

**Minutes of the 1125<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 24.10.2016**

**Present**

Permanent Secretary for Development  
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Vice-chairman

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M Lai

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Miss Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Director of Planning

Mr K.K. Ling

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3

Transport and Housing Bureau

Mr Andy S.H. Lam

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr C.W. Tse

Director of Lands

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr T.Y. Ip

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Doris S.Y. Ting

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr T.C. Cheng

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open meeting]

**Confirmation of Minutes of the 1124<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 7.10.2016**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1124<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 7.10.2016 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

[Open Meeting]

**Matters Arising**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. There were no matters arising to be reported.

**General**

**Agenda Item 3**

[Open Meeting]

Review Study of Kai Tak Development  
(TPB Paper No. 10192)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

3. The Secretary reported that the Consultant of the Review Study of Kai Tak Development (the Review Study) was AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM). The following Members had declared interests in the item :

Mr K.K. Ling <i>(as Director of Planning)</i>	-	being a member of the Task Force on Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of the Harbourfront Commission (the Task Force)
Mr Ivan C.S. Fu	]	
Ms Janice W.M. Lai	]	having current business dealings
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	]	with AECOM
Dr C.H. Hau	]	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	]	
Professor S.C. Wong <i>(Vice-chairman)</i>	-	being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong where AECOM had business dealing with some colleagues and had sponsored some activities of the Department
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam Mr Franklin Yu	-	having past business dealings with AECOM

4. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since the item was only a briefing to Members on the Review Study, Members agreed that those who had declared interests should be allowed to stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

5. The following government representatives and consultants were invited to the meeting at this point :

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Mr Tom C. K. Yip    | - District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (DPO/K, PlanD)                    |
| Mr Peter S.K. Chui  | - Chief Engineer/Kowloon (1), Civil Engineering and Development Department (CE/K(1), CEDD) |
| Mr Vincent Au Yeung | - Technical Director, AECOM Asia Co. Ltd (AECOM)   |
| Mr Steven Wong      | - Associate, AECOM   |
| Mr Simon Lee        | - Senior Engineer, AECOM   |
| Ms Winona Ip        | - Senior Planner/Urban Designer, Urbis Limited (Urbis)                                     |

6. Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, PlanD said that a physical model of Kai Tak development was displayed for Members' reference. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yip made the following main points on the Review Study as outlined in the Paper :

- (a) the Kai Tak Development (KTD) had an area of about 320ha, comprising the ex-Kai Tak airport and the adjoining waterfront areas of Ma Tau Kok, Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling. In 1990s, the then South East Kowloon Development Study once proposed to create a large scale development in KTD with extensive reclamation in the adjacent water bodies. In view of the enactment of the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance in 1997 and subsequent judgment of the Court of Final Appeal in 2004, the planning of KTD was revisited. The "Kai Tak Planning Review" (KTPR) was then commissioned in 2004

with the objective to formulating a new development scheme for KTD without any reclamation proposal. A three-stage public engagement for KTD was carried out between 2004 and 2006. Based on the findings of KTPR, the land use proposals were formulated for KTD and incorporated into the Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/1. The OZP was approved by the Chief Executive in Council in 2007;

- (b) the approved OZP adopted a planning theme to establish KTD as the “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong”. Further amendments to the OZP were made in 2011 to incorporate the urban enhancement proposals to preserve the Lung Tsun Stone Bridge (LTSB) remnants and enhance the accessibility for KTD, among others;

#### *Urban Design Concepts*

- (c) the overall identity for Kai Tak was defined by its most prominent attribute, i.e. the heritage of the site and its green open spaces spreading throughout the urban areas and along the waterfront. The urban design principles were :
  - (i) Creating a Pedestrian Friendly Environment – the pedestrian experience would be enhanced through the continuous waterfront promenade, a heritage trail connecting the Metro Park, Sung Wong Toi Park, the neighbouring districts and open spaces. The possible future provision of an Environmentally Friendly Linkage System (EFLS) would reduce the vehicular traffic in Kai Tak and in turn enhance the pedestrian environment;

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

- (ii) Creating a Dynamic Skyline – with a diverse building types, varying building heights (BHs), and selective signature towers, a dynamic skyline would grace the face of Kai Tak. The overall BH profile would originate at a landmark tower with distinctive design in the Kai Tak City Centre and gradated towards the waterfront in the southeast along the Kai Tak River towards the South Apron area and the other in the south along the residential neighbourhoods towards the Kai Tak Sports Park (KTSP) to the Metro Park and the Ma Tau Kok waterfront area. The BH profile then rose again from the Runway Precinct to another landmark building at the Tourism Node;
  
- (iii) Celebrating the Views – the views to and from the Lion Rock and Fei Ngo Shan, the Victoria Harbour and Lei Yue Mun, and distant view of Hong Kong Island and Kowloon hinterland were emphasized. The vista extending from the Metro Park, the Central Boulevard, Tourism Node and Runway Park to Lei Yue Mun would be maintained to recap the flight take-off memory; and
  
- (iv) Creating “A Green Web for Sustainable Development” – a hierarchical landscape network of parks, gardens, civic squares and waterfront for integrating the residential and commercial neighbourhoods would be created. Through the “Stadium in the Park” concept (i.e. the integration of Metro Park with open spaces around the KTSP and Station Square) and interconnected green spaces within KTD and its adjoining districts, the landscape design would place a strong emphasis on aesthetics, human comfort and creating a sense of place;



*The Planning Areas*

- (d) The major sub-areas in KTD included :
- (i) Kai Tak City Centre (North Apron) – served by the Shatin to Central Link (SCL) Kai Tak Station and To Kwa Wan Station, that area was well-placed for premier commercial uses and integrated residential development. The Kai Tak Nullah, an existing drainage channel, would be rejuvenated into the Kai Tak River with unique pedestrian sidewalks which would form a distinguished open space;
  - (ii) KTSP – the future sports centre of the territory would be conveniently located for the use of the local residents, as well as residents from the remaining parts of Hong Kong and visiting sportsmen;
  - (iii) Metro Park – a precious sizeable harbourfront park which would act as a pleasant connection between the KTSP and the rest of the Runway;
  - (iv) South Apron – mainly occupied by a variety of commercial uses and undesignated “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) sites. That area could act as a transition between the Runway attractions and the surrounding Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong business areas, and help catalyze the regeneration of the areas;
  - (v) Runway Precinct and Tourism Node – that area was well-positioned for a characteristic residential/hotel belt. A landscaped deck would be provided above the road at the Central Boulevard in the middle serving as an open space as

well as a walkway. A tourism node was planned to capitalize on the harbour views at the Runway tip; and

- (vi) Ma Tau Kok, Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling Waterfronts – a continuous landscaped promenade connecting To Kwa Wan, Ma Tau Kok, Kai Tak, Kwun Tong and Cha Kwo Ling waterfronts was planned. Apart from providing pleasant public access to the harbourfront, it would act as key green connectors linking up individual open spaces, residential areas and surrounding areas;
- (e) since the adoption of the planning theme for KTD in 2007, a number of developments had been completed, including two public rental housing developments (Kai Ching and Tak Long Estates), the Cruise Terminal, government buildings, a subsidized housing scheme (煥然壹居), Kai Tak Community Hall and primary schools. The Hong Kong Children Hospital, some private housing developments, community facilities and infrastructure were under construction;

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) since the last approval of the OZP in 2012, there had been new circumstances and development opportunities which warranted a review of the planning for KTD with regard to the established planning framework. They included :
  - (i) government's policy of optimising the development potential of developable land in the urban area including the KTD to respond to the acute demand for housing land;
  - (ii) the initiatives taken by the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) of the Development Bureau to transform Kowloon East (KE), covering KTD and the business areas of Kowloon

Bay and Kwun Tong, into a Core Business District 2 (CBD2) to sustain Hong Kong's economic development. The proposed development of the "Kai Tak Fantasy" (KTF) at the tip of the runway as a world-class tourism and entertainment hub was announced in the 2013 Policy Address;

- (iii) during the construction of the SCL To Kwa Wan Station in 2013, remnants of the Song-Yuan Period, Late Qing Dynasty to Republican Period were discovered. The government announced in late 2014 that the relics would be preserved in-situ. There was a need to preserve the heritage relics with a proper setting and ambience to facilitate the exhibition and interpretation of the discovered heritage; and
- (iv) it was revealed in a study commissioned by the CEDD that the water quality of Kai Tak Approach Channel (KTAC) had improved in recent years due to the implementation of drainage/sewerage projects in the hinterland. A relatively more cost-effective alternative Interception Pumping (IP) Scheme by intercepting and pumping stormwater from the upstream of KTAC to the Victoria Harbour side of the Runway for direct discharge could achieve similar performance in improving the water quality as that of the original proposal for a 600m opening underneath the Metro Park. The IP Scheme offered an opportunity to review and optimize the land use of northern part of Runway and to accommodate a variety of water sports and recreational activities in KTAC and the adjoining Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) to further strengthen the role of Kai Tak as a hub for sports and recreational activities;

