conducted to confirm that the project is acceptable in terms of traffic, infrastructure, landscape, air ventilation and visual impacts;

Additional reasons on specific grounds and proposals

Private columbarium development in “Village Type Development”(“V”) zone (R3 to R7 and R9)

- (b) existing recognised villages and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion are zoned “V”. ‘Columbarium’ use is considered not in line with the planning intention of the area for village-type development and not compatible with the rural character of the area. There is also no information to substantiate that there

will be no adverse traffic and environmental impact. The proposed rezoning to “Institution or Community” to reflect the existing columbarium in Nim Yuen is not supported;

Provision of elderly care facilities (R3, R4, R7 and R8)

- (c) the provision of community and social welfare facilities in TCTNE are planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and based on the advice of the relevant departments. Should there be additional need in future, ‘Residential Institution’ and ‘Social Welfare Facility’ uses are Column 2 uses which may be permitted on application to the Board within “V” and “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) zones. There is no strong justification to rezone the “V” zone in Nim Yuen Village and the “R(C)2” zone in Area 67 for the provision of community and social welfare facilities;

Objection to the “V” zone boundary of Ngau Au Village (R12)

- (d) the boundary of the “V” zone is drawn up having regard to the existing ‘Village Environs’, outstanding Small House applications, the existing settlement pattern, 10-year Small House demand forecast, the location topography and the natural environment. In view of the ecological value of the surrounding areas, there is no strong justification to expand the “V” zone;

Objection to the “Green Belt”(“GB”) zone covering the San Tau Village burial ground (R14)

- (e) the existing burial grounds within the “GB” zone would not be affected while new burial ground requires planning permission by the Board;

Employment opportunities and economic development (R13, R15 to R24, R29, R35 and R38)

- (f) the provision of commercial development in TCNTE including offices, retail, hotels and marina will create diversified employment opportunities. Other development projects in the surroundings (e.g. Three Runway System of the Hong Kong International Airport, Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities, Topside

Development in the Northern Commercial Development on airport island and Sunny Bay) will also bring more jobs to Tung Chung. Local retail uses are also planned along the Linear Parks and the main streets to provide opportunities for local residents to open up small businesses. TCNTE will create an additional 40,000 job opportunities;

- (g) 'Agricultural Use' is always permitted within the "V" and "GB" zones. The Government has no prevailing policy for resuming private land for agricultural use;
- (h) the "Commercial" ("C") sites proposed in Areas 38A, 38B and 38C will function as the local shopping centre serving the immediate neighbourhood and to capitalise on the locational advantage in proximity to the proposed Tung Chung West Railway Station. There is no concrete development proposal nor technical and environmental assessment submitted to justify the proposal to rezone part of Areas 36D, 36E and 98A from "Government, Institution or Community"("G/IC"), "Open Space"("O") and "Coastal Protection Area"("CPA") respectively to "C";

Overloading of carrying capacity of Tung Chung (R11, R29, R34 and R35)

- (i) a comprehensive transport network has been planned to serve TCNTE. The design capacity of Tung Chung Line, with the two new railway stations at Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, can accommodate the planned population upon full development of TCNTE. Tai Ho Interchange and Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) connecting Tung Chung East and North Lantau Highway are also proposed to relieve future traffic demand. Besides, Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link to be completed in 2018 will offer an alternative route and ease the traffic flow of the North Lantau Highway. In terms of internal connectivity, there are district and local distributors planned in Tung Chung Valley under the Tung Chung Study;
- (j) the provision of community, social welfare, recreational and educational facilities in TCTNE is planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and based on the advice of the relevant departments;

Residential Development (R10, R11, R15 to R19, R22 to R24, R29, R35 and R38)

- (k) different types of residential development are planned in TCNTE to ensure a balanced housing mix and different housing choices. The public/private housing split adopted in TCNTE is generally in line with that recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee. The proposed densities of residential developments have taken into account individual site characteristics, local circumstances, ecological and environmental implications, relevant planning and urban design considerations, infrastructural capacity;

- (l) the concept of low-carbon city has been adopted in TCNTE in which railway system is planned as a backbone of passenger transport to reduce demand for private vehicles. Comprehensive networks of cycle tracks, cycle parking facilities and pedestrian walkways are also planned. Food waste facilities within the Tung Chung Valley are subject to review in the detailed design stage;

Specific land use proposals of R10

Site A

- (m) the proposed extension of “G/IC” zone is inappropriate as it will encroach onto the adjacent “O” and “CPA” zones. There is no strong justification for the proposed extension and insufficient information to support the two proposed NBAs;

- (n) addition of ‘Flat’ use in Column 2 of the Notes for the “G/IC” zone is not in line with the planning intention for the “G/IC” site in Area 36A which is designated for a government, institution or community (GIC) complex to accommodate social welfare and other GIC facilities;

Site B

- (o) the proposed rezoning of “Other Specified Use” (“OU”) annotated “Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Ponds” site in Area 45D and the “CPA” site to “R(C)2” and “OU(River Park)” is not justified. The proposed stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds are required to regulate stormwater peak flow and to treat surface runoff from adjacent roads and developments and is not feasible to be relocated underground. There is no technical and environmental assessments to substantiate that there is no adverse impacts arising from the rezoning;

