

**Minutes of 1134th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017,
16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong

Transport Department

Mr Peter C.K. Mak (15.2.2017 p.m. and 16.2.2017 a.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan (7.2.2017 a.m.)

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Mr C.W. Tse (15.2.2017 a.m. and 1.3.2017)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung (7.2.2017, 15.2.2017 p.m., 16.2.2017 and 21.2.2017)

Assistant Director/Regional 1

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang (7.2.2017 a.m., 15.2.2017 p.m., 16.2.2017 and 1.3.2017 p.m.)

Assistant Director/Regional 3

Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan (7.2.2017 p.m. and 1.3.2017 a.m.)

Mr John K.T. Lai (15.2.2017 a.m. and 21.2.2017)

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Professor K.C. Chau

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Dr. C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

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

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms Sally S.Y. Fong (7.2.2017 a.m., 15.2.2017 a.m., 21.2.2017 a.m. and 1.3.2017 a.m.)

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (15.2.2017 p.m., 16.2.2017 a.m., 21.2.2017 p.m. and 1.3.2017 p.m.)

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (7.2.2017 p.m. and 16.2.2017 p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Stephen K.S. Lee (7.2.2017 a.m. and 21.2.2017 a.m.)

Ms W.H. Ho (7.2.2017 p.m.)

Ms Wendy W.L. Li (15.2.2017 a.m. and 21.2.2017 p.m.)

Ms Anissa W.Y. Lai (15.2.2017 p.m.)

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (16.2.2017 a.m.)

Ms Doris S.Y. Ting (16.2.2017 p.m.)

Ms Karen F.Y. Wong (1.3.2017 a.m.)

Mr K.K. Lee (1.3.2017 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 7.2.2017:

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

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 1), Lands Department
Mr Simon S.W. Wang

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 1

[Open meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/20
(TPB Paper No. 10244)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Declaration of Interests

2. The Secretary reported that the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H1/20 involved rezoning of a site for public housing development (Item C1) by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA); rezoning of an existing Mass Transit Railway (MTR) ventilation building (Item K) to reflect the as-built condition; and rezoning of an area within the existing Underground Island West Refuse Transfer Station (IWRTS) with stipulation of building height restriction (Item L). The following Members had declared interests on the items, for being associated/having business dealings with HKHA or Mass Transit Railway Corporation Ltd. (MTRCL); being an officer of the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) which was the operator of the Underground IWRTS, or affiliated with Mr Paul Zimmerman (R3888), the co-founder and Chief Executive Officer of Designing Hong Kong Limited (R4112/C12), Ms Mary Mulvihill (R4120/C305) and Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), the representative of China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited (R144) :

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning
(*as Director of Planning*) Committee (SPC) and the Building
Committee (BC) of HKHA

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan - being a representative of the Director of
(*as Chief Engineer*) Home Affairs who was a member of SPC and

*(Works), Home Affairs
Department)*

Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung,
Principal Environmental
Protection Officer (Metro
Assessment), EPD

- being an officer of EPD, the operator of the
existing Underground IWRTS

Mr H.F. Leung

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

Dr C.H. Hau

- having current business dealings with HKHA

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

] having current business dealings with HKHA

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

] and MTRCL

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

- having current business dealings with HKHA
and MTRCL, and personally knowing Mr
Paul Zimmerman

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

- having current business dealings with HKHA,
MTRCL and Arup

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

- having current business dealings with
MTRCL and Arup, and past business
dealings with HKHA

Mr K.K. Cheung

] their firm having current business dealing

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

] with HKHA, MTRCL and Arup, and hiring
Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time
to time

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL and Arup
- Mr Dominic K.K. Lam - having past business dealings with HKHA and Arup
- Professor S.C. Wong
(*The Vice-chairman*) - being a member of the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of MTR Academy, an engineering consultant of Arup, and the Chair Professor and Head of Department of Civil Engineering of the University of Hong Kong (HKU) where MTRCL and Arup had sponsored some activities of the Department before
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work

3. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had tendered apologies for not attending the special meeting. Messrs K.K. Cheung, Dominic K.K. Lam and Ivan C.S. Fu had also tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting.

4. As the interests of Mr Franklin Yu, Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Tony W.H. Cheung were indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting. As Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's interest was direct, Members agreed that he should leave the meeting.

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

5. The Secretary also reported that two e-mails dated 22 & 23.1.2017 from Alliance for Protecting Cadogan Park (APCP) (R150) had been received. APCP requested that its

presentation materials at the meeting be circulated to the Town Planning Board (the Board). APCP also included a video clip in the e-mail. As the submissions were made after the expiry of the statutory public consultation period, Members agreed that they should be treated as not having been made.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

7. The following government representatives, the representers/commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting:

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5 (STP/HK5), PlanD

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip - Engineer/Central & Western 3 (E/CW3), TD

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

Mr Richard W.Y. Wong - Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment) 3 (SEPO(MA)3), EPD

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R7 - 李耀明

R125 - 胡娟

西區被逼遷租客大會

Ms Lois Lee]	
Mr Leung Ping Kong]	Representers' representatives
Ms Tse Tsz Ying]	

R62 - Chai Yat Ching

R55 - Choi Kwok Hing

Mr Choi Kwok Hing	-	Representer and Representer's representative
-------------------	---	--

R57 - Choi Yat Lung

R56 - Kwan Yee Man

Ms Kwan Yee Man	-	Representer & Representer's representative
-----------------	---	--

R124 - 梁炳江

R3172 - 陳錫明

Ms Lois Lee	-	Representers' representative
-------------	---	------------------------------

R141 - 社區大使隊

Mr Chiu Wing Chiu]	
Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia]	Representer's representatives
Mr Ho Kwok Hei]	

R1800 - Wong Wai Lun

R2071 / C229 - Cheng Chap Wai Andrew

R3773 - Wai Lun Wong

R3851 - Cherry Wong

R142 / C14 - Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town

R179 / C16 - Wong Kin Ching

Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town –

Ms Wong Kin Ching	-	Representer, Commenter, and representative of Representers and Commenters
Mr Mok Kun Ki]	
Mr Fu Chee On David]	Representatives of Representers and
Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia]	Commenters

R143 - 西環體育會

Mr Lui Yat Nam	-	Representer's representative
----------------	---	------------------------------

R144 - China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited

China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited –

Mr Jiang Cheng Yi]	
Ms Xu Wei Na]	
Mr Huang Xu Liang]	Representer's representatives
Mr Yu Zhi Liang]	
Mr Chris Wong]	
Mr Ge Jin]	

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. –

Ms Yeung Wing Shan Theresa]	
Ms Alice Chow]	Representer's representatives
Mr Ferdinard Tsang]	
Ms Lau Sze-hong]	
Wong Tung & Partners Ltd –		
Mr Carrott Shiu]	Representer's representative

R151 – Law Kwun Chung (Demosistō)

R177/C274 – Wong Kai Chiu

Mr Wong Kai Chiu	-	Representer, Commenter and Representer's representative
------------------	---	--

R161 - Sin Cheuk Nam

Mr Sin Cheuk Nam - Representer

R1053 - 譚紹敏

R1278 - Ma Kong Ying Emily

R1280 - 譚翠英

R1282 - Lee Yat Ming Ken

R1281/C79 - Ma Kuk Ying

R1283 - Ma Hsien Chih

R1501 - 譚巧英

R1502 - 招紹明

R1503 - 招樹新

R178 / C291 - Ma Lai Ying

Ms Ma Lai Ying - Representer, Commenter and representative of Representers and Commenter

8. The Chairman said that on 7.10.2016, the Board decided to consider the representations and comments collectively in one group by the Board. Due to the large number of representers and commenters indicating that they would attend the hearing, the hearing would be held on five days, i.e. 7.2.2017, 15.2.2017, 16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017.