*The Review Study*

- (g) the Review Study was commenced in 2013 and technical study was commissioned to explore the feasibility of increasing the development intensity of KTD to meet the demand for housing and office land and to enhance the land use proposals. Kowloon City (KC)/Wong Tai Sin (WTS)/Kwun Tong (KT) District Councils (DCs) and the Task Force for Kai Tak Harbourfront Development of the Harbourfront Commission (the Task Force) were consulted on the initial findings of the Review in 2014. No in-principle objection was received during the consultation;
- (h) the theme of developing KTD as “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong” was respected while making appropriate refinements in response to changing planning circumstances, societal needs and rising public aspirations;
- (i) while there was a need to optimize the use of land to meet the demand for housing and office land, the proposed development intensity should commensurate with the established planning theme, urban design concepts and be sustainable from urban planning and technical terms. For residential sites, a maximum domestic plot ratio (PR) of 6.5 for new development areas in Residential Density Zone 1 area as stated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) was generally adopted, which was compatible with the overall development intensity in the Kowloon area;
- (j) while the residential and commercial GFA would be suitably increased and sites be rezoned for residential/commercial use, the proposed changes had taken into account the thresholds imposed by infrastructural capacity and technical constraints. The Review Study had included various technical assessments to ensure that the proposals would not overload the transportation, water supply,

drainage and sewerage nor have unacceptable noise, air quality, air ventilation and visual impacts;

*Development Proposals*

- (k) Heritage Park in Area 2A – the suggested area of archaeological potential falling within development sites 2A6 to 2A8 and its surrounding areas would be rezoned to “Open Space” (“O”) for a Heritage Park of about 1ha for the preservation of the existing and future archaeological findings. The Heritage Park could serve as a natural extension of the adjoining Sung Wong Toi Park to the west and the LTSB to the east, providing an important node for leisure activities amid the converging point of North Apron, Kowloon City and To Kwa Wan. A section of Road L9, Site 2A8, and part of sites 2A6 and 2A7 would be rezoned from “G/IC”, “Commercial” (“C”) and an area shown as ‘Road’ to “O”. As a replacement for the proposed fire station originally planned at Site 2A8, the northern part of the adjacent commercial Site 2A5 would be rezoned to “G/IC”;

[Mr Philip S.L. Kan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (l) Office Belt fronting Prince Edward Road East in Area 2A – Area 2A should remain to be a premier office belt near the SCL To Kwa Wan Station to meet the demand for office space in KE. The proposed electricity substation originally planned at Site 2A7 currently zoned “G/IC” was no longer required and the site would be rezoned for commercial development. The PR and building height restrictions (BHRs) for sites in Area 2A would be increased from 4.5-5 to 6.5 and 60-100mPD to 80-100mPD respectively to enhance the development potential. The proposed development intensity was considered compatible with that of Kowloon City;

- (m) Residential Sites fronting KTSP in Area 2B – the domestic PR of residential and “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) sites in Area 2B was proposed to be increased from 5 to 6.5 to optimise the development potential. The proposed PR of 6.5 was considered compatible with the high density development in the hinterland of Kowloon City and Ma Tau Kok with a maximum PR of 7.5. The threshold of infrastructure capacity would not be exceeded. The BHR of Area 2B was correspondingly increased to 100-135mPD, which would still be in line with the descending BH profile gradating from the landmark building in the City Centre for KTD;
  
- (n) Areas 3A and 3B – a number of sites in the area had been zoned for “G/IC” to meet the needs of the community, including Hong Kong Children’s Hospital and Kai Tak Acute Hospital. There was generally sufficient provision of Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities in KTD and Sites 3A6 and 3B1 to 3B4 to the south of Kwun Tong Bypass were not required for GIC development. Those sites were proposed to be rezoned for commercial uses with PRs of 8.0 and 5.8 respectively in order to maintain a critical mass of office space near Kowloon Bay to create synergy in support of the EKE initiative. Their BHRs would correspondingly be increased to 100mPD and 80mPD respectively to form a stepped BH profile toward the waterfront, which were considered compatible with the BHR of 140mPD for developments to the northeast in Kowloon Bay;
  
- (o) Area 3E – taking into consideration that comprehensive redevelopment proposals for Kerry Godown and Kowloon Godown for residential use had been approved by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC), and the gas pigging station designated for Site 3E1 was no longer required, Sites 3E1 and 3E2 and a small portion of the adjoining open space were proposed to be rezoned from “C”, “OU” annotated “Gas Pigging Station” and “O” for residential

development to form a residential cluster at the locality. Due to the site constraints imposed by the proposed Trunk Road T2 and the presence of a drainage reserve, a domestic PR of 4.5 was proposed for the site with stepped BHRs of 80 and 100mPD;

- (p) Areas 4A to 4C – in the light of the latest KTF initiative for an entertainment and tourism node at the end of the former runway, Site 4B5 near the Cruise Terminal was proposed to be rezoned from “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) to “C(4)” with a PR of 6.3. The site would form a coherent cluster of hotel developments together with Sites 4C3 to 4C5 to create synergy effect. Sites relatively remote from the Tourism Node (i.e. 4A2, 4C1 and 4C2) were proposed to be rezoned from commercial to residential use. The PRs of those residential sites at Area 4 were proposed to be increased to 6.5. Commercial PR of 0.15 would be designated for Sites 4A2, 4C1 and 4C2 in order to enhance the vibrancy of that section of waterfront promenade. The BHRs of the development sites in Areas 4A to 4C were proposed to be increased to 45mPD to 90mPD. The overall BH profile generally descending from inland areas to the runway tip would be maintained, with the lowest BH close to the Cruise Terminal and Tourism Node;
  
- (q) Metro Park – as the proposed IP Scheme could improve the water quality of KTAC and KTTS without the need for the 600m opening previously proposed under the Metro Park, an area of 2.9ha at the Metro Park could be made available for development. Sites 4E1 and 4E2 with PR of 6.5 and BHR of 80mPD, which were located adjacent to the enlarged Sites 4A1 and 4A2, were proposed for residential development. Commercial PR of 0.15 would be designated for Site 4E2. The Metro Park would still have an area of around 20ha after the rezoning. The total open space in KTD would be maintained at about 100ha;

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (r) Site 1D2 at former North Apron – as the site was no longer required for government office development, it was proposed that the site be rezoned from “G/IC” to “C” with a PR of 8 and BHR of 120mPD;
- (s) Animal Management Centre (AMC) at Site 3A1 – the site was earmarked for the reprovisioning of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)’s AMC at Mok Cheong Street. In order to meet the latest operational need to incorporate additional animal management/welfare services in the new AMC, the BHR for the site would be relaxed to 80mPD. The site boundary would also be re-configured to tally with the finalized alignment of Central Kowloon Route (CKR) and local roads re-alignment;
- (t) Kai Tak Acute Hospital at Site 3C1(A) – in order to meet the latest operational need of the Hospital Authority (HA), it was proposed to extend the site boundary of 3C1(A) northward and to relax the BHR from 60mPD to 100mPD;
- (u) Vocational Training Council’s (VTC) Campus Building – a site (about 4.2ha) along Cha Kwo Ling waterfront had been identified for the development of a new campus building for the VTC. The site was currently occupied by a dedicated Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) filling station, a temporary soccer pitch and some temporary uses. As the two sites for sewage treatment plant and tunnel ventilation shaft developments were no longer required for the designated sites, it was proposed to rezone the area covering the two sites and adjoining areas to “G/IC” with a stepped BH profile of 70mPD to 60mPD from south to north. The LPG station and the soccer pitch would be relocated northward to facilitate a larger site for use by VTC;



- (v) Land for Watersports Activities – subject to further improvement of water quality in KTAC and KTTS, water sports and recreational activities might be accommodated there in the longer term to further strengthen the role of Kai Tak as a hub for sports and recreational activities. It was proposed to include ‘water sports/recreation use’ as a Column 1 use of the Notes for the “O” zone. The location to be earmarked for water sports/recreational use would be subject to further discussion between the Home Affairs Bureau and the stakeholders, pending the continuous improvement of water quality in the KTAC and KTTS;

*Overall Assessment*

- (w) the development proposals under the Review Study would result in overall increase in the number of flats and population from 39,000 to 49,900 and 105,000 to 134,000 respectively. There would also be an increase in commercial GFA from 1,950,000m<sup>2</sup> to 2,280,000m<sup>2</sup> with an increase in employment opportunity. Technical assessments concluded that the proposals would have no significant impacts on the capacity of the transport, water supply, drainage, sewerage infrastructures, and noise and air quality. Apart from providing the much needed housing and office land for the community, the Review Study had also proposed enhancement to strengthen the overarching theme of developing KTD as the “Heritage, Green, Sports and Tourism Hub of Hong Kong” through the provision of a Heritage Park, water sports/recreation activities, rationalised land uses near the tourism hub and community facilities. As illustrated by photomontages of developments in KTD taken from major vantage points, the proposed increase in BHs would not have significant visual impact; and

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

### *Way Forward*

- (x) subject to the views and comments of the Board, PlanD/CEDD would consult the KCDC/WTSDC/KTDC and the Task Force on the findings and recommended development proposals under the Study Review. The comments and views collected would be taken into account in finalising the proposed amendments to the OZP, and both would be submitted to MPC for consideration.