Specific land use proposals of R11

- (p) the proposed rezoning of Area 60 from “R(C)2” to “R(C)1” is not substantiated by technical and environmental assessments and is not acceptable from urban design perspective. The “R(C)” zone is intended for low-rise, low-density residential developments where commercial uses may be permitted on application to the Board. ‘Shop and Services’ use is a Column 2 use which may be permitted with or without conditions on application to the Board;
- (q) there is no justification nor visual and technical assessment to support the proposed removal of the two non-building areas in Areas 60 and 71A which function as breezeways and/or air ventilation corridors;
- (r) the “OU(Stormwater Attenuation and Treatment Ponds)” zone forms part of the sustainable drainage and flood prevention system in Tung Chung Valley. The proposed rezoning to other zones is not supported by any technical assessment and there is no alternative measures proposed;

Ecological conservation and environmental concerns (R9, R11 and R18 to R38)

- (s) the environmental and ecological issues of the proposed new developments under the TCNTE project have been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA report to confirm its compliance with the EIAO requirements and was approved by EPD in April 2016. In particular, ecological surveys have been conducted in formulating the land use proposals in the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) under the Tung Chung Study which forms the basis of the draft Tung Chung Valley Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Sites are identified as suitable for low-rise, low-density residential development taking account of their relatively low ecological value and the rural and scenic character of the area;
- (t) the proposed conservation related zonings such as “CA”, “CPA” and “GB” at various locations, taking into account the ecological function and environmental conditions of the areas including the riparian zone of Tung Chung Stream, coastal area of Tung

Chung Bay and mature woodlands in the Tung Chung Valley are considered appropriate from nature conservation perspective.

- (u) the boundary of “V” zone of Shek Lau Po is drawn up having regard to the existing ‘VE’, outstanding Small House applications, the existing settlement pattern, 10-year Small House demand forecast, the location topography and the natural environment. The peripheral of the existing village is mainly abandoned farmland and unmanaged orchards with only limited agricultural activities. ‘Agricultural Use’ is always permitted within “V” zone;
- (v) the “OU(River Park)” is intended to protect and retain the existing natural landscape, ecological or topographic features of the area for preservation, flood prevention, educational and research purposes through the development of River Park and to separate sensitive natural environment of the Tung Chung Ecologically Important Stream from the adverse effects of development. The proposal for eco-tourism and eco-education can be considered within the River Park. The details of the proposed River Park for educational and research purposes will be studied in the detailed design stage;
- (w) the Tung Chung Valley area has already been covered by a Development Permission Area Plan since 21.8.2015 which was subsequently replaced by the draft OZP on 8.1.2016. Enforcement can be undertaken by the Planning Authority against unauthorised developments in Tung Chung Valley;
- (x) Tin Sam/San Tau area is remote from Tung Chung with no existing vehicular access nor large scale development planned in the surroundings. The area is subject to relatively low development threat and there is no urgent need for a statutory plan covering the area;
- (y) according to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the potential environmental impacts from the proposed construction and operation phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under the EIAO; and

- (z) there are already adequate provision under the Notes of the draft OZP to prohibit uses/developments and activities with potential adverse impacts on ecology and environment. ”

Agenda Item 5

[Closed Meeting (Deliberation)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/21
(TPB Paper No. 10178)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Deliberation Session

89. The Chairman said that the representations and comments in respect of the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCTC/21 were heard on 4.10.2016. The draft minutes of the meeting which had been issued to Members on 11.11.2016 were confirmed at Agenda Item 1 of the meeting without amendments and the video recordings of the hearing sessions were sent to Members on 18.10.2016.

90. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests was reported at the hearing session on 4.10.2016, and recorded in paragraph 4 of the minutes on 4.10.2016 which was as follows:

Mr K.K. Ling - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee
(*as Director of Planning*) and Building Committee of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C Kwan - being a representative of the Director of Home
(*as Chief Engineer* Affairs who was a member of the Strategic Planning
(*Works*), Home Affairs Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of
Department) HKHA

- his close relative owning a property in Tung Chung Town Centre

- Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA)

- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealing with HKHA, and the being vice-chairman of The Conservancy Association (CA) (R24)

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu] having current business dealing with HKHA and
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho] Swire (mother company of Coral Ching Limited (R1))

- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealing with HKHA and her firm was a tenant of Swire

- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealing with Swire

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealing with Masterplan Limited (representing the Hong Kong Water Sports Council(R5)) and past business dealing with HKHA

- Mr Franklin Yu] having past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]

- Mr K.K. Cheung - having past business dealing with World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF)(R25)

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

Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative possibly owning a property in Tung Chung

91. 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 Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Dominic K.K. Lam, Mr K.K. Cheung and Professor T.S. Liu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Members also noted that interests of Mr Martin K.C. Kwan and Ms Janice W.M. Lai were indirect and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

92. The meeting noted that all the Members currently present at the meeting attended the hearing session for the draft TCTC OZP on 4.10.2016.