9. The Chairman went on to say that government representatives would first brief Members on the background to the representations and comments. The Chairman would then invite the representers, commenters and their representatives to make oral submission. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their

representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in their absence, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

10. The Chairman then invited Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK to brief Members on the background to the representations.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the land use review on the western part of Kennedy Town, the views and proposals of the representations and comments on representations with respect to the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/20 (the draft OZP), the planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10244.

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of DPO/HK]

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

R7 - 李耀明

R125 - 胡娟

13. Ms Lois Lee made the following main points:

- (a) the representers were tenants living in small rental flats in Sai Wan. Their living conditions were bad with inadequate provision of sanitary facilities;
- (b) there were some 300,000 people on the waiting list for public rental housing (PRH), and people had to wait for a long period of time before they were allocated a public rental flat. Sai Wan Estate with a total of

638 public housing units was the only PRH estate in Sai Wan. Due to shortage of PRH flats, particularly on the Hong Kong Island, many eligible elderly were not able to secure a PRH flat in the area. The Government should provide more PRH to meet the demand, not bulldozing the old buildings for luxurious housing or hotels and displacing the existing residents;

- (c) the ex-temporary school site for the Hong Kong Academy, the ex-Police Married Officers Quarters at Ka Wai Man Road and ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area site offered great opportunity for PRH development. Since car ownership of residents in PRH estates was low, PRH development in the area would not overtax the transport facilities in the area; and
- (d) a signature campaign in May 2015 had collected some 500 signatures in two weeks supporting the construction of PRH in the area. The Government was urged to increase the supply of PRH rather than luxurious private housing to meet the need of the general public.

R57 - Choi Yat Lung

R56 - Kwan Yee Man

14. Ms Kwan Yee Man made the following main points:

- (a) she did not understand why the sites of the ex-Police Married Officers Quarters at Ka Wai Man Road and ex-Mount Davis Cottage Area were withheld from development. They should be developed for PRH; and
- (b) she had been growing up in Sai Wan and witnessed the transformation of Sai Wan from an old area to one filled with new shops and high-end residential buildings. More sites should be reserved for PRH development in the area for the general public.

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

R141 - 社區大使隊

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia made the following main points:

- (a) “The Community Ambassador” (“社區大使隊”) was an organization formed in 2003 by residents who had lived in the Western District for a long period of time. “Our Vision for the Waterfront Promenade” (“我們所盼望的海濱長廊”) would be the theme of her oral submission;
- (b) they had maintained communication with PlanD and the other government departments regarding the planning of the proposed waterfront promenade since their establishment. Their views were mainly on Amendment Items C1, A1 and C2;

Amendment Item C1

- (c) they supported the development of 2,340 PRH units under Amendment Item C1 to optimize the use of land resources for public housing and housing for the elderly when their homes were redeveloped. The proposed PRH would help bring about a balanced and well-planned community;

Amendment Item A1

- (d) although the implementation of a continuous waterfront promenade around the Hong Kong Island was supported, they objected to commercialization of the promenade which would adversely affect the connectivity and public use of the promenade;
- (e) taking Pier No.7 in the Central District as an example, the public open space within the building was a narrow strip of land accessible only through a restaurant with no clear directional signage for the public.

Such commercialized open space would mainly benefit the patron of the commercial services but not the general public;

- (f) since 2009, their organization had organized a workshop and submitted a proposal to the Government in relation to the design of the proposed waterfront promenade. It was disappointing that the organization's award-winning proposal in a national competition had not been taken seriously by the Government in the design of the promenade in the Western District;
- (g) the organization had the following suggestions on the future waterfront promenade:

Quality open space

- (i) with reference to other waterfront promenades, the proposed promenade should be widened to at least 20 m with dense trees and plants which should be wind and seawater resistant;

Accessible by the general public

- (ii) the public should have free access to the waterfront area 24 hours a day, and the area should be free of commercial uses/activities;

Amendment Item C2

- (h) there was insufficient open space provision in the area. Despite some new open spaces were proposed on the OZP, they did not address the existing shortfall in the area;
- (i) the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG) should be retained to cater for the need of the growing and ageing population in the area. It had served the area for years, and its demolition would cause great inconvenience to the residents;

- (j) the planned waterfront promenade was not close to the residential areas and was segregated by roads, making it quite inaccessible, particularly to the aged and the physically impaired. Open space should be close to the residents' homes, such as CSTG, to allow them to relax after a day of hard work;
- (k) CSTG with 196 mature trees, including a rare and precious species *Aquilaria sinensis*, should be preserved. Being the only green lung in the area, its demolition could hardly be compensated in terms of quality. Since the park had been used for many years without causing any harm, decontamination was considered not necessary;
- (l) CSTG should be retained and integrated with the proposed waterfront promenade so as to improve the connectivity of the waterfront promenade which would be linked up with the other waterfront promenades on Hong Kong Island, providing a sustainable waterfront environment; and
- (m) Members were invited to consider the points raised by the organization and help materialize the implementation of the waterfront promenade which had been long awaited by the residents of Sai Wan.

R1800 - Wong Wai Lun

R2071 / C229 - Cheng Chap Wai Andrew

R3773 - Wai Lun Wong

R3851 - Cherry Wong

R142 / C14 - Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town

R179 / C16 - Wong Kin Ching

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and some video clips, Ms Wong Kin Ching and Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points:

- (a) the Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town (the Concern Group) was formed in October 2015 to express views and concerns in relation to the proposals on the draft OZP;

Public consultation

- (b) residents were only aware of the Government's plan for Kennedy Town in March 2013 through a member of the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC). PlanD's public consultation mainly involved C&WDC but had not reached out to the residents. C&WDC members did not focus on the technical issues e.g. decontamination and their views did not represent the views of the residents in Kennedy Town and Mount Davis (KTMD);
- (c) the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) paper on the subject was in English and many local residents could not understand it. They could only rely on the C&WDC members to provide information on the subject but did not get a full picture;
- (d) it was stated in the MPC paper that '[i]n general, C&WDC and the general public have no in-principle objection to develop and enhance the western part of Kennedy Town'. That statement had played down the residents' opposing views in KTMD. The Concern Group had collected over 5,000 signatures which objected to Amendment Item C2 and supported the retention of CSTG. Due to inadequate public consultation on the matter, many residents in KTMD, including those in The Merton and Sai Wan Apartments located adjacent to CSTG, had no knowledge about the planning proposals including the demolition of CSTG until the Concern Group's signature campaign. Other than C&WDC, the Government had only consulted SKH Lui Ming Choi Memorial Primary School, the Harbourfront Commission and those attended the briefing organized by The Merton Owners' Committee, etc in relation to the decontamination works. Due to inadequate coverage of the public consultation, the views collected were biased;

Population estimates

- (e) the population estimates quoted in the OZP were doubtful. As stated in the MPC paper, the planned population in KTMD was about 90,600 comparing with 75,400 in 2011, which represented an increase of 8,500 people arising from the new developments on the draft OZP and the 6,700 people from redevelopment of existing buildings. The Concern Group considered such figures had underestimated the future population of KTMD;

- (f) according to the Concern Group's rough estimate, at least 13 new residential developments comprising about 1,868 residential units had been completed in KTMD in recent years, bringing about an increase of over 5,000 persons, based on a person-per-flat rate of 2.7. The Concern Group estimated that the population of the area would reach 110,000 upon full development which was about 20,000 more than the planned population estimated by the Government. The planned facilities including open space reserved on the draft OZP, which was based on an underestimated population figure, would not be adequate to cater for the need of the future population;

Traffic impact assessment (TIA)