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

- 7. As the presentation of the government representatives was completed, the Chairman invited comments/questions from Members.

### Open Space Provision

- 8. A Member asked whether the ratio of land for open space (about 100ha) in KTD with a total land area of about 320ha was applicable in other districts. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K said that the open space requirements specified in HKPSG were used in planning for existing and new development areas. For KTD, the open space provision was more than the minimum requirements under the HKPSG and the abundant provision of open space including some regional open spaces were intended to serve the local residents as well as people from other districts.

### Traffic and Transport

- 9. Two Members asked whether (a) consideration had been given to providing water transport for commuting and for tourism to take advantage of the waterfront access in KTD, (b) the proposed road bridge connecting Kwun Tong and the Tourism and Leisure Hub at the end of the former runway might pose constraints on boats and vessels to pass underneath, thus affecting the possibility of providing water transport connection points in KTTS, (c) jetty would be provided to promote the use of water transport, e.g. water taxi. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the Review Study was mainly to optimise the

landuse options to respond to the needs of the society. Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) had been carried out for the planned road network. By using the ex-Fire Boat Pier, there was currently 'kaito' service from Kai Tak waterfront to Kwun Tong during holidays. Ferry operators were liaising with Transport Department (TD) to provide more regular ferry service. The provision of jetties and landing steps at various locations would be examined carefully taking into consideration the marine safety aspect and the provisions under The Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

[Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

10. Mr Peter S.K. Chui, CE/K(1), CEDD said that rail services would be the main transportation mode for KTD, supplemented by road network. There were three public transport interchanges (PTIs) for KTD located at Kowloon City, Kai Tak City Centre and the Tourism and Leisure Hub. CEDD had renovated a pier for providing 'kaito' service at an ex-Fire Boat Pier. The view of DC and ferry operators on providing 'kaito' services had been referred to TD for consideration.

11. Mr Chui also said that the proposed road bridge at the end of the ex-runway would possibly be part of the future EFLS. That bridge would be elevated to enable vessels to pass through to KTTS. The other bridge connecting Area 4B/4C to Area 3 was an existing bridge previously used as a taxiway for the former Kai Tak Airport. Two footbridges at the same level as the existing bridge were planned and it would not be practical to raise the level of those footbridges.

12. Another Member asked whether the previously low development intensity for KTD was due to traffic and/or environmental constraints, and whether the previous concerns, if any, had been addressed in the Review Study, which proposed to increase the overall development intensity. That Member also asked whether the only road serving the hotel and residential developments in Area 4 could cope with the traffic generated. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the current OZP was formulated after taking into consideration the views collected in the public engagement between 2004 and 2006, when there was general preference for lower development scale with less concern on the housing land supply. The increase in development intensity proposed under the Review Study

was to respond to the changing societal needs in meeting the acute housing shortage. The proposed PR of 6.5 was in line with the development intensity for new development area as specified in the HKPSG and was generally lower than the surrounding areas and in the main urban area. While the development intensity would be increased, the planning scheme and landuse pattern of KTD would remain unchanged. Technical assessments had concluded that there would not be any adverse impacts on the traffic and environment.

13. Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the Review Study had maintained the air and view corridors of the OZP. Assessments had been made to ensure that the site layout would comply with requirements regarding air ventilation and visual permeability. While the development intensity of Area 4 would be increased, three of the commercial sites were proposed to be rezoned for residential development, which would have a lower traffic generation rate. The capacity of the road serving the area was considered adequate.

14. Another Member asked whether the road bridges connecting KTD with Kwun Tong could be widened. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the widening of those proposed road bridges would have implication on the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance.

15. A Member asked whether the traffic generated from the residential and commercial developments could be absorbed by the existing traffic infrastructure. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that KTD would mainly be served by SCL. With the completion of the CKR, Road T2 and the Tseung Kwan O/Lam Tin Tunnel, the traffic along Prince Edward Road East would be significantly reduced. The transportation infrastructure would have adequate capacity to cope with the additional traffic generated in KTD.

16. A Member suggested that the linear route of EFLS from Kowloon City to the Cruise Terminal should be extended to serve Kowloon Bay and Kwun Tong to form a loop. As there would be more electric cars on the road, KTD should provide more charging stations for these vehicles in KTD. As a new development area, pedestrian should be separated from vehicular traffic. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the separation of pedestrian from vehicular traffic was one of the design concepts for KTD. An extensive network of open space and promenade was provided to encourage walking in a

safe environment. Mr Peter S.K. Chui supplemented that in the preliminary design of the routing, EFLS would connect Kwun Tong MTR Station, Kowloon Bay MTR Station, Kai Tak City Centre and Tourism and Leisure Hub. The routing might be revised taking into account public's view collected in the ongoing detailed feasibility for the EFLS. Charging stations for electric car could be provided in new developments in KTD through land sale conditions. At present, a bus route from Kai Tak was already served by electric buses, with charging station at the Kai Ching Estate terminal.

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

#### Water Quality of KTAC and KTTS and Water Sports Facilities

17. A Member asked for elaboration on why the water quality of KTAC and KTTS would improve without the proposed 600m opening underneath the Metro Park. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the water quality of KTAC had improved due to the implementation of drainage/sewerage projects in the hinterland and water decontamination measures in KTAC. The water quality would further improve with the proposed IP Scheme under consideration. Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that provision of facilities for water sports would be considered at the KTF proposed by the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO).

18. The same Member asked whether the water quality of Kai Tak River and KTAC would be affected if the Sha Tin Water Treatment Plant was relocated to cavern and the discharge was diverted from Kai Tak River. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the pollution in KTAC was the result of the discharge from previous industrial activities. Since the implementation of drainage/sewerage projects in the hinterland, the water quality there had improved. It was expected that the proposed IP scheme would further improve the water quality to allow water sports in the area.

#### Building Height Profile

19. A Member said that (a) the development sites in Area 2 were closely spaced and that consideration could be given to increasing the BHs for those sites by

correspondingly reducing the site coverage (SC) for creating a more spacious environment at pedestrian level, (b) the BH and SC for sites in Area 4 might be varied to avoid having a monotonous BH profile and elongated developments blocking the views to and from the hinterland. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the proposals under the Review Study had taken into account the previously established urban design principles, including the need to maintain the intended stepped and varied BH profiles of developments. With the proposed increase in the development intensity, the BH at various sites had been correspondingly increased but was considered not incompatible with surrounding high-rise developments in the hinterland areas of San Po Kong, Kowloon City and Kwun Tong. For Area 4, a varied BH profile would be maintained with the overall BH profile generally descending from inland areas to the Runway Tip, with the lowest BH close to the Cruise Terminal and Tourism Node. In general, the urban design principle of the gradual decrease in BH profile from hinterland to waterfront could be maintained.

20. Two Members also considered that the BH of developments in Area 3 was monotonous and suggested that the BH profile of those sites should be enhanced for a more interesting skyline. One Member asked whether the two rows of commercial and residential buildings would create any wall effect. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that Members' views on the BH profile would be taken into consideration. He said that as one of the main prevailing winds in the summer was from the southeast, which could flow along KTAC and Road T2 running in southeast to northwest direction, there would not be any unacceptable air ventilation impact. Besides, any proposed developments would have to comply with the Building (Planning) Regulations and the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines. Ms Winona Ip, Urbis supplemented that the SC and constraints of various sites had been studied in detail with reference to the stipulated PRs, urban design principles and relevant Regulations/guidelines before the recommended BH profile was worked out.

21. Some Members generally considered that there were room for further adjusting the proposed site configuration, PR and SC of development sites to achieve a more interesting and varied BH profile so as to ensure visually permeability and avoid possible wall effect, especially when viewing from Hong Kong Island, and the overall building layout should be improved to allow for greater separation between buildings.

### Heritage Park

22. A Member asked the possibility of finding more relics in the development sites near the Heritage Park and how they would be preserved. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that a Heritage Park was proposed to preserve the heritage relics in-situ. The chance of finding more relics in the development sites was slim as those sites were located off-shore and not yet reclaimed for human settlement during the Qing Dynasty. Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that while some relics, e.g. ancient wells, would be preserved in-situ, some would be re-instated in their original locations after the completion of the SCL To Kwa Wan Station.