93. To facilitate the deliberation, the Secretary briefly recapitulated the background of the representations and comments in respect of the draft TCTC OZP as follows:

- (a) on 8.1.2016, the OZPs including the draft TCTC OZP which mainly incorporated land use proposals as recommended under the Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) Study (the Tung Chung Study) were exhibited for public inspection under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) during the statutory exhibition period, 28 representations and 81 comments on the representations in respect of the draft TCTC OZP were received.

Supportive Representation (R1)

94. The Secretary recapitulated that R1 had made the following major points in its written and oral submissions:

- (a) while the draft TCTC OZP in general and the rezoning of “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites to other zones to reflect the existing developments were supported, there were the following concerns:
- the proposed downzoning of Area 48 from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “Residential (Group B)3” (“R(B)3”) (under Amendment Item C) (from plot ratio (PR) 5 to 2) violated the current policy objective to increase the supply of housing land. The proposed building height (BH) of 55mPD was in conflict with the stepped BH profile. Area 48 was more suitable for high-density development than the neighbouring Area 23 which was rezoned from “Open Space” (“O”) to “R(B)” with a PR of 4. Area 48 should be retained for “R(A)” development with a PR of 5 and a BH with reference to Yat Tung Estate of 130mPD; and
 - the provision of community services and facilities should be strengthened to ensure that the entire Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) was self-contained and sustainable for the local community. Area 43, which was located between two “R(A)” zones and along Tung Chung Road, should be rezoned from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”).

95. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during Planning Department’s (PlanD’s) presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) the supportive views were noted;
- (b) Area 48 was located adjacent to Ma Wan Chung Village and at the foot of a knoll which was planned to be the future town park. The site was proposed for residential use with a PR of 2 and BH of 55mPD under the Tung Chung Study taking into account various considerations, in particular land use compatibility and the stepped height profile from the inland decreasing towards the waterfront;

- (c) the proposed increase in BH would create overshadowing effect on the adjacent village development in Ma Wan Chung. The proposed increase in development intensity would lead to population increase and demand for various infrastructure including traffic and sewerage provision etc. which had not been assessed in the Tung Chung Study;
- (d) according to the approved Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), the Fong Yuen area in Area 43 (under Amendment Item A1) was covered by wet abandoned agricultural land and provided habitats for wildlife, in particular the rare butterfly species and the endangered Romer's Tree Frog. The "GB" zone in which there was a general presumption against development was considered appropriate for the area; and
- (e) the provision of government, institution or community (GIC) facilities in the TCTNE were planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and based on the advice of the relevant departments.

Adverse Representations (R2 to R28)

Boundary adjustments to reflect existing uses and Country Park boundary

(Amendment Items B2, D1, D2, E1, F1, F2, G1, H, J and R3)

96. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) there was no clear justification for excising areas currently covered by the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park from the planning scheme area of the OZP (Amendment Item B2);
- (b) rezoning of open space or public space for development use would lead to the loss of vegetation/trees in the existing community and the surrounding "GB" zones, take away public and activity spaces, worsen the air pollution problem

and give rise to construction pollution. A detailed plan for re-allocation of open space should be provided. The open spaces should be retained and planned according to the needs of the residents. If rezoning of “Open Space” (“O”) was necessary, the sites should be used for small-scale public/elderly housing;

- (c) rezoning of the cycle parking areas under Amendment Items D2 and H1 would result in further privatization of public space and loss in cycle parking spaces;
- (d) for the area under Amendment Item H1, the number of cycle parking spaces should be reduced, and planting for improving air quality and seating places for people waiting at the terminus should be provided; and
- (e) the area under Amendment Item J should be rezoned for provision of a cycle parking area to create a bicycle-friendly community. An overall cycling path plan should be provided.

97. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) *Amendment Item B2* – only boundary adjustments to tally with the boundary of the Country Park. The excised areas would be under the control of the Country and Marine Parks Authority;
- (b) *Amendment Items D1, E1, F1, G1, F2 and R3* – minor boundary adjustments of the concerned sites to tally with the lease boundaries and to reflect the as-built situation and existing land features. Those amendments would not affect the existing vegetation, open spaces and recreational spaces nor generate any impact on the community, environment and air quality. Moreover, they would not affect the existing vegetation and trees in the area, and the small strips of land under those amendment items were not feasible for housing development;

- (c) *Amendment Item H1* - to reflect the as-built commercial development i.e. Citygate in accordance with the approved Master Layout Plan, and would not result in privatization of open space nor have any impact on the provision of cycle parking spaces, planting and seating places for people waiting at the terminus;
- (d) *Amendment Item D2* – a minor zoning boundary adjustment to reflect the existing road alignment and amenity area; and
- (e) *Amendment Item J* – for rezoning the site currently occupied by the existing Tung Chung Railway Station to “Other Specified Use” (“OU”) annotated ‘Railway Station’ (“OU(Railway Station)”). A comprehensive cycling network with adequate parking facilities had been proposed for the entire Tung Chung New Town and its extension area