- (g) the traffic in the area was very congested. Given the underestimated planned population, the assumption used in the TIA was wrong and the findings of the assessment were inaccurate. For example, the AM and PM peak hour pedestrian count in the TIA report at Ka Wai Man Road was 29 and 26 respectively. The pedestrian count was unreasonable as there was a primary school in Ka Wai Man Road and the footpath concerned was heavily used by students, particularly during the PM peak hour;

- (h) the following traffic mitigation measures proposed in the TIA report were also considered ineffective:

Left-turn only traffic from Ka Wai Man Road

- (i) left-turn only traffic generated by the future PRH developments and private developments from Ka Wai Man Road would have to join the westbound traffic on Victoria Road and use the proposed new road to go to Central via Cadogan Road. The arrangement was inefficient and took longer travelling time;

MTR

- (ii) MTR was not a solution to the traffic problem in the area. The MTR Kennedy Town Station was far away from the proposed new developments. People who travelled short distance preferred road-based transport to MTR;

Proposed public vehicle park to the west of Sai See Street

- (iii) the proposal to provide more public car parking spaces would only attract more vehicles to the area. The location of the proposed vehicle park was far away from Forbes Street where the demand was generated. A better location for the proposed vehicle park would be the Green Minibus terminus adjacent to the MTR Kennedy Town Station;

Changing circumstances

- (i) the draft OZP had overlooked the following changing circumstances both within and adjacent to KTMD:

Redevelopment potential of public and private developments

- (i) Sai Wan Estate, which was over 50 years old, and some other private residential developments in Kennedy Town were due for redevelopment and they would provide a substantial supply of housing stock in the area. The proposed PRH developments, which would be an ideal decanting estate for tenants of Sai Wan Estate, should be considered comprehensively with Sai Wan Estate redevelopment in one go;

Gentrification

- (ii) Kennedy Town had become more commercialized and local shops were being replaced by high-end shops generally unaffordable by the local residents. The Government's response that gentrification was not a land use related matter was unfounded as provision of a balanced community was always an objective of land use planning;

Interaction with neighbouring districts

- (iii) people drove from Pokfulam, Cyberport, Aberdeen, etc to Kennedy Town for shopping and dining facilities. With the extension of the MTR Island Line to Kennedy Town, more visitors were attracted to the area. With increasing interactions of Kennedy Town with its neighbouring districts, the traffic problems in Kennedy Town were no longer local issues;

Building heights

- (j) the stepped building height (BH) profile should be descending from the west to the east while taller buildings should be located near hillside for better air ventilation;

No alternatives for CSTG

- (k) CSTG should be preserved as it was conveniently located at the centre of KTMD and covered with trees, providing habitats for birds, bats and squirrels, and a lawn for public enjoyment. The alternatives proposed to replace CSTG were inadequate. The Smithfield Road Children's Playground was too small with a narrow configuration, and was subject to exhaust air from air-conditioners of the adjacent residential development. Ka Wai Man Road Garden could only be accessed via steps and ramps which was inconvenient for the aged and the physically impaired. It was poorly managed with limited greenery space. Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground at Sai Ning Street was designed mainly for ball games and conflicts with younger users would likely arise if the seniors used the recreation ground for 'Tai Chi' or stretching exercise. Belcher Bay Park was two bus stops away from the western part of Kennedy Town and hence too far for the seniors. Besides, the park had already been heavily used and was very crowded. Conflicts and arguments among users on the use of the park arose from time to time. Regarding the proposed temporary use of part of the Western District Public Cargo Working Area as open space, the public cargo working area was still in operation and currently not available for use. Future planning of the site was still under consultation. Besides, the site was far away from the western part of Kennedy Town;

The proposed Waterfront Promenade

- (l) as for the proposed waterfront promenade, it was still in the planning stage. Taking into account the time required for decontamination and construction, the promenade would only be available 10 years later. Besides, the accessibility of the proposed waterfront promenade was undesirable as the access via podium of the proposed residential development at the CSTG site might be denied by its future residents while at-grade access would involve crossing of roads. Furthermore,

many high-rise buildings in Belcher's Street would block the views to the proposed promenade and undermine its visual accessibility and usage;

- (m) the provision of shops and other commercial uses on the promenade would be too expensive for the general public. It was also anticipated that the future promenade would be largely paved with little greenery space and only shrubs or small trees would be planted in the initial years. It would take a long time for the plants to grow to a mature size;

Tree compensation

- (n) the compensatory planting ratio of 1:1 should not only be in terms of quantity but also in aggregate diameter at breast height (DBH). It was unlikely that the compensatory planting in the waterfront promenade could be provided on that basis;
- (o) selection of tree types was also important which should be wind, seawater and heat resistant;
- (p) the two healthy and mature *Ficus Benjamina* within the decontamination area should be preserved;

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of about five minutes at this juncture.]

Conclusion

- (q) Members were requested to note and consider the following concluding remarks:

Availability of alternatives

- (i) the 600 units to be provided within the CSTG site could not help solve the housing problems. There were better alternative sites to accommodate those 600 flats. Other proposed uses within the site

e.g. public transport terminus and public vehicle parks could be provided elsewhere;

Provision of open space

- (ii) it was unfair to assess open space provision at a district council level. The local open space shortfall should be addressed at the local level. With the demolition of CSTG, provision of open space in KTMD, including the proposed waterfront promenade, was only 0.87 m² per person, which was below the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines requiring 2 m² per person. The alternative open space sites proposed by the Government were not comparable to CSTG in terms of location, size and amount of greenery;

Social impact

- (iii) CSTG had been used by residents of all ages without any concern for over 18 years. No social impact assessment on its demolition had been done by the Government and the consultation with the local residents was far from comprehensive. The overwhelming number of residents responding to the signature campaign had indicated the significant adverse social impact that would be brought about by the demolition of CSTG;

Environmental impact

- (iv) unlike the ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant site, no decontamination was necessary for the CSTG site. The Task Force on Harbourfront Development on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission was briefed on the matter and agreed unanimously that decontamination of the CSTG site was unnecessary and that retention of CSTG would enhance the proposed waterfront promenade;

Tree preservation

- (v) there were mature trees, including *Aquilaria sinensis*, in CSTG and the provision of compensatory planting in the proposed waterfront promenade would not be adequate to compensate for the loss. CSTG should be retained to help reduce carbon emission and promote biodiversity;

Traffic impact

- (vi) the proposed traffic mitigation measures would not solve the traffic problems in the area. If CSTG was to be retained, it would help reduce some traffic. Besides, the reduction of 600 flats was not anticipated to have significant impact on the overall housing land supply. Furthermore, the traffic impact should be considered comprehensively with those that might be generated from the future development of East Lantau Metropolis envisaged in Hong Kong 2030+; and

Air ventilation and visual impacts

- (vii) the proposals under the amendment items would adversely affect air ventilation and visual amenity. The Government's responses were not agreeable.

R143 - 西環體育會

- 17. Mr Lui Yat Nam made the following main points:
 - (a) they organized sports activities for the residents. According to the views collected, most residents objected to the demolition of CSTG for the following reasons:

Insufficient open space

- (i) as compared to the other districts, provision of open space in Kennedy Town was insufficient. Taking Wan Chai as an example, there were Wan Chai Park and Harbour Road Garden. In Sai Ying Pun, there were King George V Memorial Park, Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park and Caine Road Garden. If CSTG was to be demolished, residents had to share-use the Belcher Bay Park with residents of Shek Tong Tsui, which had already been heavily used. It was essential to retain CSTG for use by the residents;

Precedents of providing open space in crowded area

- (ii) there were precedents to reduce over-crowdedness of old districts by provision of open space. In Yau Ma Tei, old buildings were demolished for the provision of breathing space/sitting-out areas, e.g. at Portland Street and Waterloo Road for the residents. CSTG needed to be retained, particularly for the elderly who could not walk very far;

No new park in Kennedy Town since late 1990s

- (iii) after the opening of CSTG in late 1990s, no new parks were provided in the area to serve the residents despite the construction of a number of new developments. Demolition of CSTG would further aggravate the shortage of open space;
- (b) there were already proposals to demolish Wan Chai Sports Ground, reduce the size of the Hong Kong Stadium and have underground development in Victoria Park and Southorn Playground. If CSTG could not be retained, the other open space/sports facilities on Hong Kong Island might subsequently be replaced by commercial or other uses;

- (c) if CSTG was to be demolished for high-rise buildings and with more upcoming developments, he worried that Kennedy Town would become another North Point with walled buildings and poor air ventilation. Noting the importance of CSTG to the residents, Members were requested to reconsider retaining CSTG and make it a permanent facility.