### Development Intensity

23. Two Members said that the Review Study generally proposed an increase in the development intensity of KTD and considered that the proposed PR of 6.5 was significant. One of them considered that more GIC and community facilities should be provided to better address the needs of the society in order to gain support from DC members. The photomontages should also be improved to show the visual impact of the overall increase in BHs in KTD.

### Urban Design / Site Swapping

24. A Member considered that (a) the commercial developments in Area 3 were traversed by Road T2 and suggested that the road be decked over so that the commercial developments would not be segregated and (b) Area 3 was located near Kai Tak City Centre and suggested that the commercial developments in Area 3 and the residential developments in Area 4 could be swapped. Two Members considered that the hotel development at Site 4C3 could be swapped with the residential development at Site 4B4 so that the four sites designated for hotel development would form a cluster.

25. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the Runway Precinct in Area 4 was planned with a mixture of commercial/residential developments with vibrant activities

along the spacious waterfront promenade. Cycling paths, walking trails and retail frontage would be provided along the waterfront. The planned development with both commercial and residential uses would help making of “place” by attracting vibrant activities and bring residents, workers and visitors to the waterfront promenades at different time of the days. As the proposed hotel developments at Sites 4C3 to 4C5 faced a wider waterfront promenade in proximity to the existing Cruise Terminal and the proposed Tourism Node, and had an early development timeframe, they should be retained for hotel use to achieve the synergy effect for enhancing tourism-related development. Hence, site swapping might not be desirable from land use planning perspective. Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the commercial sites on two sides of Road T2 would be connected. However, whether such connection would be provided by road decking should be considered further. As Area 3 would be subject to traffic noise problem from Road T2, swapping the residential developments in Area 4 with commercial developments in Area 3 was not recommended.

26. A Member asked whether there would be any traffic conflict for the proposed Road T2 to cross over a proposed road bridge near the Tourism and Leisure Hub. In response, Mr Peter S.K. Chui said that the proposed Road T2 provided a link between the CKR and Tseung Kwan O/Lam Tin Tunnel. Road T2 would go underground in Area 3 and underneath water in KTTS and thus would not have any conflict with the proposed elevated road bridge near the Tourism and Leisure Hub.

27. In response to a Member’s question, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that one of the main design concepts advocated for KTD was podium-free development with provision of car parking facilities in the basement.

#### Other Issues

28. A Member suggested that a library should be provided for KTD to serve the future population. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that a library had been planned for KTD in the North Apron Area, the implementation of which would have to tie in with the development programme of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) as well as the overall implementation of infrastructures for KTD. In general, the provision of



library facilities in Kowloon City District covering KTD had exceeded the minimum requirements under the HKPSG.

29. Another Member asked whether there was any mechanism to phase the development at Sites 3E1 and 3E2 so that the proposed residential developments would not be implemented before the redevelopment of the Kerry Dangerous Goods Godown and Kowloon Godown in the vicinity. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that planning permissions for redeveloping the two godown sites for residential use were granted in 2012 and 2014. The proposed rezoning of Sites 3E1 and 3E2 was based on the consideration that these godown sites would be redeveloped for residential use so as to form a residential cluster in the locality. As Sites 3E1 and 3E2 would be disposed for development after the completion of the proposed Road T2 tentatively in 2023/2024, it was anticipated that the two godowns might have already been redeveloped by then. In formulating the development proposal for Sites 3E1 and 3E2, the site constraints/condition and the surrounding developments had been fully taken into consideration.

30. Another Member asked whether there was any information on the mix of public/private housing development and their proposed location. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that some sites in KTD had already been developed for public housing, including Kai Ching Estate and Tak Long Estate (public rental housing (PRH)) and 煥然壹居 (a subsidised housing scheme). There were also other planned private residential developments in the Kai Tak City Centre. While it was noted that the community had a strong aspiration for more public housing development, the type of residential development for the remaining sites as proposed under the Review was yet to be decided. Since the site and development requirements for private and public housing development differed, the exact housing mix and proposed sites for public housing development would need to be further examined in consultation with the concerned bureaux/departments/stakeholders, taking into account the overall demand and housing supply situation at the time when these sites were ready for development.

31. The same Member considered that without any designation of residential sites for PRH development on the OZP, the general public's request for more PRH had not been properly addressed. That Member also said that Appendix II of the Paper only covered

the G/IC and open space provision in Kowloon City, and asked whether there was any shortfall in G/IC and open space provision in the adjoining districts, e.g. Wong Tai Sin and Kwun Tong. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that as KTD mainly fell within the DC boundary of Kowloon City, an assessment on the G/IC and open space provision was based on Kowloon City DC, although the provision in adjoining districts was generally adequate. As KTD was a new development area, there was room for providing more open space and G/IC facilities to serve the adjoining districts. The open space provision in KTD and Kowloon City would exceed the overall minimum requirements under the HKPSG. A library and Kai Tak Acute Hospital were proposed to meet the community's need for various GIC facilities and for the purpose of serving a wider area.

32. The Chairman supplemented that the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS) had set a target of producing 46,000 flats per year for the next 10 years, with a 60:40 split for public and private housing. The housing mix was an overall target but not for individual OZP. The OZP would focus on identifying sites suitable for residential development, with flexibility of allocating the type of housing development according to the actual circumstances.

33. A Member asked whether the number of flats in the completed Kai Ching Estate, Tak Long Estate and 煥然壹居 had been included in the estimated number of flats for KTD. That Member also asked whether any centralised waste disposal system similar to that adopted in some German cities would be proposed for KTD. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the estimated 49,900 flats for KTD had already included those completed flats mentioned above. The Chairman also noted that the government did not have, at the moment, a policy regarding the provision of centralised waste disposal system similar to that adopted in some German cities in new development areas. Members' views might be conveyed to the relevant Bureau for consideration.

34. As Members had no further questions, the Chairman thanked the representatives from the government and AECOM for attending the meeting. He requested that PlanD should take into consideration Members' comments on the Review Study and explore the feasibility of enhancing the development proposals.

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

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

### **Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-CS/B – Preliminary Consideration of a New Plan

(TPB Paper No. 10194)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

35. The following representatives from Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point :

- |                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr C.K. Soh       | - District Planning Officer/Shan Tin,<br>Tai Po and North (DPO/STN),<br>PlanD |
| Ms Channy C. Yang | - Senior Town Planner/Country Park<br>Enclaves (2) (STP/CPE(2)), PlanD        |

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Channy C. Yang, STP/CPE(2) made the following main points on the draft Cheung Sheung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-CS/B as outlined in the Paper :

#### **Background**

- (a) on 21.3.2014, the draft Cheung Sheung Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/NE-CS/1 was exhibited for public inspection

under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The draft Cheung Sheung DPA Plan was subsequently approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) on 24.5.2015, and the plan was renumbered as DPA/NE-CS/2;

- (b) pursuant to section 20(5) of the Ordinance, the Cheung Sheung DPA Plan was effective for a period of three years until 21.3.2017. An OZP had to be prepared to replace the DPA Plan in order to maintain statutory planning control over the area upon expiry of the DPA Plan;

#### The Planning Scheme Area

- (c) the Planning Scheme Area (the Area), covering a total land area of about 18 ha, was located at the centre of Sai Kung West Country Park, on an upland plateau about 300m above sea level and was surrounded by ridges and spurs. It was a Priority Site for Enhanced Conservation under the New Nature Conservation Policy and was located within the upper indirect water gathering ground (WGG);
- (d) according to the “Landscape Value Mapping of Hong Kong (2005)”, the Area was characterized as upland plateau (freshwater wetland), with woodland and natural streams as significant landscape resources of high landscape sensitivity. In general, the Area was natural and rural in character and has high landscape and scenic value;
- (e) encircled by the Sai Kung West Country Park, the Area formed part of the wider natural system of the Country Park. It mainly comprised secondary woodland on an upland plateau surrounded by hillside woodland in its southwestern, western and northern parts. Cheung Sheung Country Trail and an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS) with freshwater marshes along its bank traversed the Area largely from west to east, with MacLehose Trail branching off in its southern fringe;

- (f) the Area was accessible only by footpaths such as MacLehose Trail connecting to other parts of Sai Kung Country Parks, or Cheung Sheung Country Trail leading to Yung Shue O via the long and steep “Jacob’s Ladder”. The trails were often used for hiking events, such as Oxfam Trailwalker and Cheung Sheung Ascension Festival;
- (g) Cheung Sheung Village, which was largely deserted and derelict, was the only recognized village in the Area. The settlements were scattered and isolated, not forming any village clusters. A few inhabited domestic squatters and a provision store providing refreshment for hikers could be found fronting an open ground at the more accessible location in the central part of the Area. Based on the 2011 Population Census, the total population of the Area was estimated to be about 10 persons. About 75% of land in Cheung Sheung was government land while 25% was under private ownership;
- (h) the freshwater habitats in Cheung Sheung had long been recognized to have high ecological value. The upland marshes in the Area were an uncommon habitat in Hong Kong supporting a moderate diversity of plants with a number of uncommon species. The Cheung Sheung EIS, together with its occasionally flooded riparian zone, supported a population of *Macropodus hongkongensis* (Hong Kong Paradise Fish, 香港鬥魚), which was of conservation concern. The freshwater habitats also supported a moderate diversity of amphibians and dragonflies;
- (i) the woodland was ecologically linked to the natural habitats in the Country Park. It mainly consisted of common native plant species with some protected species. A moderate diversity of butterflies including some species of conservation interest, and the endangered Chinese Pangolin (穿山甲) had been recorded in the Area;

