

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:05 a.m. on 15.2.2017.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session of the resumed meeting:

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

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

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

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Assistant Director of Lands/Regional 3
Mr John K.T. Lai

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Mr C.W. Tse

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

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.]

3. The Chairman said that the meeting was the second hearing day of the representations and comments in respect of the draft Kennedy Town & Mount Davis Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H1/20 (the draft OZP).

4. The Secretary said that Members' declaration of interests were made in the first hearing session on 7.2.2017 (paragraphs 2 to 4 of the minutes of 7.2.2017). Members noted that Messrs Raymond K.W. Lee, H.W. Cheung, Lincoln L.H. Huang, Thomas O.S. Ho, Patrick H.T. Lau, Stephen L.H. Liu, Dr C.H. Hau, Martin W.C. Kwan, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Franklin Yu, K.K. Cheung, Professor K.C. Chau, Professor T.S. Liu, H.F. Leung, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Ms Christina M. Lee, Miss Winnie W.M. Ng and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had tendered apologies for not attending the special meeting. The following Members had also declared interests on the item for having business dealings with Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK), the consultant of the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) on ground decontamination works for the Kennedy Town area:

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with
MMHK

Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealing
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] with MMHK

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

5. Members noted that Mr Franklin Yu and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As for those Members who had declared interests for having current/past business dealings with MMHK, the meeting considered those interests remote/indirect and agreed that they could stay in the meeting. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai had yet to arrive at the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations and comments in their absence.

7. The following government's representatives and consultant, 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)

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

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip - Engineer/Central & Western 3 (E/C&W3)

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

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

CEDD

Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung - Senior Engineer

Mr Derek H.F. Kwok - Engineer

MMHK

Mr Eric Ching - Director (Environment)

Mr P.K. Chan - Senior Environmental Consultant (SEC)

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R140 – 徐曼詩

R150/C13 – Alliance for Protecting Cadogan Park

R159 – Yiu Sau Fong

R184/C169 – Marcus Peter Lo

R186 – Ng Wing Chi

R346 – 李欽源

R347 – Yip Kark Yin

R353 – 呂照改

R354 – 黃楚華

R358 – Soo Hang Ping

R467 – 洪岳香

R537 – Law Chung Ting James

R645 – Lui Yuet Kwan

R650 – Lee Chi Kwan

R652 – Chan Mei Mei May

R653 – Lee Kwok On
R888 – Chan Kwok Chung
R935 – Leung Kam Sing
R1024 – Bridget Diane Steis
R1100 – Wong Yuk Lan
R1217 – Chan Yiu Kwong
R1220 – 鄭子桂
R1221 – 鄭惠
R1232 – Kong Siu Lan
R1234 – 蘇興女
R1236 – 陳柏樂
R1251 – Tsui Shing Hei
R1252 – Terry Tsui
R1253 – Fong Wai Yi
R1259 – Tse Mei Sin
R1267 – Cheng Hon Ming
R1409 – 李煥琮
R1449 – Law Oi Ling Jessie
R1452/C255 – Wu Sai Mui
R1524 – Lam Wai
R1525/C74 – Lam Wai Choi Danny
R1605 – Fu Wing Sze
R1622/C175 – Ho Man Man Lucretia
R1737 – Chan Ngan Ying
R1791/C290 – Lau Ka Sin Cynthia
R1801 – Yeung Ming Yan
R1835/C297 – Jon Colbear
R1801 – Yeung Ming Yan
R1884 – Ruth King
R1898 – Lam Ching Man
R1919 – Mok Koon Yip
R1920 – Ernie Mok Kai Shing

R1922 – Ng Yee Man
R1927 – Cheng Wai Sum
R1928 – Kwong Mun Fong
R1942 – 黃惠玉
R1946 – Fung Ming Kong
R1947 – Leung Yuet Ching Nancy
R1950 – 鄭何淑貞
R2031 – 鄭振鐸
R2038 – Kan Chun Kong
R2076 – Hung Sau Yung Vanessa
R2149 – Chan Wai Chi
R2300 – 莫秋景
R2360 – Lau Suk Ling
R2361 – Cheng Lap Hung
R2380 – Cheng Bik Fai Anna
R2472 – Wong Yun Fun
R2473 – Lau Chi Ling
R2474 – Lau Chi Ming
R2475 – Lau Yiu Kwong
R2476 – Yee Ho Kei
R2509 – Chan Shui Yee
R2510 – Chiu Tak Kwong
R2511 – Fu Sin Tung
R2512 – Fu Tze Lok
R2513 – 陳國康
R2519 – Chan Mei Chi
R2799/C139 – Luk Hiu Wa Hilda
R2807/C87 – Alice Lau
R2842/C40 – Cheuk Ming Li
R2852/C146 – Lee Wai Kuen Katherine
R2916/C242 – Jayne Elizabeth Wright
R3159 – Ng Yuen Har

R3224 – Tsang Lai Sheung Kea

Alliance for Protecting Cadogan Park (APCP) - Representers, Commenters, Representers' and Commenters' representative

(represented by

Mr Mok Kun Ki

Mr Paul Zimmerman

Ms Wong Kin Ching

Ms Cynthia K.S. Lau

Ms Ma Lai Ying

Mr David C.O. Fu

Ms Mak Lai Sum

Mr Sin Chung Kai

Mr Samson W.S. Chan

Ms Chiu Siu Wai

Ms Lesley S.M. Lee

Ms Amy T.Y. Tse)

R2580 – Cheung Chi Wah

Mr Cheung Chi Wah - Representer

8. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background to the representations and comments. The Chairman would then invite the representers/commenters or their representatives to make oral submissions. 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.