R144 - China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Yeung Wing Shan Theresa made the following main points:

- (a) the representer agreed to the following PlanD's responses to its representation:
 - (i) the rezoning of the site under Amendment Item B from "Industrial" to "Other Specified Uses" annotation "Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses" ("OU(CLT)" zone was to provide incentive for phasing out incompatible industrial uses;
 - (ii) putting commercial, leisure and tourism related uses under Column 2 was to ensure that future development/redevelopment would be put under scrutiny through the planning application mechanism;
 - (iii) the proposed wine cellar for wholesale of wine might be regarded as 'Wholesale Trade', which could be permitted on application to the Board;
 - (iv) the building height (BH) control for the "OU(CLT)" zone was the maximum BH in terms of mPD and number of storeys as stipulated on the OZP or height of the existing building, whichever was the greater;

The current situation of the site

- (b) the site consisted of two industrial buildings of 30 and 33 years old respectively for warehouse use and a pier of 625 m long protruding into the harbour. Several years ago, part of the warehouse had been turned into a red wine cellar;

Proposed relaxation of the restrictions of the draft OZP

- (c) the pier being situated at the western gateway to the harbour had redevelopment potential for commercial, leisure and tourism uses. However, with the maximum GFA of 46,446 m² as stipulated on the draft OZP for the site, after discounting the GFA for the existing two industrial buildings on site, only about 122.58 m² GFA would be left for commercial/leisure/tourism uses at the pier, which were inadequate for any meaningful uses to promote vibrancy and diversity of the site;
- (d) to realize the planning intention of the OZP, an additional GFA of 18,777 m² for the site was considered appropriate to allow a two-storey commercial development at the pier with an elevated walkway connecting the roof-top garden on the pier to the waterfront promenade;
- (e) the additional GFA would not affect the maximum BH restriction of the site. The resultant overall plot ratio (PR) of 5 was still lower than that for the Kai Tak Runway's development. As the proposed GFA relaxation would exceed the level that could be allowed under the planning application mechanism, amendment to the GFA restriction was necessary in the plan-making stage;
- (f) the current waterfront, excluding a landing area of 1.5 m, was only 10.5 m wide. The proposed 12 m wide promenade was unreasonable as it was two times the width of the elevated walkway in the Central District where pedestrian flow was much higher;

- (g) the width of the waterfront promenade adjoining the site was only 2.3 m or 4.5 m if including the planter. If a continuous waterfront promenade of 12 m wide was to be provided, the basketball court and two soccer pitches in Sai Ning Street would need to be demolished;
- (h) as a vehicular access to the pier was required, the provision of an elevated walkway would provide a continuous promenade while avoiding vehicular and pedestrian conflicts at-grade. In view of the limited space available, the width of the elevated walkway could not be as wide as 12m;
- (i) the gap between the two existing industrial buildings was only 27 to 30 m wide. To require an NBA of 30 m was unreasonable and would adversely affect the redevelopment of the site. The width of the NBA should follow that recommended in PlanD's Air Ventilation Assessment, i.e. 15 m wide; and

Conclusion

- (j) Members were requested to consider relaxing the GFA restriction and allow an additional GFA of 18,777m² (i.e. a 40% increase). The proposed relaxation would result in a PR of 5 and would not affect the BH restriction for a vibrant and diversified commercial, leisure and tourism development on the site.

R151 – Law Kwun Chung (Demosistō)

R177/C274 – Wong Kai Chiu

19. With the aid of some video clips, Mr Wong Kai Chiu made the following points:

Traffic issues

- (a) he had lived in Cadogan Street for more than 10 years. Before the extension of the MTR Island Line to Kennedy Town, residents mainly relied on bus, tram and GMB to go to work or school. The traffic was

very busy during rush hours and a large number of loading and unloading activities were carried out on-street during the day;

- (b) according to C&WDC, a majority of the residents used MTR for commuting and the rest mainly used buses to go to the Southern District. Although many bus routes had been cancelled after extension of the MTR Island Line to Kennedy Town, traffic conditions in Kennedy Town had not been improved as additional traffic had been generated by new high-rise and high-density developments in recent years;
- (c) due to insufficient car parking spaces, illegal parking of the patronage of the high-end restaurants in Forbes Street was common. The proposed public vehicle park in Cadogan Street could not resolve the illegal parking problem because its location was inconvenient;
- (d) the proposed traffic measures to widen Victoria Road and provide a new road to the north of the CSTG site would not bring about significant improvements as the eastbound traffic of Kennedy Town was very busy. Besides, as school provision in the area was insufficient and primary school students needed to travel to school in other districts by school buses, there were a lot of roadside student pickup and drop-off activities. With the construction of more public and private housing units in the area and the commercial development at Amendment Item B site, the existing traffic problem would be aggravated;
- (e) the Government should not only consider the traffic problems at the Cadogan Street junction, but also the impact of the increased traffic on the adjoining road network, such as in Sands Street, Belcher's Street and Catchick Street. The proposed new bus terminus in the future residential development at the CSTG site would not help improve the traffic problems;

Insufficient open space

- (f) CSTG was very important to the local resident and should be retained. The other open space in the area was no alternative, for example, the children playground near The Merton was small and subject to exhaust emission from nearby restaurants;
- (g) the Belcher's Bay Park was some 300 - 400 m away from the western part of Kennedy Town and was currently heavily utilized. More conflicts would be anticipated if residents of KTMD had to share-use the Belcher's Bay Park with Shek Tong Tsui residents; and
- (h) if the Board endorsed the land use proposals on the OZP turning a blind eye to the poor traffic conditions and insufficient open space provision in the area, the local residents' welfare would be disregarded.

R161 - Sin Cheuk Nam

20. Mr Sin Cheuk Nam made the following main points:

The TPB paper

- (a) it was stated in the TPB paper that C&WDC and the residents in general had no objection to the amendments. However, it was not mentioned in the Paper that their "no objection" was subject to the adequate provision of open space and transport infrastructure. Clarification on why omitting these information in the Paper was required;

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

Ground decontamination

- (b) both the Civil Engineering and Development Department and PlanD provided no satisfactory responses to why decontamination of the CSTG site

was necessary. There were public and media queries that the data used in the environmental impact assessment was obsolete and irrelevant. Clarification from concerned departments on the assessment was required;

TIA report

- (c) according to a survey conducted in May 2015, the pedestrian flow at Ka Wai Man Road, comprising mainly residents of Mount Davis and Cayman Rise, students and staff of SKH Lui Ming Choi Memorial Primary School and residents of Sai Wan Estate, was about 200 to 300 pedestrians per hour. With the occupancy of the future public rental housing estate of 2,340 units, 20 more pedestrians per minute would be added according to the information from TD. Such assumption was doubtful. The pedestrian flow on Ka Wai Man Road would be much higher. Adequate measures should be provided to mitigate the possible adverse impacts arising from the proposed development; and
- (d) there was a shortfall of public open space in the area. Belcher's Bay Park and other piecemeal open spaces were no alternatives to CSTG. It was unfair to consider open space provision on a district council level basis while the TIA only took account of the developments in the nearby area.