### Consideration of the DPA Plan

- (j) during the two-month exhibition period of the draft Cheung Sheung DPA Plan, a total of eight representations and one comment on the representations were received. The Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) of Cheung Sheung Village and Sai Kung North Rural Committee (SKNRC) mainly objected to the lack of “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone. They proposed that “V” zone should be designated and that Wong Chuk Long and Tai Hom should be included in the DPA Plan. However, the green/concern groups and some individuals proposed to better protect the ecological importance and natural habitats of the Area by confining the “V” zone to existing building lots or not to designate “V” zone at all, and to incorporate the Area into the Country Park;
  
- (k) on 5.12.2014, the Board decided not to propose any amendment to the draft DPA Plan to meet the representations and noted that detailed studies and analysis would be conducted to formulate the appropriate land use zonings in the course of preparing the OZP. No planning application had been received for proposed development within the Area;

### Development Proposals Received

- (l) in the course of preparing the OZP, some views/proposals were received from concerned parties and they were set out below :
  - (i) on 24.3.2016, Kadoorie Farm & Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBG) made a submission stating that the Area was a popular hiking spot, of ecological importance and located within the WGG, no “V” zone should be designated and the whole Area should be zoned “Conservation Area” (“CA”);

- (ii) on 29.3.2016, an informal discussion with the Indigenous Inhabitant Representative (IIR) of Cheung Sheung Village was conducted to solicit the views and proposals of villagers on the land use zonings. The IIR subsequently submitted a letter on 5.4.2016 mainly requesting for designation of “V” zone to respect the indigenous villagers’ rights for Small House development in future;

#### Land Use Planning Considerations

- (m) Conservation of Natural Environment – in view of the high ecological value of Cheung Sheung, it was proposed to designate the riparian zone of the EIS as “CA” in order to reflect the ecological importance of those natural habitats whilst “Green Belt” (“GB”) zoning would be appropriate to conserve the natural and landscape character of the woodland adjoining the Country Park;
- (n) Land for Village Development – Cheung Sheung Village was a recognised village. Two village environs (‘VEs’) with a total area of 7.86 ha and about 6.38 ha fell within the boundary of the draft OZP. However, there were only a few building lots located away from any footpath and were now in ruins overgrown with vegetation. As advised by the District Lands Officer/Tai Po, Lands Department (DLO/TP, LandsD), there was no outstanding Small House application in the Area as at September 2016 and the 10-year Small House demand forecast provided by the respective IIR was two. It was estimated that about 0.03 ha of land would be sufficient to accommodate the demand for two Small Houses. The area proposed for Small House development was situated on government land within the ‘VE’ at a more accessible location near the existing inhabited domestic squatters and the provision store;

### Planning Intention

- (o) the general planning intention of the Area was to protect its high conservation and landscape value which complemented the overall naturalness and the landscape beauty of the surrounding Country Park. It was also intended to consolidate village development so as to avoid undesirable disturbances to the natural environment and overtaxing the limited infrastructure in the Area;

### Land Use Zonings

- (p) the proposed zoning included :
  - (i) “V” (about 0.03ha) – the planning intention of this zone was to designate both the existing recognized village and areas of land considered suitable for village expansion and to concentrate village type development within this zone for a more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructures and services. The boundary of the “V” zone was drawn up having regard to the ‘VEs’, the number of outstanding Small House application, Small House demand forecast, local topography and site constraints;
  - (ii) “GB” (about 13.7ha) – the planning intention was primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. This zone comprised mainly woodland buffering the village type developments from the Sai Kung West Country Park. It also comprised the open grassland in front of the provision store, which was a popular resting place for hikers. There was a general presumption against development in this zone;



- (iii) “CA” (about 4.27ha) – this zone largely covered the riparian zone of the EIS where freshwater marshes and habitat of Hong Kong Paradise Fish were found. The planning intention was to protect and retain the existing natural landscape, ecological or topographical features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as Country Park from the adverse effects of development. There was a general presumption against development in this zone; and

### Consultation

- (q) the draft OZP together with its Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) as well as the Planning Report had been circulated to the relevant government bureaux and departments for comments. Views from KFBC, and the IIR of Cheung Sheung Village had been incorporated where appropriate. TPDC and SKNRC would be consulted and their comments would be submitted to the Board for consideration prior to the publication of the draft OZP.

37. As the presentation of the PlanD was completed, the Chairman invited comments/questions from Members.

38. A Member asked whether there were any regular hiking activities in the area and the statistics on the number of hikers using the walking trails. In response, Mr C.K. Soh, DPO/STN said that PlanD did not have such statistics. The Cheung Sheung Country Trail and the MacLehose Trail were popular hiking trails. The OZP had taken into consideration those hiking trails and the use of the provision store. Ms Channy C. Yang, STP/CPE(2) supplemented that the Oxfam Trailwalker held an annual hiking event in November each year, using MacLehose Trail in Cheung Sheung. In addition, the Cheung Sheung Ascension Festival was held in early 2016 and the provision store was the finishing point of the hike.

39. Another Member asked for the reason for designating the “V” zone on government land. In response, Mr C.K. Soh said that most private land in Cheung Sheung was agricultural land. While some private land fell within the ‘VE’, they were remote and heavily vegetated. The proposed “V” zone was a piece of flat grass land near the existing settlement and was relatively accessible. The site was considered suitable for accommodating the demand for 2 Small Houses estimated under the 10-year Small House demand forecast.

40. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/B (Appendix I of the Paper) together with its Notes (Appendix II of the Paper) was suitable for consultation with TPDC;
- (b) the ES (Appendix III of the Paper) was suitable to serve as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the land use zoning of the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/B and the ES should be issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) the ES (Appendix III of the Paper) was suitable for consultation with TPDC together with the draft OZP.

[Professor S.C. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

### **Sai Kung and Islands District**

#### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open meeting]

Draft Tai Ho Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TH/B – Preliminary Consideration of a New Plan  
(TPB Paper No. 10186)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

41. The Secretary reported that a land use proposal was received during the preparation of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), which was submitted by the major private owners in Tai Ho, including Sun Hung Kai Properties Limited (SHK) and Swire Properties (Swire). The following Members had declared interests in the item :

- |                     |   |  |
|---------------------|---|--|
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho   | ] | having current business dealings   |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | ] | with SHK and Swire   |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai  | - | having current business dealings with SHK and her firm being tenant of the properties of Swire |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu     | - | having current business dealings with SHK  |
| Mr Franklin Yu      | - | having past business dealings with SHK and his spouse was an employee of SHK                   |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having current business dealings with SHK and past business dealings with Swire                |
| Miss Winnie W.M. Ng | - | being a Director of Kowloon Motor Bus Co. Ltd (KMB) and SHK was one of the shareholders of KMB |
| Professor S.C. Wong | - | being the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of     |

Hong Kong where SHK had sponsored some activities of the Department before

Ms Christina M. Lee - being the Secretary-General of the Hong Kong Metropolitan Sports Event Association which had obtained sponsorship from SHK before

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from SHK

42. Members noted that Ms Christina M. Lee and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Professor S.C. Wong and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had left the meeting. Members considered that the interests of Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng were direct and agreed that they should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. As the interests of Mr Franklin Yu were remote, Members agreed that he should be allowed to stay at the meeting.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng left the meeting temporarily and Mr Patrick H.T. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

43. The following representative from Planning Department (PlanD) was invited to the meeting at this point :

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands (DPO/SKIs), PlanD

44. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs made the following main points on the Draft Tai Ho Sheung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TH/B as outlined in the Paper :

Background

- (a) On 28 March 2014, the draft Tai Ho Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan No. DPA/I-TH/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). The DPA Plan was subsequently approved by the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) on 24.2.2015;
- (b) pursuant to section 20(5) of the Ordinance, the Tai Ho DPA Plan was effective for a period of three years until 28 March 2017. As such, an OZP had to be prepared to replace the DPA Plan in order to maintain statutory planning control over the Area upon expiry of the DPA Plan.