Village, Residential and Commercial Developments

98. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

Residential development

- (a) *Amendment Item A1* - more housing sites to the west of Yat Tung Estate in Areas 32 and 33 should be provided, and the “O” zone in Areas 26 and 35 should be rezoned to “R(A)” or “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”);
- (b) the proposed residential development (in particular the “R(A)” sites in Areas 42 and 46) and village type development would generate noise, sewage and light pollution, affect natural landscape, hydrology and ecology of Tung Chung Stream, threaten the inhabited wildlife, impact the water quality of Tung Chung Stream, worsen the air pollution and geotechnical risks, and block the breezeway/view corridor in the area. The “R(A)” sites in Areas 42 and 46 would aggravate the existing traffic problem. “R(A)” sites in Tung Chung Valley (TCV) and Tung Chung Bay should be deleted;

- (c) *Amendment Item C* – the rezoning of various sites for low-density residential and village developments would result in loss of open space and vegetation and destroy the natural environment. Tree compensation should be provided. It should provide public housing development instead of low-density residential and village development;

“Village Type Development” (“V”) zone

- (d) the “V” zone boundary should be confined to the existing building structures and approved Small Houses;
- (e) the total area of the “V” zone should be extended by including the expansion of Wong Nei Uk Village as well as designating land to the west of Chek Lap Kok New Village and to the northeast of Ma Wan New Village currently zoned “GB” to “V”; and

Commercial development

- (f) *Amendment Item K* - the rezoning of Area 6 from “G/IC” to “Commercial (3)” (“C(3)”) was objected to as it would lead to traffic congestion at the road outside Exit A of Tung Chung MTR Station, where there would be insufficient space for a pick up and drop off area for the passengers, and the proposed building would have adverse impacts on visual, air ventilation and air quality of the area. Area 6 should be retained as an open area. If development was necessary, the BH should not be higher than that of Citygate, and more non-building areas (NBAs) should be reserved around the building.

99. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

Residential development

- (a) *Amendment Item A1* – area to the west of Yat Tung Estate was located along the waterfront with a mudflat coastline. Sensitive treatment to preserve the coastal area and the natural character of Tung Chung Bay was required. A “R(B)2” site for medium-density residential development in Area 33 was designated to the west of Yat Tung Estate and Area 32 was zoned “O” for a planned waterfront park. The “O” zone in Areas 26 and 35 were to reflect respectively the existing children playground and plant nursery;
- (b) taken into consideration the local context and the need for preservation of the TCV, only areas with low ecological value and high accessibility had been optimized to accommodate development needs. In fact, areas within TCV are designated for low-density and village developments only. For TCTC, Areas 42 and 46 were more disturbed and fragmented and thus of lower ecological value. Area 42 was designated as high-density residential development as it was adjacent to existing built-up area and site under development, and directly connected to Tung Chung Road. Area 46 was separated from the ecologically sensitive middle and southern sections of Fong Yuen by Shek Mun Kap Road. According to the approved EIA, there was no adverse ecological and environmental impact on the area arising from the proposed developments. According to the results of the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment for Tung Chung Study, no insurmountable impacts would be generated and mitigation measures would be implemented for the improvement of traffic infrastructure for the whole Tung Chung. Regarding the geotechnical stability of the Tung Chung West area, no insurmountable problems had been identified and appropriate mitigation measures had been proposed;
- (c) *Amendment Item C* -
- the proposed rezoning of “O” would not affect the provision of the planned town park and there would be adequate provision of public open space in Tung Chung upon completion of TCNTE. Besides, according to the EIA report of the Tung Chung Study, the concerned vegetation within the sites zoned for residential use was mainly secondary

woodland. Compensation woodland planting had been proposed under the EIA report;

- only two “R(B)” sites were proposed under Amendment Item C. The development parameters of the two “R(B)” sites at PRs of 2 and 4 and BHs of 55mPD and 75mPD had already taken the surrounding rural and natural environment into consideration;
- a public/private housing split of about 63:37 was currently adopted for the TCNTE as a whole, which was in line with the public/private housing split of 60:40 as recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee. There were already public housing developments including Yat Tung Estate, and the planned public housing developments in Areas 27, 39, 42 and 46 in the TCTC;

“V” zone

- (d) the boundaries of the “V” zones for the villages within the Area had been drawn up taking into account the existing building structures, the extent of village ‘environ’ (‘VE’), approved Small House applications, outstanding Small House application, building lots, local topography, site characteristics and estimated Small House demand;
- (e) the areas near Wong Nei Uk and Ma Wang New Village were overlooked by steep natural terrain and Natural Terrain Hazard Studies were required for any Small House development. The area adjoining Wong Nei Uk in Area 24B was an existing sewage pumping station and the area to the north in Area 48 was located further away from the existing village cluster and was identified suitable for medium-density residential development. As for Chek Lap Kok Village, the existing “V” zone reflected the resited village;

Commercial development

- (f) *Amendment Item K* - considering its prime location, proximity to the Tung Chung Railway Station, better utilization of land, and that the site was no longer required for government offices use, Area 6 was rezoned to “C(3)” for

commercial uses and was subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 5 and BH of 100mPD, which were in line with the development intensity and BHs of the surrounding developments such as Citygate;