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

22. The meeting was resumed at 2:20 p.m. on 7.2.2017.

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

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

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Mr Louis K.H. Kau - District Planning Officer/Hong Kong
(DPO/HK), PlanD
- Mr Derek P.K. Tse - Senior Town Planner/Hong Kong 5
(STP/HK5), PlanD

Transport Department (TD)

- Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip - Engineer/Central & Western 3 (E/CW3),
TD

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

- Mr Richard W.Y. Wong - Senior Environmental Protection Officer
(Metro Assessment) 3 (SEPO(MA)3),
EPD

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1800 - Wong Wai Lun

R2071 / C229 - Cheng Chap Wai Andrew

R3773 - Wai Lun Wong

R3851 - Cherry Wong

R142 / C14 - Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town

R179 / C16 - Wong Kin Ching

Concern Group for Protecting Kennedy Town –

- Ms Wong Kin Ching - Representer, commenter, and
representers' and commenters'
representative
- Mr Mok Kun Ki] Representers' and commenters'
- Mr Fu Chee On David] representatives

R143 - 西環體育會

Mr Lui Yat Nam - Representers' representative

R144 - China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited

China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited –

Mr Jiang Cheng Yi]

Ms Xu Wei Na]

Mr Huang Xu Liang] Representers' representatives

Mr Yu Zhi Liang]

Mr Chris Wong]

Mr Ge Jin]

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Ltd. –

Ms Yeung Wing Shan Theresa]

Ms Alice Chow] Representers' representatives

Mr Ferdinard Tsang]

Ms Lau Sze-hong]

Wong Tung & Partners Ltd –

Mr Carrott Shiu] Representers' representative

R151 – Law Kwun Chung (Demosistō)

R177/C274 – Wong Kai Chiu

Mr Wong Kai Chiu - Representers, commenter and
representers' representative

R178 / C291 - Ma Lai Ying

R1053 - 譚紹敏

R1278 - Ma Kong Ying Emily

R1280 - 譚翠英

R1281/C79 - Ma Kuk Ying

R1282 - Lee Yat Ming Ken

R1283 - Ma Hsien Chih

R1501 - 譚巧英

R1502 - 招紹明

R1503 - 招樹新

Ms Ma Lai Ying	-	Representer, commenter and Representers' and commenter's representative
Mr Wong Kai Chiu]	Representers' and commenters'
Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia]	representatives

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

R178 / C291 - Ma Lai Ying

R1053 - 譚紹敏

R1278 - Ma Kong Ying Emily

R1280 - 譚翠英

R1281/C79 - Ma Kuk Ying

R1282 - Lee Yat Ming Ken

R1283 - Ma Hsien Chih

R1501 - 譚巧英

R1502 - 招紹明

R1503 - 招樹新

26. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Ma Lai Ying made the following main points:

- (a) being a resident of The Merton, she and her family members strongly objected to the demolition of Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG) for private residential development. Given the importance of CSTG to the local residents, several thousands of representations had been submitted to object the proposal. The Government should not demolish CSTG which had been there for 19 years with many trees that had taken years to grow to the current state;

- (b) in view of the rapid changes in the district in the past 10 years, including aging of the population, increase in retail shops and traffic flow related to the new development/redevelopment projects, CSTG was particularly important to the local residents as it functioned as a 'green lung' within the dense built-up areas. CSTG was popular due to its sizable grassland, the existence of many trees and small animals such as birds, bats and squirrels, and the provision of fitness facilities and benches. Besides, it was relatively flat with a number of easily accessible entrances for the aged and the physically impaired and was popularly used by different users at different times, e.g. the aged exercising in the morning, young people in the evening and families at weekends and holidays;
- (c) CSTG was more user-friendly than other gardens in the district. For example, the landscape garden near Chung Wo Lane and Wa In Fong East was covered with stairs and subject to opening hours from 7 a.m. to 11 p.m. Chung Wo Lane Sitting-out area was sandwiched between building blocks with only a few planters;
- (d) although the Government claimed that CSTG should be demolished for ground decontamination works, it was suspected if it was an excuse to facilitate luxurious private residential development of 600 units. Given the existing soil contaminants at the site were covered by a thick layer of top soil with 181 trees which should have performed certain decontamination function, CSTG had been opened for public use for 19 years without posing any danger to the local residents. Retaining CSTG would not only save time (7-year implementation period) and money (HK\$ 1.1 billion) for decontamination, but would also avoid removing the top soil and exposing the contaminants underneath thereby endangering the health of the local residents in such a densely populated area;
- (e) without CSTG, local residents would need to go to Belcher Bay Park which required about 20 minutes walk and passing through a number of

road crossings, thus causing inconvenience to the aged and the physically impaired;

- (f) the Government's claim that CSTG could be compensated by a waterfront park was not agreeable as it would likely be hard-paved with very few trees and fitness facilities, and the commercial facilities such as outdoor café and viewing platform would only attract tourists. Besides, the accessibility and connectivity of the future waterfront park were not satisfactory;
- (g) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standard for open space provision was a minimum of 2m^2 per person, including 1m^2 district open space (DO) and 1m^2 local open space (LO) respectively. However, the existing provision in the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis area (KTMD area) was only 0.83m^2 per person. Although the figure would increase to 0.87m^2 per person under the Recommended Land Use Proposal (RLUP), it was still lower than HKPSG's standard;
- (h) PlanD's claim that there was no deficit in the overall provision of open space in the Central and Western (C&W) District was not convincing since a number of remote open spaces such as Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park, Hong Kong Park, the new Central Harbourfront, and Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens had been included in the calculation. To meet the open space provision standard, the total open space provision including the existing and additional open space should be able to cater for the requirement of the existing population plus the additional population generated from the new developments. However, according to PlanD's calculation, the net increase in open space provision (1.7ha) would only be able to meet the requirement of the additional population whereas the current deficit of open space provision to serve the existing population had been ignored;

- (i) according to “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (“HK 2030+”), the existing average provision of open space per person in Hong Kong were about 1.64m² and 1.07m² for LO and DO respectively. For the purpose of planning for land requirement for open space use, a higher ratio of 2.5 m² per person for open space provision (including both LO and DO) was recommended under the “HK2030+”. However, the open space provision in the KTMD area was much lower than the planning objective of “HK 2030+”. The Government was urged to provide a healthy and quality living environment to the local residents in accordance with the planning objectives of “HK 2030+” and consider an alternative location for housing development;

- (j) in sum, CSTG should be retained for the following reasons:
 - (i) the cost of HK\$ 1.1 billion for ground decontamination works could be saved;

 - (ii) health risk caused by the dispersion of soil contaminants during the ground decontamination works could be avoided;

 - (iii) the physical and psychological health of the park users, in particular the coordination, cognitive, communication and cooperation skills of the children, could be improved thus reducing the Government’s health expenditure;

 - (iv) it had provided a venue for family and community activities thereby fostering greater harmony in families and society; and

 - (v) it could preserve bio-diversity, adjust temperature and purify the air.