The Planning Scheme Area

- (c) the Planning Scheme Area (the Area) covered a total area of about 230ha (including about 32ha of water body (Tai Ho Wan)). Only about 38.79ha of land was under private ownership while the remaining was government land. It was located to the east of Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) Area and was separated by the mountain ridges of Por Kai Shan within Lantau North (Extension) Country Park. Vehicular access to the Area was via an access road branching off Cheung Tung Road which ran in parallel to the North Lantau highway (NLH), connecting the Area to Tung Chung, the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) and the metro area. A concrete footpath linked the NLH to the country parks uphill, going through village settlements at Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho San Tsuen with associated agricultural land;

- (d) there are four recognised villages within the Area, namely Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long, Tai Ho (also known as Tai Ho San Tsuen) and Wong Kung Tin (also known as Wong Fung Tin). However, there was no existing village settlement in Wong Kung Tin village. Based on the population data of the 2011 Census, the population in the Area is estimated to be about 150. Some active agricultural activities were found at Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho, but most other agricultural land had been abandoned;
- (e) the Area had rich landscape resources including mature woodland, shrubland, grassland, valley, knolls, and streams. There were also natural coastal features such as the estuary and shorelines at Tai Ho Wan. Tai Ho Wan was a major landmark along NLH, which previously was an open coastal bay before the highway was built. The estuary area of Tai Ho Stream consisted of mangrove and inter-tidal mudflats;
- (f) part of Tai Ho Stream was listed as an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS) and was a designated Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) which was one of the few remaining medium-sized natural streams of its kind in Hong Kong. The stream supported a high diversity of freshwater and brackish-water fishes in Hong Kong. Seagrass and Horseshoe crabs of conservation importance had also been recorded in the mudflat within the boundary of Tai Ho Stream SSSI;
- (g) Tai Ho also supported the reptile of regional concern as well as a number of rare/uncommon butterflies. Two amphibian species of conservation interest, namely Romer's Tree Frog (*Liuixalus romeri* 盧氏小樹蛙) and Short-legged Toad (*Megophrys brachykolos* 短腳角蟾) had also been recorded at Tai Ho;

- (h) the area further uphill was densely vegetated woodland and shrubland on the valley sides extending into Lantau North (Extension) Country Park and Lantau North Country Park beyond the Area. The mature woodland at the south of Pak Mong was also an important inhabitat;

#### Consideration of the DPA Plan

- (i) during the consideration of the representations to the draft DPA Plan on 19 December 2014, the following proposals from major groups were put forward for the Board's consideration :
  - (i) the Mui Wo RC and local villagers suggested that the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone boundaries of all villages (including Wong Kung Tin) should follow the 'Village Environs' ('VE') and additional government land should be included in the "V" zone to meet the demand for Small House development. Road access, drainage and sewerage facilities should be provided for Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho;
  - (ii) the private land owners of Tai Ho suggested to designate the least environmentally sensitive areas in the western part of Tai Ho Valley and an area in the east of Tai Ho Wan as "Comprehensive Development Area" ("CDA") zone for low to medium-density residential developments and tourism-related facilities; and
  - (iii) the green/concern groups and some individuals suggested to designate the important habitats of Tai Ho, especially the areas around Tai Ho Stream SSSI, as Country Park and the "V" zone should only cover the existing village settlements;

- (j) on 19 December 2014, the Board decided not to uphold the representations nor propose amendment to the DPA Plan. The Board also noted the suggestions of green/concern groups on conservation zonings and agreed that detailed studies and analysis would be conducted to determine the appropriate land use zonings of the concerned area in the preparation of the OZP stage. Since the gazettal of the draft DPA Plan on 28 March 2014, no planning application was received in the Area;

#### Development Proposals Received

- (k) in the course of preparing the OZP, some views/proposals were received from concerned parties and they are set out below :
- (i) land use proposal, similar to that previously submitted and considered, submitted by the major private landowners in the Area;
  - (ii) the views of the Mui Wo RC on the land uses of the Area expressed in the meetings held on 13 May 2016 and 13 September 2016; and
  - (iii) the views of green/concern groups including Green Power, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG), Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK) and Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS);
- (l) letters were also received after issuance of Paper from Green Power, KFBG providing suggestions and comments on the draft OZP, and from MasterPlan Limited and the village representatives of Pak Mong, Tai Ho San Tsuen and Ngau Kwu Long raising objections to the draft OZP. The letters were circulated to Members for information. The



views were similar to those received mentioned above and were summarised below :

- (i) KFBG considered that the “V” zones of Pak Mong Village and Ngau Kwu Long village was too close to the watercourses;
  - (ii) Green Power proposed to extend the SSSI to cover the whole river course and river banks of all tributaries, ‘Agricultural Use’ that involved excavation of top soil, paving with concrete/asphalt or non-arable materials should be prohibited, and “V” zoned should not be designated near the existing streams;
  - (iii) MasterPlan Limited considered that the “GB” zoning could not conserve the ecologically sensitive areas but it would restricted development at less ecologically sensitive areas, the “V” zone was too small to meet the Small House demand, and there was no measures for eco-tourism and conservation of other stream courses and coastal shorelines; and
  - (iv) village representatives objected to the designation of private land in the “GB” and “CA” zones, and agricultural use should be maintained in those areas;
- (m) regarding KFBG and Green Power’s comments, the streams near Pak Mong and Ngau Kwu Long Villages were not EIS, the “V” zones were to reflect the existing village developments. Future Small House developments would need to comply with the requirement regarding sewage treatment, e.g. provision of septic tanks. Excavation and land filling in “V”, “Green Belt” (“GB”), “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) and “Conservation Area” (“CA”) zones required planning permission from the Board. AFCD had confirmed

that the SSSI was appropriate. The proposal submitted by MasterPlan Limited was similar to that submitted previously and was considered not acceptable as there was no assessment to demonstrate the feasibility of the proposal. The “GB” and “CA” zoning designated for the abandoned agricultural land with high ecological value was considered appropriate;

#### Land Use Planning Considerations

- (n) Lantau Development Context – under the Revised Concept Plan for Lantau, the Area consisting of woodland, grassland/shrubland, streams, coastal mudflat, agricultural field and villages was identified as a conservation area to conserve the existing natural character and intrinsic landscape value. The Area was also identified as a landscape protection area. Given the ecological sensitivity of Tai Ho Stream SSSI and Tai Ho Wan, no large-scale development should be introduced in order not to compromise the rural setting and natural environment. Developments should be of a low-rise character and had regards to the existing landscape;
  
- (o) Nature Conservation – Tai Ho formed an integral part of the natural landscape in the adjoining country parks with a wide spectrum of natural habitats. It was designated as one of the 12 priority sites for enhanced conservation under the New Nature Conservation Policy (NNCP) introduced in November 2004, which aimed at regulating, protecting and managing natural resources that were important for the conservation of biological diversity of Hong Kong in a sustainable manner. On this aspect, a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) pilot scheme which involved the establishment of an Ecology Park in Tai Ho was received in 2005. On 14.4.2008, the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE) considered that the pilot scheme was not ready to be taken forward in the present form in view of, amongst others, the potentially complicated land related issues and the lack of

an experienced partner to manage the proposed Ecology Park. Similar proposal to designate areas mainly in the western part of Tai Ho Valley as development sites for low to medium-density residential developments and tourism-related facilities was also received during the DPA plan representation stage and the OZP preparation stage;

- (p) Land for Village Development – there were four recognised villages in the Area and their ‘VE’ covered an area of about 26.05ha. Except for Wong Kung Tin at the southernmost part of the Area where no village settlement was found, all other villages in the Area consisted of typical 3-storey village houses with ancestral halls (Tsz Tong) and a large area of paved area for ancestral worshipping activities. There were 34 outstanding applications for Small House in the Area. According to the 10-year forecast of Small House demand, there would be a demand for 196 Small Houses. About 5.76ha of land would be required to meet the Small House demand. About 3.37ha of land would be available within the “V” zone, meeting 58% of the demand. An incremental approach for designation of “V” zone for Small House development had been adopted with an aim to consolidating Small House development at suitable locations in order to avoid undesirable disturbances to the natural environment and overtaxing the limited infrastructure in the Area;

#### Planning Intention

- (q) the general planning intention of the Area was to conserve the Area’s outstanding natural landscape with unique scientific and ecological values in safeguarding the natural habitat and natural system of the wider area and to preserve historical artifacts, local culture and traditions of the villages. Due consideration should be given to the conservation of the ecologically and environmentally sensitive areas, such as Tai Ho Stream SSSI, when development in or near the Area was proposed. Small House development in recognised villages

would be consolidated at suitable locations to preserve the rural character of the Area;