- (g) the Visual Appraisal (VA) conducted for the proposed commercial development in Area 6 had confirmed that the proposed development would not create visual incompatibility with the surrounding areas, while the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation (EE) concluded that it would have some impact on its surroundings under the prevailing winds, it was recommended that the future developer should refer to both the design guidelines of Building Disposition and Building Permeability in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and follow the building separation requirement in the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines at the building design stage. Otherwise, a quantitative AVA study would be required to be conducted for minimising the impacts of the future development; and
- (h) a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) would be conducted under the Detailed Design and Construction Study of the Tung Chung Study to assess the traffic impact and recommend mitigation measures prior to the disposal of the site. A public transport interchange (PTI) would be reprovisioned on the ground floor of the future commercial development.

Ecological conservation and environmental concerns

100. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) there were doubts on the EIA for TCTCE including the heritage assessment, tree surveys, ecological value of the area, and concern on the ecological impacts of implementation/construction methods in the TCNTE development;

Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and Fong Yuen area

- (b) there were concerns on the conservation of Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and their riparian areas. The area covering 30m on either side of river courses, banks and tributaries of Tung Chung Stream and Wong Lung Hang, Tung Chung Stream estuary and Tung Chung Bay should be zoned “Site of Special Scientific Interest” (“SSSI”);
- (c) there was concern on the lack of land use control and enforcement power against eco-vandalism e.g. waste dumping, discharge of waste water, incompatible developments, etc.;
- (d) ‘conservation first before development’ strategy should be adopted;

Wong Lung Hang area

- (e) there was doubt on whether the conservation measures on local habitats and areas of ecological value, e.g. Wong Lung Hang Stream, an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS), and its riparian area would be effective. The “CA” and “GB” zones were not sufficient to protect Wong Lung Hang as there were private lands in its riparian area. The present road gate was located at upper stream section and would not be effective in deterring developments in lower and middle stream sections;
- (f) the Wong Lung Hang area should be excised from the draft TCTC OZP for incorporation into a new Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan or Country Park Extension; and
- (g) R4 objected to the inclusion of some private lands into the “GB” and “CA” zones and requested for land resumption by the Government.

101. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD’s presentation, and/or in answering Member’s enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) an EIA Report to assess the environmental impacts of TCNTE was submitted under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) on 8.10.2015 for approval. The EIA Report had been exhibited for public inspection from 4.12.2015 to 2.1.2016 and was approved with conditions by DEP on 8.4.2016. No insurmountable problems had been identified and appropriate mitigation measures had been proposed;

Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and Fong Yuen area

- (b) Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and their riparian area mostly fell outside the draft TCTC OZP. Ecological surveys had been conducted in formulating the land use proposals in the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) under the Tung Chung Study which formed the basis of the draft OZPs covering the areas. Reclamation in Tung Chung Bay had been avoided to preserve habitats of high ecological value including seagrass beds, mudflats and mangroves. Ecologically sensitive areas and habitats had been identified and zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) (in TCV OZP) with a view to protecting them from any development or impacts from developments nearby;
- (c) “GB” and “CA zones had been designated on the draft TCTC OZP for the protection of the natural environment;
- (d) ‘conservation first before development’ strategy had been adopted by designating conservation zonings at appropriate areas;

Wong Lung Hang area

- (e) Wong Lung Hang Stream was located to the south of the existing TCTC area and a large part of the Wong Lung Hang area was government land. The only access road to the area was a single-lane service road of the Water Supplies Department (WSD), i.e. Wong Lung Hang Road, with a gate restricting the vehicular access to the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream. Some private agricultural lands could be found along the bank of the Wong Lung Hang Stream but was mainly separated from Wong Lung Hang Road by

a vegetated slope. The area was considered not prone to environmental vandalism and with low development threat;

- (f) Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian area of 30m wide were already zoned “CA” to protect the stream from human activities, whereas the fringe of its riparian area, the surrounding area covered by dense vegetation and woodland, and area near the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park were zoned “GB” to preserve the habitats and natural environment of the area comprehensively;
- (g) inclusion of Wong Lung Hang into the TCTC OZP would not preclude it from being designated as Country Park in future; and
- (h) R4’s lots at Wong Lung Hang were densely vegetated and located along the banks of Wong Lung Hang Stream, an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS). “CA” and “GB” zones were considered appropriate to reflect the existing habitat condition and provide buffer areas to the EIS. Since the private land was primarily demised for agricultural purpose under the block government lease and ‘Agricultural Use’ was always permitted within the “GB” and “CA” zones, there was no deprivation of the rights of the landowners. The Government currently had no prevailing policies for resuming private land for conservation use in Tung Chung.

Inadequate Provision of Transport Facilities

102. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) there were concerns that the population increase in Tung Chung would overload the carrying capacity of the area such as air pollution and transport facilities; and
- (b) the ferry transport service provision should be strengthened.

103. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) a comprehensive transport network had been planned to serve the TCNTE. According to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the potential air quality impacts from the proposed reclamation and construction and operational phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under the EIAO; and
- (b) there were three existing piers in Tung Chung and there was existing ferry service provided between Tuen Mun, Tung Chung, Sha Lo Wan and Tai O at Tung Chung Development Pier. The Transport Department (TD) advised that the licensed ferry service would be strengthened, subject to passenger demand.

Inadequate provision of sports/recreational and Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities

104. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions :

- (a) a portion of "O" located immediately to the north of the "R(B)2" site in Area 33 should be rezoned to "OU(Water Sports Centre)". The whole area of Lantau Island did not have any water sports centre. Tung Chung Bay was an ideal location for use by small boats and water sports due to its protected water. Water sports involving naturally powered boats would have no significant impact on the ecologically sensitive Tung Chung Bay. The habitat map of the EIA report (2015) indicated that the proposed site was covered by orchard and urbanised/disturbed/waste land. The use of floating pontoons and special bridge system could help minimise impact on sea bed;

- (b) Hong Kong Water Sports Council indicated that it could develop and manage the proposed water sports centre in Area 33 as an alternative to be developed by the Director of Leisure and Cultural Services (DLCS); and
- (c) there were inadequate sports and recreational facilities and more GIC facilities should be provided in Tung Chung, including a local market for licensed hawkers.

105. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) Tung Chung Bay was considered an ecologically sensitive area and the representer had not submitted assessments to demonstrate the technical feasibility and environmental acceptability of the water sports uses;
- (b) DLCS had no plans to develop water sports centre in Tung Chung. As the site for the proposed water sports centre was zoned "O", any private development proposals for sports or recreational use at the site should obtain policy support from the Government on top of the relevant technical assessments; and
- (c) the provision of GIC facilities in the TCNTE was planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under HKPSG and based on the advice of the relevant departments. There were existing and planned wet markets in the TCTC. The relevant bureaux and departments would take appropriate follow-up action during the detailed design and implementation stage of TCNTE.

Other Aspects

106. The Secretary recapitulated that some representers and commenters had made the following major points in their written and oral submissions:

- (a) there were concerns on provision of waste collection and recycling facilities for the district; and
- (b) a comprehensive plan for Lantau should be prepared.

107. Members then went through the following responses of the relevant government departments given during PlanD's presentation, and/or in answering Member's enquiries at the hearing, and/or recorded in the Paper:

- (a) while the OZPs were mainly to designate the appropriate land use zonings for the development of Tung Chung, if considered necessary, specific requirements for waste collection and recycling could be incorporated in the building design of the new developments when implementing the land use proposals on the OZPs; and
- (b) a comprehensive planning strategy for Lantau was proposed by the Lantau Development Advisory Committee (LanDAC) in January 2016. The Government was considering the public views during the PE and targeted to announce the Blueprint for Lantau Development by the end of 2016.

Comments on Representations

108. The Secretary recapitulated that the views of the 81 commenters and their proposals were similar to those of the representations, and C13 proposed to rezone Area from "GB" to "G/IC" for a cycling hotel development. The meeting noted that the responses to the representations made in the above paragraphs were relevant, and C13's proposal was not related to any amendment item or representations.

109. The Chairman invited Members to express their views on various aspects of concerns raised by the representers and commenters.

Wong Lung Hang

110. A Member said that during a recent site visit, a lot of recreational activities at Wong Lung Hang including swimming, volleyball game and even clothes washing were observed. Any amendment to the OZP would not address the issue and education for proper use of the stream was more appropriate to prevent polluting the stream water.

111. Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, agreed that such kind of human activities could not be prohibited by the zoning on the OZP. A possible action was to fence off the stream to prevent human disturbance which, however, might not be desirable. The main concern of the Green Groups was dumping of soil/wastes, and they requested to cover Wong Lung Hang with a DPA plan to empower the Planning Authority to take enforcement action. Wong Lung Hang was only accessible via a single-lane road under the control of WSD, and had all along been maintained in its natural environment. Should there be unauthorized developments found to be prevailing in the area, the Government could liaise with the local villagers for relocating WSD's gate from its current upper stream section to the lower stream section. Actions could be taken against the unauthorized developments under other relevant legislations, such as Waste Disposal Ordinance, and land lease.

112. A Member noted that stream-side recreational activities were welcomed in overseas countries, and there was no reason that such activities should be prohibited in Hong Kong. It was not appropriate to fence off the stream to block public enjoyment of the natural environment.

113. In response to the Vice-chairman's enquiry, Mr K.K. Ling said that a DPA plan to cover Wong Lung Hang was considered not necessary as the area was remote with existing restriction on vehicular access, no developments were planned or envisaged in the surroundings and the area was subject to relatively low development threat. Similar to other urban fringe areas, "CA" and "GB" zonings should offer sufficient protection to Wong Lung Hang. If unauthorized developments were found to be prevailing, WSD's gate could be moved to the lower section of the road that provided the only access to Wong Lung Hang. The Secretary supplemented that Wong Lung Hang was already covered by an OZP. Under section 20(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance, 'The Board shall not designate as a development permission area any area that is or was previously included in a plan under this Ordinance, other than that a plan prepared under section 26'. The plan prepared under section 26 was interim DPA plan.