27. Mr Wong Kai Chiu made the following main points:

- (a) while he appreciated the Government’s planning intention for a quality open space, he doubted why the Government’s RLUP was bundled with

the commercial and tourism development proposal of the China Merchants Godown, Wharf & Transportation Company Limited (CMG);

- (b) starting from 2008, some district council (DC) members had requested the Government to review the land use planning of the western part of Kennedy Town. In 2010, CW Power (中西區發展動力), which was formed by some DC members and influential people in the district, advocated a Revamping Kennedy Town Campaign (點亮堅城計劃) with proposals including cruise terminal and hotel development at the CMG's site, and removal of CSTG for residential development. It was noted that the DC member subsequently proposed to replace residential development with community facilities, which coincided with the Government's proposal to incorporate government, institution and community (GIC) facilities at the private residential site under Amendment Item C2;
- (c) he believed that CW Power was influenced by the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government in the Hong Kong S.A.R. and suspected that the Government's proposed developments at the waterfront area were to facilitate CMG's commercial and tourism development proposal at the expense of the welfare of the local residents. The area would be adversely affected by the induced traffic flow, and the site next to tourism facilities was not suitable for primary school development;
- (d) he disagreed with CMG's claim that the proposed water promenade of 6m wide at their site would be better than the promenade to the north of Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground (KTTRG), with only 4.5m wide. The area of the existing waterfront promenade to the north of KTTRG was originally used as pier for loading/unloading activities. It was adjacent to two existing soccer pitches which effectively formed part of the open space. It was also noted that the waterfront promenade in the Eastern District had a width of about 30m. The latest standard should be adopted when planning the waterfront promenade in the area; and

- (e) to promote social harmony in the development process, he urged the Government to retain CSTG and provide a quality open space for the local residents. A separate consultation should also be conducted for the private initiated project at the CMG's site.

28. With the aid of some photographs shown in the visualiser, Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia made the following main points:

- (a) the site next to CMG's development was not suitable for primary school use, which should be located in a tranquil environment;
- (b) while CMG's proposal was a grand economic development, it was not beneficial to the local residents. The two-storey commercial buildings at the pier were not conducive to a good design at the waterfront area, which should be relatively flat without commercial activities. She suspected the Government's proposed restriction was to facilitate CMG's development. The RLUP would lead to queries on whether there was collusion between the Government and the business sector;
- (c) the Community Ambassador (社區大使隊) had fought for many years to convert the vacant part of the Western Wholesale Food Market (WWFM) to a temporary waterfront promenade. As most of the current uses in the WWFM were not related to wholesale trade, it was proposed to conduct a land exchange with CMG for cruise terminal development at the WWFM, which would not only facilitate the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade in the Land Use Review area, but also save the time and resources for ground decontamination works;
- (d) the CMG's site, which was located at the western corner of Hong Kong Island, was not suitable for tourism development. The Community Ambassador had previously proposed setting up a water activity centre in the area but the proposal was not endorsed by the Government;

- (e) given the natural cooling effect in summer, the magnificent sunset scenery, the popularity of CSTG and the close proximity to eating places, the waterfront area had great potential to be developed into a quality waterfront promenade for the enjoyment of the general public. Cruise terminal or hotel development would only worsen the traffic condition in the area; and
- (f) the Government was urged to formulate a land use proposal consciously and pragmatically to provide a quality waterfront promenade and make up for the shortfall of open space provision in the KTMD area.

29. As the presentation from the government representative, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question and answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties.

Ground Decontamination Works

30. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) what the soil contaminants were and what standards were used to assess the level of contamination;
 - (b) why ground decontamination works was necessary;
 - (c) what decontamination method would be adopted; and
 - (d) whether there was any legislation governing the ground decontamination works.

31. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK of PlanD, and Mr Richard W.Y. Wong, SEPO(MA)3 of EPD, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the yellow area shown on Plan H-1 of the Paper, including the ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant (ex-KTIP), ex-Kennedy Town Abattoir (ex-KTA), ex-New World First Bus Depot, temporary public car park and CSTG, was the area subject to ground decontamination works. KTIP ceased to operate in 1993 and KTA was closed in 1999. In 1998, the Government began to review the land uses at the five sites and the adjoining areas and an environmental impact assessments (EIA) had been conducted. A total of 189 site investigation boreholes were carried out at the five sites as sampling points to identify the type, extent and concentration of contaminants in the underground soil. It was found that the underground soil at those sites had been contaminated by heavy metals (including mercury, lead and arsenic) and hydrocarbons which had exceeded the standards specified in the Guidance Manual for Use of Risk-based Remediation Goals for Contaminated Land Management issued by EPD by several times to a few dozens of times. To follow-up the recommendations of the EIA, the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) was commissioned to undertake ground decontamination works before any redevelopment of the area involved;

- (b) as the soil contaminants were not volatile and covered by the top soil/cement, it was estimated that the contaminants within the area had not reduced in amount over the years. Whilst the soil contaminants would not pose any imminent risk at the five sites, any digging of land for future development/redevelopment would cause the contaminants to disperse in the air which might cause adverse health risk to the local residents. As the five sites were located in close proximity to a dense urban area and there were redevelopment opportunities for the sites, it was recommended to conduct ground decontamination works for the whole yellow area in one go;

- (c) the EIA had reviewed nine decontamination methods and concluded that biopiling and cement solidification were the most effective methods to treat the two types of soil contaminant identified within the redevelopment area. Biopiling involved heaping contaminated soil into piles and stimulating aerobic microbial activity within the soil to break down the hydrocarbons, while cement solidification involved the addition of cement to limit the mobility of the heavy metals. According to the latest guidelines of EPD, the ground decontamination would need to be carried out in-situ. The contractor would dig out, sort and treat the soil on-site, and then use the treated soil after testing to backfill the excavations. The proposed decontamination method had been adopted in the ex-Kai Tak Airport; and
- (d) the ground decontamination works at the yellow area was governed by an Environmental Permit which included a list of conditions and mitigation measures which would need to be complied with before and during the decontamination works.

History of CSTG

32. In response to a Member's question on the history of CSTG, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the existing site of CSTG was used as a vegetable wholesale market since 1945. After the vegetable wholesale market moved to WWFM in 1990, the site was converted to a temporary car park in 1994. Upon closure of the KTIP and KTA, the Government conducted a feasibility study on the redevelopment of the ex-KTIP, ex-KTA and the adjoining areas including CSTG. At the request of the then DC to provide more open space to meet the shortfall of the KTMD area, CSTG was provided as a temporary garden in 1999 pending future development upon completion of the study;
- (b) in 2006, a number of sites including the ex-KTIP and ex-KTA sites had been identified as temporary works area to facilitate the construction of West Island Line (WIL). In that regard, KTIP and KTA were handed

over to the Highways Department (HyD) and then to MTR Corporation Limited (MTRC) after demolition works at the sites were completed in 2009. Upon completion of the construction of WIL, MTRC returned the sites to the Government in early 2016. As the development in the area had been put on hold due to the construction of WIL, CSTG had been remained as a temporary garden since 1999; and

- (c) taking account of the commissioning of WIL in 2014, PlanD carried out a comprehensive Land Use Review on the Western Part of Kennedy Town (the Land Use Review) and conducted two rounds of public consultation exercise in 2013 and 2015.

Open Space Provision

33. The Vice-chairman and a Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the open space provision in the KTMD area was adequate;
- (b) what the distribution of active and passive open spaces was in the KTMD area;
- (c) whether the planned population in the KTMD area estimated by PlanD had accurately reflected the future population in the area; and
- (d) whether there was any information on the open space provision in other districts.

34. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of a table shown on the visualiser, made the following points:

- (a) according to HKPSG, the overall provision of open space was assessed at a DC level. The existing and planned open space provisions at the DC level were able to meet the requirements under HKPSG. For the KTMD planning scheme area, although there were deficits in both the existing and

planned open space provisions, there would be a net increase of open space provision after the implementation of the planned open spaces including those proposed under RLUP, and the open space provision would be increased from 1.12m² to 1.29m² per person. To meet the shortfall of open space provision, opportunity would be taken to increase the open space provision where appropriate. For example, three berths in the Western District Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) with a site area of about 7,700m² were intended to be converted to temporary open space for public enjoyment;

- (b) the existing active open spaces included two soccer pitches in KTTRG, soccer pitch/playground in Forbes Street Temporary Playground and Kennedy Town Service Reservoir Playground. The existing passive open spaces included CSTG, Ka Wai Man Road Garden, Catchick Street Playground, Belcher Bay Park, etc. Besides, C&WDC was being consulted on the proposal to convert three berths in the Western District PCWA to a community farm;
- (c) the planned population in the KTMD area was estimated by PlanD based on the 2011 Population Census with adjustments to take account of known new development/redevelopment projects. In estimating the additional population brought about by the redevelopment projects, the existing population at the concerned site should be deducted to avoid double counting; and
- (d) the information on open space provision in other districts was not at hand but could be provided later in the subsequent hearing sessions.