### Land Use Zonings

- (r) the proposed zoning included :
- (i) “V” (about 6.43ha) – the planning intention of this zone was to designate both existing recognised villages and area of land considered suitable for village expansion. Except Wong Kwun Tin where there was no existing village settlement, outstanding Small House application and forecast for Small House demand, “V” zones were designated for Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long and Tai Ho Village around existing village cluster having regard to the ‘VE’, approved Small House applications, building lots, local topography, site characteristics and Small House demand forecast. Areas of difficult terrain, dense vegetation, ecologically sensitive areas and buffer area for stream courses were excluded;
  - (ii) “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) (about 0.15ha) – the planning intention of this zone is primarily for the provision of Government, institution or community (GIC) facilities serving the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district, region or the territory. The two existing public toilets located at Pak Mong and Ngau Kwu Long, and the existing Luk Hop Yuen Temple on the eastern side of Tai Ho Wan were zoned “G/IC”;
  - (iii) “Green Belt” (“GB”) (about 166.97ha) – the planning intention of this zone was primarily for defining the limits of development areas by natural features and to preserve the existing natural landscape as well as to provide passive

recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. The “GB” zone mainly covered agricultural land, hillslopes, natural vegetations and small streams in Tai Ho Valley, Hung Fa Ngan and A Po Long area, and Wong Kung Tin. Agricultural land at Pak Mong, Ngau Kwu Long, Tai Ho and Wong Kung Tin Villages was also included in this zone;

- (iv) “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) (about 4.20ha) – the planning intention of this zone was to conserve, protect and retain the natural coastlines and the sensitive coastal natural environment, including attractive geological features, physical landform or area of high landscape, scenic or ecological value, with a minimum of built development. The coastal areas along Tai Ho Wan which primarily consist of coastal vegetation, tidal mudflats, rocky boulder coasts and part of the mangrove on the western side of Tai Ho Stream’s estuary were zoned “CPA”. New residential development was not permitted under this zone. Redevelopment of existing house might be permitted on application to the Board;
  
- (iv) “Conservation Area” (“CA”) (about 15.41ha) – this zone was intended to protect and retain the existing natural landscape, ecological or topographical features of the area for conservation, educational and research purposes and to separate sensitive natural environment such as SSSI or Country Park from the adverse effects of development. The “CA” zone covered buffers areas on both sides of Tai Ho Stream SSSI and a mature woodland at the south of Pak Mong village. Redevelopment of existing house might be permitted on application to the Board; and

- (v) “SSSI” (about 4.64ha) – the planning intention of this zone was to conserve and protect the features of special scientific interest such as rare or particular species of fauna and flora and their habitats which are designated as SSSI. The designated Tai Ho Stream SSSI, which was a natural stream with several tributaries running from upland to the lowland estuary and of conservation importance were zoned “SSSI”. Diversion of streams, filling of land/pond or excavation of land might cause adverse impacts on the adjacent areas and adverse impacts on the natural environment. In view of the conservation value of the area within this zone, permission from the Board was required for such activities; and

#### Consultation

- (s) the draft OZP together with its Notes and Explanatory Statement (ES) as well as the Planning Report had been circulated to the relevant government bureaux and departments for comments. Comments received had been incorporated where appropriate. Islands District Council and Mui Wo Rural Committee would be consulted and their comments would be submitted to the Board for consideration prior to the publication of the draft OZP.

45. As the presentation of the PlanD was completed, the Chairman invited comments/questions from Members.

46. In response to a Member’s question on whether agricultural use would be permitted in “GB” and “CA” zones, the Chairman invited DPO/SKIs to elaborate on the different treatments on agricultural use in various zonings. In this regard, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that agricultural use was always permitted in “V”, “AGR”, “GB” and “CA” zones as it was considered compatible with the village and natural environment. Areas with active agricultural activities or areas considered by Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) of having potential for agricultural rehabilitation would

be zoned “AGR”. “GB” zoning would usually be designated to derelict farm land or area covered with vegetation. Developments within “GB” and “CA” zones would be subject to more stringent controls as there was a general presumption against development in these zones.

47. Another Member noted that the boundary of two “V” zones was very near the natural stream and asked whether the “V” zone concerned could be set back. In response, Ms Donna P.Y. Tam said that the existing village cluster and some abandoned agricultural land in front were designated “V”. It was common that villages and agricultural land were situated close to streams for cultivation purpose. For the “V” zones in Tai Ho, relevant departments had been consulted and it was considered that the small streams did not have any significant ecological value that warranted the need for a buffer. Notwithstanding, future Small House development within the “V” zone would need to comply with government’s requirement in terms of drainage and sewage treatment. Septic tanks would not be permitted within 30m from the stream.

48. The same Member further asked about the alignment of the “V” zone and whether there would be room to build a concrete pavement along the stream. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam showed a plan of Ngau Kwu Long Village and explained that the “V” zone generally follow the boundary of agricultural lots. In processing applications for Small House, PlanD would provide comment to the Lands Department regarding the location of the Small House to avoid intruding onto the stream.

49. Another Member said that preserving the ecologically valuable area might impose constraints on village development and asked whether there was any policy to relocate the affected villages so that villagers could develop and the natural environment could be preserved. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam said that in designating “V” zones in high ecologically sensitive areas, the “V” zone would be confined to the existing village cluster. However, in less ecologically sensitive areas, a slightly bigger “V” zone might be considered, which might serve to accommodate cross-village application of Small House developments from villages of the same Heung. As Tai Ho was far away from Mui Wo under Mui Wo Heung, cross-village application of Tai Ho villagers for Small House development in Mui Wo would be likely not acceptable. Pak Mong Village was away

from the Tai Ho EIS and there were existing village developments in the area. For Ngau Kwu Long Village and Tai Ho San Tsuen, the “V” zones were mainly to reflect the existing village clusters and there was no spare capacity in the “V” zone to accommodate additional Small House development. A 30m buffer from the EIS was generally maintained. Future Small House demand for those two villages might need to be accommodated in Pak Mong Village.

50. Mr K.K. Ling, D of Plan said that there was no policy to relocate a village on conservation ground. Regarding a Member’s suggestion to set back the “V” zone of Ngau Kwu Long Village from the stream, as the stream will flow into the EIS, he suggested that AFCD should be consulted on whether the boundary of the concerned “V” zone should be adjusted. Members agreed.

51. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the draft Tai Ho OZP No. S/I-TH/B (Appendix I of the Paper) together with its Notes (Appendix II of the Paper) was suitable for consultation with IsDC;
- (b) the ES (Appendix III of the Paper) was suitable to serve as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for the land use zoning of the draft Tai Ho OZP No. S/I-TH/B and the ES should be issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) the ES (Appendix III of the Paper) was suitable for consultation with IsDC together with the draft OZP.

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng returned to join the meeting at this point.]



**Procedural Matters**

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TW/32 (TPB Paper No. 10193)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

52. The Secretary reported that one of the items involved amendment to the approved Tsuen Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TW/32 to facilitate a community hall development. The following Members had declared interests in the item for owning properties in the area and involved in the community hall development project :

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Ms Christina M. Lee | - | being a director of a company which owns some properties and car parking spaces in Texaco Road, Tsuen Wan   |
| Dr C.H. Hau         | - | co-owning a property in Castle Peak Road, Tsuen Wan   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan | - | being the representative of the Home Affairs Department, which is involved in a community hall development project under one of the Amendment Items |

53. Members noted that Dr C.H. Hau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

54. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 13.5.2016, the draft Tsuen Wan OZP No. S/TW/32 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 17 representations and one comment were received. All representations were related to the Amendment Item A regarding the rezoning of areas generally bounded by Castle Peak Road – Tsuen Wan, Pun Shan Street, Chai Wan Kok Street and Tai Chung Road from “Industrial” (“I”) to “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)"). The grounds of representation were on traffic congestion, rising rents, infrastructure provision, reducing industrial land, security and timing of rezoning.

55. It was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the full Board as they were of similar nature. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board’s regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

56. To ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum presentation time of 10 minutes to each representer and commenter in the hearing session. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for December 2016.

57. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered by the Board itself; and
- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter to ensure the efficient operation of the hearing.

**Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Further Representations on Proposed Amendments to the Draft Yi O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-YO/1 Arising from Consideration of Representations and Comments on the Draft Yi O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-YO/1  
(TPB Paper No. 10195)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

58. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, the Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item for having current or past business dealings with the representative of some representers/commenters, or acquainted with some representers/commenters or with Mr Andrew S.L. Lam, whose name was repeatedly mentioned by the representative of two commenters in the meeting held on 8.7.2016 to consider the representations and comments :

- |                    |   |  |
|--------------------|---|--|
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu    | - | having current business dealings with Urbis Limited, the representative of (C1) and being acquainted with Mr Andrew S.L. Lam   |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai | ] | having current business dealings   |
| Mr K.K. Cheung     | ] | with Urbis Limited   |
| Dr C.H. Hau        | - | being the Vice-Chairman of The Conservancy Association (R16)   |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | - | his company having business dealings with Urbis Limited, the representative of (C1) and personally knowing Mr Paul Zimmerman (C1264), who was also the representative of |

Designing Hong Kong Limited  
(R17)

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	]	personally knowing some of the
Professor T.S. Liu	]	representers/commenters
Mr Franklin Yu	-	having past business dealings with Urbis Limited
Mr Michael W.L. Wong (Chairman)	]	
Professor S.C. Wong (Vice-chairman)	]	
Mr. H.W. Cheung	]	
Mr Patrick H.T. Lau	]	being acquainted with Mr Andrew
Mr Philip S.L. Kan	]	S.L. Lam
Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung	]	
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	
Mr Stephen L.H. Liu	]	
Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong	]	
Mr K.K. Ling	]	

59. Members noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

60. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 13.11.2015, the draft Yi O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-YO/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 20 representations and 1,401 comments were received.