114. The Chairman noted that inclusion of Wong Lung Hang into the OZP would not preclude its inclusion into the Country Park if considered appropriate by the Country and Marine Parks Authority. Moreover, the latter decision was for that Authority, not the Board, to make.

115. Members noted and agreed with the responses to the grounds and proposals of the representations and comments as detailed in paragraphs 6.12 to 6.51, 7.1 and 7.2 of the Paper as well as those made during the hearing and deliberation sessions. Members also agreed that there were no insurmountable concerns that had not been addressed, which necessitated the amendment of the draft OZP.

116. After deliberation, the Board agreed to note the supportive views of Representation No. R1 (part).

117. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining views of Representation No. R1 and the views of Representations No. R2 to R28 and considered that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations for the following reasons:

“ For all Representations

- (a) the overall objective of Tung Chung New Town (TCNT) Extension (TCNTE) is to extend the existing TCNT into a distinct community which can meet housing, social, economic, environmental and local needs. The Tung Chung East reclamation is one of the important land supply sources to meet territorial housing and economic needs in medium to long-term. The environmental and ecological issues of the proposed reclamation and new development under the TCNTE project have been properly assessed and addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report to confirm its compliance with the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) requirements and was approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) in April 2016. Various technical assessments have also been conducted to confirm that the project is acceptable in terms of traffic, infrastructure, landscape, air ventilation and visual impacts;

Additional reasons on specific grounds and proposals

Concerns on the privatization of open space, loss of vegetation and reduction of recreational spaces and cycle parking spaces (R6 to R16, R21 and R28)

- (b) the amendments under Items D1, D2, E1, F1, F2, G1, H1, J and R3 are only minor boundary adjustments of the sites to tally with the lease boundaries and/or to reflect the as-built condition, and existing land features and road alignment. These amendments would not affect the existing vegetation, open spaces and recreational spaces and would not generate any adverse impact on community, environment and air quality. These amendments mainly involve small strip of lands, and are not feasible for the development of public housing and elderly public housing;
- (c) the rezoning of “Open Space”(“O”) for residential development under Amendment Item C will not affect the provision of the planned town park. There will be adequate provision of public open space in Tung Chung upon completion of TCNTE. According to the EIA Report of the Tung Chung Study, compensation woodland planting has been proposed under the EIA Report for TCNTE;
- (d) a comprehensive cycling network with adequate parking facilities are proposed for the entire TCNT and its extension area. The cycling routes have already been provided along the main roads within the existing Tung Chung Town Centre and will be linked up with the cycling routes planned within the TCNTE area as recommended under the Tung Chung Study;

Concerns on “Village Type Development (“V”) and residential development (R2, R3, R6, R7, R11 to R14 and R21)

- (e) the proposed development to the west of Yat Tung Estate including a waterfront park zoned “O” and a “Residential (Group B)2” “R(B)2”) site for medium-density residential development are appropriate in striking a balance between conservation and development and taking into account relevant planning considerations;
- (f) the rezoning to “V” and residential development under Amendment Item C have already taken into account relevant planning considerations and would not destroy the natural environment. Besides, appropriate private/public housing split has

been adopted for TCNTE and there are already public housing developments in the Area;

- (g) Amendment Item R3 is mainly zoning boundary adjustment to reflect the existing features including slopes, the existing village area and road. The concerned strip of land is very small and is not possible for the development of public housing and elderly public housing;
- (h) the boundaries of the “V” zone has been drawn up having regard to existing building structures, the extent of ‘Village Environs’, approved Small House applications, outstanding Small House application, building lots, local topography, site characteristics and estimated Small House demand. Areas of dense vegetation, active agricultural land, difficult terrain, ecologically sensitive areas and streamcourses have been avoided where possible;
- (i) the area adjoining Wong Nai Uk in Area 24B is an existing sewage pumping station and the area to the north in Area 48 is located further away from the existing village cluster and is identified suitable for medium-density residential development. Besides, the “V” zones for Ma Wan New Village and Chek Lap Kok New Village reflect the resited villages. The expansion of the “V” zones for these villages is not justified;

Ecological conservation and environmental concerns (R1 and R18 to R27)

- (j) the environmental and ecological issues of the TCNTE project had been properly assessed and addressed in the EIA Report for TCNTE to confirm its compliance with the EIAO requirements and was approved by DEPith conditions on 8.4.2016;
- (k) conservation zonings such as “Conservation Area”(“CA”) and “Green Belt”(“GB”) have been designated for the preservation of important habitats in Tung Chung Bay, Valley and Stream and Wong Lung Hung area and their riparian area and surrounding woodlands. There is general presumption against development under these zones. Besides, any diversion of streams, filling or excavation of land in the “GB” and “CA” zones require planning permission from the Board. The zonings are considered appropriate for conservation protection;