Waterfront Planning

35. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the waterfront promenade could be extended to the east outside the Land Use Review area;

- (b) whether the provision of waterfront promenade in the RLUP had taken into account the planning principle for waterfront promenade on HK Island North;
- (c) what the design of the future waterfront park was;
- (d) whether land had been reserved to facilitate the provision of marine traffic; and
- (e) what the views of the local residents were on the future planning of the waterfront area.

36. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of the visualiser, made the following points:

- (a) the proposed waterfront promenade/park would be connected to New Praya Kennedy Town, which was a road without footpath abutting the waterfront. To the further east, however, as the existing bus terminus at Shing Sai Road would be relocated to the private residential site under Amendment Item C2, the bus terminus site could be released for open space use. The Government was also actively pursuing the temporary use of part of the Western District PCWA as open space for public enjoyment;
- (b) the planning of the proposed waterfront promenade/park had taken into account the Harbourfront Commission's planning principles, in particular the provision of a continuous waterfront promenade in the northern part of Hong Kong Island for public enjoyment;
- (c) the design for the waterfront promenade/park was still at a conceptual stage and there was flexibility for the future project proponent to provide trees, grassland and recreation facilities to meet the needs of the local residents. PlanD had consulted the Harbourfront Commission (HC) on

the conceptual design of the waterfront promenade/park. HC considered that the design concept could be used for future reference; and

- (d) the feasibility of and need for marine traffic would be subject to study by TD and the Marine Department.

37. In response, Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia, the representative of Representers and Commenters, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) since 2009, the Community Ambassador had organized workshops to solicit views from the local residents on the use of waterfront area and carried out discussions with the operators in the PCWA with a view to releasing some idle areas for public open space use. With the support of the students of the University of Hong Kong, a plan for the waterfront area comprising five sub-areas had been formulated with the following three principles:
 - (i) Quality Open Space: with reference to the design of other waterfront promenades, the proposed promenade should be at least 20m wide with more greenery and facilities;
 - (ii) Accessible to the General Public: commercial uses should be avoided in the waterfront area. The improper arrangement of placing the waterfront promenade outside a restaurant at Pier No.7 in the Central District should not be repeated; and
 - (iii) 24-hour Free Access: the public should have a 24-hour free access to the waterfront promenade.

Proposed Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses (Amendment Item B)

38. The Vice-chairman and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) how to ensure the waterfront promenade provided at the CMG's site could match with the design of the waterfront promenade as a whole, and how the 12m-wide requirement was derived;
- (b) whether the development restrictions, including the 12m wide waterfront promenade and the 30m wide non-building area (NBA), would only be applicable upon redevelopment of the CMG site;
- (c) whether the pier and the land portions of the CMG site were under the same control in the lease;
- (d) how the Government could ensure the future waterfront promenade at the CMG's site would be opened for public use;
- (e) whether CMG's proposal to add two storeys in Block A would breach the building height restriction on the draft outline zoning plan (OZP);
- (f) whether the relaxation of gross floor area (GFA) restriction was necessary for the proposed commercial and tourism developments at the CMG site;
- (g) whether CMG would drop the development proposal or pursue a compromised proposal if the Town Planning Board (the Board) would not fully accede to its request for relaxation of development restrictions; and
- (h) whether CMG had consulted or engaged the local residents in formulating the development proposal.

39. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of the visualiser, made the following points:

- (a) the CMG site, which was in-between the proposed waterfront park under Amendment Item A1 and the proposed conversion of KTTRG into a permanent open space under Amendment Item A3, was under private ownership. In order to provide a continuous pedestrian linkage in the

waterfront area, a 12m wide waterfront promenade was required to be provided at the CMG site. The width of the pedestrian linkage was determined having regard to the width between the existing buildings and the coastline and the need for sufficient width at the promenade within CMG site for better connection between the two open spaces. In order to provide flexibility and encourage innovative design of the waterfront promenade, except for the total width, there was no other specific restriction on the design of the linkage, such as the form, level or uses, imposed;

- (b) the requirement for a 12m wide waterfront promenade at the CMG site had been incorporated in the Notes of the draft OZP. In general, no action was required to make the existing use of any land or building conform to the OZP requirements until there was a material change of use or the building was redeveloped. The requirement of a 30m wide NBA at the CMG site was incorporated in the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP. For wholesale conversion of the buildings without physical changes to the existing bulk of the buildings, there was no need to fulfil the NBA requirement;
- (c) both the pier and the land portions of the CMG site were under the same private treaty grant to CMG for godown and cargo handling pier uses. Under the government lease, there was GFA restriction for the land portion but not the pier portion;
- (d) in the “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses” (“OU (Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses)”) zone, apart from the ‘Pier’ use, appropriate commercial, leisure and tourism related uses were all Column 2 uses for which planning permission from the Board would be required. In that regard, upon application for such uses, the applicant would need to provide detailed information including design concept and opening hours of the proposed waterfront promenade for the consideration of the Board. Should the Board consider the proposed scheme under the application be acceptable and grant planning permission for the proposed development, Lands Department would consider

incorporating relevant proposals in the approved scheme such as opening hours for the waterfront promenade into the lease conditions upon lease modification; and

- (e) the existing building height for the two industrial buildings were 84mPD and 64mPD respectively. CMG proposed to add two storeys in Block A by adjusting the internal design without increasing the overall height of the existing building.

40. In response, Mr Jiang Cheng Yi and Ms Yeung Wing Shan Theresa, R144's representatives, made the following points:

- (a) CMG fully supported the Government's RLUP and had actively studied how the proposal could be realized at their site. If the development restrictions could be relaxed, the CMG site could be transformed into a commercial, leisure and tourism node to tie in with the Government's planning intention for the area;
- (b) since the current waterfront, excluding a landing area of 1.5m, was only 10.5m wide and the gap between the two existing industrial buildings was only 27 to 30m wide, they had raised concern on the requirements of a 12m wide waterfront promenade and a 30m wide NBA under the draft OZP. After the clarification of DPO/HK, it was noted that there was flexibility for the design of the waterfront promenade and the NBA requirement would only need to be met until there was redevelopment of the existing buildings;
- (c) however, if the GFA restriction could not be relaxed, the existing use would remain and the site had no redevelopment prospect due to the following reasons:
 - (i) discounting the existing GFA from the maximum GFA stipulated on the draft OZP, there was only 122.58m² left for commercial/leisure/tourism uses at the pier portion, which were

inadequate to realise the planning intention of the “OU (Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses)” zone. A 40% increase in the allowable GFA under the draft OZP was required for the proposed development:

- (1) 25% for the proposed two-storey development with roof-top garden at the pier, which was the most important element to promote vibrancy and diversity in the waterfront area. Only 5,840m² out of 7,000m² of the pier would be used for development and the remaining area would be used for access;
 - (2) 3% for the proposed commercial portion of the elevated walkway, which was necessary to improve the linkage within the site;
 - (3) 5% for the necessary conversion of the existing industrial buildings for the proposed commercial use, since some of the non-accountable GFA in the existing industrial buildings would become GFA accountable in commercial use;
 - (4) 6% for the proposed addition of two storeys in Block A;
- (ii) the additional GFA would result in a plot ratio (PR) of 5 for the whole site. Although the proposed addition of two storeys in Block A could be dropped, the additional GFA for other items described above, which was equivalent to an increase of about 33% in the allowable GFA under the draft OZP, was necessary for the conversion of the site for commercial/leisure/tourism uses. As the proposed GFA relaxation would exceed the level that could be allowed under planning application for minor relaxation, it was proposed to amend the Notes of the draft OZP in the current plan-making stage; and

- (d) as the commercial, leisure and tourism uses were all Column 2 uses under the “OU (Commercial, Leisure and Tourism Related Uses)” zone on the draft OZP, any future development proposal would need to be submitted to the Board for consideration. Views from the local residents or DC would be sought before formal submission was made to the Board with a view to incorporating their aspirations into the future development proposal.