61. After consideration of the representations and comments on 8.7.2016, the Board decided to partially uphold some of the representations (R11 to R17) by rezoning two sites at the western part of Yi O San Tsuen with dense tree clusters from “Agriculture” (“AGR”) to “Green Belt” (“GB”) and a site at the northern part of the eastern riparian of the stream at Yi O from “AGR” to “GB”. The proposed amendments to the draft OZP were published for public inspection on 2.9.2016. Upon expiry of the 3-week exhibition period, seven further representations (FRs) were received.

62. Of the seven FRs received, F5 to F7 were submitted by the original representers (R11 to R13) and the proposed amendments were made after consideration of their representations. Those three FRs were thus considered as invalid and should be treated as not having been made under section 6D(3) of the Ordinance.

63. The FR submitted by Yi O Indigenous Inhabitant Representative mainly objected the proposed amendments of sites at the western part of Yi O San Tsuen and the northern part of the eastern riparian stream at Yi O to “Green Belt” (“GB”) while the FRs submitted by individuals supported the proposed amendments. The FR submitted by a green group proposed more stringent control by rezoning the sites to “Conservation Area” (“CA”).

64. It was recommended that as the representations were considered by the full Board, it is considered more appropriate for the Board to hear the further representations without resorting to the appointment of a Representation Hearing Committee. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board’s regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

65. In view of the large number of original representations and comments, and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each original representers and commenters as well as further representers in the hearing session, subject to confirmation of the number of representers and commenters attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required. The original representers who have made representations/comments on which the proposed amendments have been made and the further representers F1 to F4 will be invited to the

hearing. Consideration of the FR by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for December 2016.

66. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the three FRs (R5 to F7) were considered as invalid and should be treated as not having been made under section 6D(3) of the Ordinance;
- (b) the FRs should be considered by the Board itself; and
- (c) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each FR, representer/commenter, subject to confirmation of the number of representatives and commenters attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required.

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comment on the Draft The Peak Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H14/12  
(TPB Paper No. 10196)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

67. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item for living in the area and having past business dealings with one of the representatives/commenters :

Mr K.K. Cheung	-	having past business dealings with World Wide Fund for Nature of Hong Kong (R5/C32)
----------------	---	---

Mr K.K. Ling  
(Director of Planning)

- living in the government staff quarters in the Peak area and with no pecuniary interest in property value

68. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

69. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 29.4.2016, the draft The Peak Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H14/12 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 1,640 representations and 40 comments were received. One representation supported the amendment item and the remaining 1,639 representations and the 40 comments opposed the rezoning. The grounds of objection were mainly related to the policy of protecting “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites, heritage conservation policy, the lack of overriding need for rezoning the site for development, and adverse impacts on traffic, environment, landscape, visual, noise etc.

70. It was recommended that the representations and comments should be considered collectively in one group by the full Board as they were of similar nature. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board’s regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary.

71. To ensure the efficient operation of the hearing, it was recommended to allot a maximum presentation time of 10 minutes to each representer and commenter in the hearing session, subject to confirmation of the number of representers and commenters attending the hearing and the aggregate presentation time required. Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board was tentatively scheduled for December 2016/January 2017.

72. After deliberation, the Board agreed that :

- (a) the representations and comments should be considered by the Board itself; and

- (b) a 10-minute presentation time would be allotted to each representer/commenter to ensure the efficient operation of the hearing.

**Agenda Item 9**

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K11/28A under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10197)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

73. The Secretary reported that the following Member had declared interests in the item for owning a property in the area :

Ms Christina M. Lee - being a director of a company  
which owns a property at Fung  
Cheung House, Wong Tai Sin

74. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Member who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

75. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 24.3.2016, the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K11/28 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). One supportive representation and no comment was received. After giving consideration to the representation on 7.10.2016, the Board noted the supportive representation and decided not to propose any amendment to the OZP to meet/partially meet the representer's proposal.



76. Since the representation consideration process has been completed, the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP is now ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council for approval.

77. After deliberation, the Board agreed :

- (a) that the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/28A and its Notes were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) to endorse the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tsz Wan Shan, Diamond Hill and San Po Kong OZP No. S/K11/28A as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for the various land-use zonings on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) that the updated ES was suitable for submission to the CE in C together with the draft OZP.

### **Agenda Item 10**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H15/30 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10198)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

78. The Secretary reported that the following Member had declared interests in the item for owning a property in the area :

Mr Wilton W.T. Fok - co-owning a flat in the South  
Horizons, Ap Lei Chau

79. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Member who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

80. The Secretary reported that on 24.12.2015, the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H15/30 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 607 representations and 16 comments were received.

81. On 27.9.2016, the Town Planning Board (the Board) considered all the representations and comments. During the deliberation session, the Board decided to defer a decision on the representations and request additional information from concerned government departments on aspects related to traffic, driving school operation and waterfront promenade. The Board would hold another meeting to continue the consideration of the representations and comments on the OZP upon presentation of the additional information.

82. According to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 24.11.2016. It was unlikely that the plan-making process could be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit for submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for approval (i.e. before 24.11.2016). There was a need to apply to the CE for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process of the draft OZP prior to submission to the CE in C for approval.

83. The Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft Aberdeen & Ap Lei Chau OZP No. S/H15/30 to the CE in C for a period of six months from 24.11.2016 to 24.5.2017.

**Agenda Item 11**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/21, Draft Tung Chung Extension Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCE/1 and Draft Tung Chung Valley Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCV/1 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval  
(TPB Paper No. 10199)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

84. The Secretary reported that the proposed amendments to the approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCTC/20 involved zoning of sites for proposed public housing developments. The proposed amendments are also subject to representations submitted by Coral Ching Limited, which was a subsidiary company of Swire Properties Limited (Swire) (R1), the Hong Kong Water Sports Council which was represented by Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) (R5), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R24) and World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) (R25).

85. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests in the item for having affiliation/business dealings with the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), representers and/or their consultant, or having close relative owning property in the area :

Mr H.F. Leung

- being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA and being a convenor of the Railway Objections Hearing Panel

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Mr K.K. Ling<br><i>(as Director of Planning)</i>                                   | - | being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and Building Committee of HKHA   |
| Mr Martin W.C. Kwan<br><i>(as Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department)</i> | - | being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who is a member of the Strategic Planning Committee and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA, and his close relative owning property in Tung Chung Town Centre |
| Dr C.H. Hau  | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and being Vice-chairman of the CA (R24)  |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu  | ] | having current business dealings  |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho  | ] | with HKHA and Swire (R1)  |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai   | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and her firm is a tenant of Swire (R1)   |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau  | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and past business dealings with Swire (R1)   |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu  | - | having current business dealings with HKHA and Masterplan (R5)  |

Mr Franklin Yu	]	having past business dealings with
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam	]	HKHA
Mr K.K. Cheung	-	Having past business dealings with WWF (R25)
Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon	-	his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work

86. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the item was procedural in nature, Members agreed that the above Members who had declared interests could stay in the meeting.

87. The Secretary reported that on 8.1.2016, the draft TCTC OZP, draft Tung Chung Extension (TCE) Area OZP and the Draft Tung Chung Valley (TCV) OZP were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). A total of 125 representations and 246 comments were received on the three OZPs (28 representations and 81 comments for TCTC OZP, 59 representations and 78 comments for TCE OZP and 38 representations and 87 comments for TCV OZP).

88. The hearings of representations and comments by the Town Planning Board (the Board) were held on 28.9.2016, 29.9.2016 and 4.10.2016. As the three Tung Chung OZPs were interrelated, deliberation of the OZPs would be held together and was tentatively scheduled for November 2016.

89. According to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 8.12.2016. It was unlikely that the plan-making process could be completed within the 9-month statutory time limit for submission of the three draft OZPs to the CE in C for approval (i.e. before 8.12.2016). There was a need to apply to the CE for an extension of the statutory time

limit for six months to allow sufficient time to complete the plan-making process of the three draft OZPs prior to submission to the CE in C for approval.

90. The Board agreed that the CE's agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft TCTC OZP No. S/I-TCTC/21, draft TCE OZP No. S/I-TCE/1 and draft TCV OZP No. S/I-TCV/1 to the CE in C for a period of six months from 8.12.2016 to 8.6.2017.

**Agenda Item 12**

[Confidential Item] [Closed Meeting]

91. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

**Agenda Item 13**

[Open Meeting]

**Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

92. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:15pm.

(Chairman)  
Town Planning Board