- (l) there is restricted access to the Wong Lung Hang area and majority of the area is government land. As no developments are planned or envisaged in the surroundings, the area is subject to relatively low development threat. The current “CA” zoning for Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian area is considered appropriate for conservation protection;
- (m) developments around Fong Yuen area are limited to Areas 42 and 46 taking into consideration the ecological value of the area and other relevant planning considerations. According the approved EIA, there is no adverse ecological and environmental impact to the area;
- (n) according to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, with the implementation of the recommended measures, the potential environmental impacts from the proposed construction and operation phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under EIAO;

Concern on the carrying capacity of Tung Chung (R6, R7, R11, R12, R21, R22 and R27)

- (o) according to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, the potential air quality impacts from the proposed reclamation and construction and operation phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under the EIAO. With appropriate mitigation measures, there will also be no insurmountable problems on the geotechnical stability of the Tung Chung West area;
- (p) a comprehensive transport network has been planned to serve TCNTE. According to the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment, the design capacity of the Tung Chung Line, with the two new railway stations at Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, can accommodate the planned population upon full development of TCNTE. Tai Ho Interchange and Road P1 (Tung Chung – Tai Ho Section) connecting Tung Chung East and North Lantau Highway are also proposed to relieve future traffic demand. Besides, Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link to be completed in 2018 will offer an alternative route and ease the traffic flow of the North Lantau Highway. In terms of internal connectivity, there are district and

local distributors planned in Tung Chung Town Centre Area under the Tung Chung Study;

- (q) the Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment carried out under the Tung Chung Study concludes that no insurmountable impacts would be generated and mitigation measures would be implemented for the improvement of traffic infrastructure for the whole Tung Chung;

Provision of sports/recreational and GIC facilities (R1, R5, R21 and R27)

- (r) the provision of sports/recreational and GIC facilities are planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and based on the advice of the relevant departments. The government, institution or community (GIC) uses are also carefully planned and located such that they are easily accessible by local residents and would serve the wider community. Additional sites are reserved for unforeseen GIC uses such as municipal market when need arises;
- (s) there is no strong justification for the proposed rezoning of part of “O” in Area 32 to “Other Specified Use”(“OU”) annotated “Water Sports Centre”. There is no technical assessment to demonstrate that the proposed water sports centre would not create adverse impacts on the ecology, environment and water quality of the Tung Chung Bay;
- (t) there are at present market facilities and other fresh provision retail shops such as the wet markets in Yat Tung Estate and Fu Tung Estate and two new public wet markets to be provided within new public housing developments for completion by 2016 and 2018 tentatively. Sites have already been reserved in TCNTE for possible development of a myriad of GIC facilities in which public markets are always permitted and could be developed should the need arise. Besides, retail facilities including markets could also be provided at “Residential (Group A)” sites for both public and private housing developments. Relevant bureaux and departments will work closely together to follow up the issue during the detailed design and implementation stage of TCNTE;

Boundary Adjustments on the Planning Scheme Area (R6 to R10 and R28)

- (u) Amendment Item B2 is boundary adjustment to tally with the boundary of the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park gazetted under the Country Parks Ordinance. The amendment is considered appropriate;

Rezoning of Area 48 (R1)

- (v) the site context and the planning circumstances of the area covering Area 48 and Area 23 have been changed after the review of the development in Tung Chung West under the Tung Chung Study. The area is no longer intended for high-density residential development. The proposed rezoning of Area 48 to retain “R(A)” zone is not compatible with the adjacent Ma Wan Chung Village and the planned town park. There is also no technical and environmental assessment to support the proposal;

Rezoning Area 6 from “G/IC” to “C(3)” (R6, R7 and R17)

- (w) the rezoning of Area 6 from “G/IC” to “Commercial (3)” for commercial development with a PR of 5 and BH of 100mPD is considered appropriate taking into account all relevant planning considerations. A Visual Appraisal (VA) and an Air Ventilation Assessment (Expert Evaluation) (AVA EE) have been carried out to evaluate the potential visual impact and air ventilation impact arising from the proposed commercial development. The future developer would be requested to implement mitigation measures as recommended in the VA and AVA EE to minimise the impacts to the surroundings. Traffic Impact Assessment will be conducted under the Detailed Design & Construction Study of the Tung Chung Study to assess the traffic impact and recommend mitigation measures prior to the disposal of the site. A Public Transport Interchange would be reprovided on the ground floor of the proposed commercial development; and

Deprivation of development right (R4)

- (x) the concerned lots are densely vegetated and located along the banks of Wong Lung Hang Stream, an Ecologically Important Stream. “CA” and “GB” zones are considered appropriate to reflect the existing habitat condition and provide buffer

areas to the EIS. As the lots owned by the representer within the site are primarily demised for agricultural purpose under the block government lease and ‘Agricultural Use’ is always permitted within “GB” and “CA” zones, there is no deprivation of the rights of the landowners. The Government currently has no prevailing policies for resuming private land for conservation use in Tung Chung. ”

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Vote of Thanks

118. The Secretary informed Members that this was the last meeting of the Town Planning Board meeting attended by Mr K.K. Ling, Director of Planning, prior to his retirement. Members expressed a vote of thanks to Mr Ling for his contributions to the Board and wished him a happy and healthy retirement.

119. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 7:15 p.m.