41. A Member asked the view of the Representatives’ and Commenters’ representatives on how public open space could be implemented at the CMG’s site, which was on private land. In response, Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia said that given the shortfall of public open space provision in the KTMD area, CMG should provide a waterfront promenade with sufficient width and leave half of the width of the pier for the enjoyment of the general public as a corporate social responsibility. If CMG was willing to seek the views of the local residents, they could have further discussions on the future planning of the waterfront promenade.

Trees

42. A Member raised the following questions:

- (a) where the locations of the two Old and Valuable Trees (OVTs) were; and
- (b) whether the trees in CSTG could be compensated if the garden was demolished.

43. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points:

- (a) there were two *Ficus microcarpa*, which were OVTs, located at the existing sitting-out area at the slope abutting Victoria Road within the “Open Space” zone under Amendment Item A2 and would be preserved in-situ. Regarding the existing trees in CSTG, there were three *Aquilaria sinensis* and two *Ailanthus fordii* (rare plant species) according to the tree survey in the EIA but no OVT was found. As the underground soil in CSTG was

contaminated, the possibility of retaining or transplanting the trees was not recommended; and

- (b) according to the guidelines for tree compensation, implementation of compensatory planting should be of a ratio not less than 1:1 in terms of number. If sufficient space for tree planting could be identified, additional planting to achieve the compensatory planting ratio of 1:1 in terms of aggregated diameter at breast height (DBH) should be undertaken as far as practicable. In the design and implementation of the future waterfront park, trees would be compensated in accordance with relevant guidelines in terms of tree number. Opportunity would also be explored to meeting the aggregated DBH requirement in the detailed design stage.

44. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Mok Kun Ki, representative of representers and commenters, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide supplemented that one of the *Aquilaria sinensis* was located near the north-western corner of CSTG. Mr Mok went on saying that some representers had mentioned that as 80% of CSTG was covered by vegetation for more than 18 years, the trees should have performed certain decontamination function. However, the Government had not considered any possibility of phytoremediation although it was a proven technology for removal of soil contaminants in other countries. The EIA for ground decontamination works was not conducted in accordance with the guiding principle of the EIA Ordinance i.e. an in-depth historical analysis should be carried out to identify the reasons of contamination and the latest information should be obtained to ascertain the level of contamination. The Government's claim that the soil was contaminated by ex-KTIP was not convincing and the data obtained by site investigation 14 years ago was outdated. An expert would be invited to give more details on that aspect in the subsequent hearing session.

Traffic and Accessibility

45. Two Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether there was spare road capacity in the area for the proposed developments; and

(b) how the accessibility of the area could be improved.

46. In response, Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip, E/CW3 of TD, said that according to the junction capacity assessment in the traffic review, with the implementation of the proposed traffic improvement measures, the performance of the key junctions within the Land Use Review area and in the vicinity would operate satisfactorily in 2027, i.e. three years after the completion of the planned developments.

47. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, also supplemented that new pedestrian facilities were proposed to enhance accessibility to the waterfront area. Two pedestrian footbridges across Victoria Road would be provided, one would connect the proposed public housing site (Amendment Item C1) with the proposed open space (Amendment Item A2) leading to the waterfront park via Sai Ning Street, another connecting Ka Wai Man Road with the proposed public transport terminus (Amendment Item C2) via another proposed footbridge to the waterfront park. Barrier-free access would be provided at the footbridges. The footpaths at Cadogan Street and Sai Ning Street would also be widened to 7m and 5m respectively, and the footpath along the new access road would have a width of 3.7m. Besides, signalised junctions would be provided at Victoria Road/Sai Ning Street, Victoria Road/new access road, and new access road/Catchick Street/Cadogan Street to facilitate pedestrian crossing.

Social Impact Assessment

48. A Member asked whether social impact assessment (SIA) had been conducted either by the Government or the local community groups.

49. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that although formal SIA had not been conducted, the Land Use Review had taken into account the long-term implications of the proposed developments, including traffic, visual, landscape, air ventilation and community facilities with a view to improving the living environment in the area.

50. In response, Mr Mok Kun Ki said that CSTG was very popular and there were different activities at different times. Although no survey had been conducted, it was

observed that there were morning walkers as early as 4:00a.m. and more activities from 6:00a.m. to 8:00a.m. Some of the activities such as Taiji classes were conducted on a regular basis in weekdays. At weekends, there were more young people doing exercises and domestic helpers taking rest in CSTG. If CSTG was removed, the existing activities could not be continued and the local residents would need to walk several hundred metres to the Belcher Bay Park.

Others

51. Some Member raised the following questions:

- (a) whether centralized underground refuse collection system had been studied;
- (b) whether the reprovisioning of Victoria Public Mortuary (VPM) would have any adverse impact on the local residents, and how corpses would be transported to the new reprovisioning site;
- (c) whether there was any plan to redevelop Sai Wan Estate;
- (d) whether the primary school at Ka Wai Man Road would be relocated;
- (e) the representers' justification for proposing the in-situ preservation of the Arch and Foundation Stone of the Tung Wah Smallpox Hospital; and
- (f) the views of the local residents on Sai Wan Swimming Shed.

52. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following points:

- (a) the Land Use Review only focused on the land use of a local area and the centralized underground refuse collection system was outside the study scope;

- (b) VPM would be relocated to a cavern and a disused platform at Victoria Road to the south-west of the Land Use Review area. As there was no residential use in the vicinity, the reprovisioning of the VPM should not have any adverse impact on the local residents. Upon reprovisioning, corpses would be transported to the new public mortuary by means of land transport;
- (c) there was currently no plan to redevelop Sai Wan Estate by the Housing Authority; and
- (d) the existing primary school at Ka Wai Man Road would not be relocated. The proposed primary school site under Amendment Item D1 was to address the request of the Education Bureau to provide a new school site to meet the demand of school places in the C&W District.

53. In response, Ms Lau Ka Sin Cynthia said that the Arch and Foundation Stone was built to commemorate the contribution of Tung Wah Smallpox Hospital in the control of smallpox. Although the existing location was a relocated site, it should be preserved in-situ given its historic values. The site near the Arch and Foundation Stone was proposed to be used for community facilities in particular those for the aged.

54. Ms Ma Lai Ying, representer and commenter, also made the following points:

- (a) the local residents did not have strong views on the reprovisioning site for VPM;
- (b) as the Arch and Foundation Stone could help understand the development history of the western district, it should be preserved in-situ and included in the waterfront promenade with compatible design. The waterfront promenade should incorporate more elements with historic value rather than commercial uses such as restaurants; and
- (c) Sai Wan Swimming Shed, which was located to the west of the proposed public housing site, was a very popular place for photography. There was

currently no development proposal near the area and the Government should maintain the status quo of the natural environment.

[Dr F.C. Chan, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

55. As Members had no more question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing on the day was completed. He thanked the government's representatives, as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would resume the hearing on 15.2.2017. The Board would deliberate the representations and comments in closed meeting after completing all the hearing sessions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government's representatives, as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives left this session of the meeting at this point.

56. There being no other business, this session of the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.