9. The Chairman then invited the representative of PlanD to brief Members on the background to the representations and comments. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Louis K. H. Kau, DPO/HK, repeated the presentation that was made in the morning session of the meeting on 7.2.2017, which was recorded in paragraph 11 of the minutes of 7.2.2017 (a.m. session).

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join this session of the meeting during DPO/HK's presentation.]

10. The Chairman then invited the representers, commenter and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

R2580 – Cheung Chi Wah

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheung Chi Wah made the following main points:

- (a) he had resided in the area near the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG) for about five years and had immensely enjoyed CSTG, which was conveniently located and provided a large open and flat lawn with many trees. The park's minimal facilities had allowed a diverse range of activities by users such as leisure walks by the elderly and playing badminton, golf and football by those who were active;
- (b) CSTG could not be replaced by other open spaces in the area. There were two small parks located at Catchick Street, one had a children's playground and the other was next to The Merton. Both were different from and less inviting than CSTG. While the Belcher Bay Park (BBP) was a large park

with a wide range of recreational facilities, it was overcrowded and there were conflicts amongst various park users requiring police assistance;

- (c) the loss of CSTG could not be compensated by the proposed waterfront park, given the differences between the two in terms of function and nature. Rather, they could complement each other;
- (d) CSTG not only provided a place for both active and passive recreation, social interactions and experiences for a wide spectrum of users, it also provided visual relief to the local residents and pedestrians in a highly urbanized city, contributing positively to both physical and mental well-being of the users. In view of the stressful lifestyle in Hong Kong and that country parks were not easily accessible, more local open spaces similar to CSTG should be provided and preserved for the welfare of the society;
- (e) with an increasing population in Kennedy Town, the demand for open space would be on the rise. It was unclear whether other alternative sites had been considered instead of destroying CSTG and whether any studies concerning the social impacts of demolition of CSTG had been considered, especially on the elderly with low mobility;

Decontamination

- (f) the Government's proposal for decontamination concerning the ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant (ex-KTIP) site, ex-Kennedy Town Abattoir (ex-KTA) site and CSTG was made many years ago. As CSTG had been in use for the past 19 years, he was unsure whether CSTG had become safer for use or more dangerous over the years and whether the need for its removal was imminent;
- (g) given that the decontamination works would take seven years, the potential risks/impacts on the local residents needed to be assessed. If CSTG could be retained, the cost and time required for the decontamination might be

reduced. Such information should be provided to the local residents for reference; and

- (h) Members were urged to seriously consider keeping CSTG for the local residents, especially the elderly.

R140 – 徐曼詩

R150/C13– APCP

R159 – Yiu Sau Fong

R184/C169 – Marcus Peter Lo

R186 – Ng Wing Chi

R346 – 李欽源

R347 – Yip Kark Yin

R353 – 呂照改

R354 – 黃楚華

R358– Soo Hang Ping

R467 – 洪岳香

R537 – Law Chung Ting James

R645 – Lui Yuet Kwan

R650 – Lee Chi Kwan

R652 – Chan Mei Mei May

R653 – Lee Kwok On

R888 – Chan Kwok Chung

R935 – Leung Kam Sing

R1024 – Bridget Diane Steis

R1100 – Wong Yuk Lan

R1217 – Chan Yiu Kwong

R1220 – 鄭子桂

R1221 – 鄭惠

R1232 – Kong Siu Lan

R1234 – 蘇興女

R1236 – 陳柏樂

R1251– Tsui Shing Hei

R1252 – Terry Tsui

R1253 – Fong Wai Yi

R1259 – Tse Mei Sin

R1267 – Cheng Hon Ming

R1409 – 李煥琮

R1449 – Law Oi Ling Jessie

R1452/C255 – Wu Sai Mui

R1524 – Lam Wai

R1525/C74 – Lam Wai Choi Danny

R1605 – Fu Wing Sze

R1622/C175 – Ho Man Man Lucretia

R1737 – Chan Ngan Ying

R1791/C290 – Lau Ka Sin Cynthia

R1801 – Yeung Ming Yan

R1835/C297 – Jon Colbear

R1801 – Yeung Ming Yan

R1884 – Ruth King

R1898 – Lam Ching Man

R1919 – Mok Koon Yip

R1920 – Ernie Mok Kai Shing

R1922 – Ng Yee Man

R1927 – Cheng Wai Sum

R1928 – Kwong Mun Fong

R1942 – 黃惠玉

R1946 – Fung Ming Kong

R1947 – Leung Yuet Ching Nancy

R1950 – 鄭何淑貞

R2031 – 鄭振鏗

R2038 – Kan Chun Kong

R2076 – Hung Sau Yung Vanessa

R2149 – Chan Wai Chi

R2300 – 莫秋景

R2360 – Lau Suk Ling

R2361 – Cheng Lap Hung

R2380 – Cheng Bik Fai Anna

R2472 – Wong Yun Fun

R2473 – Lau Chi Ling

R2474 – Lau Chi Ming

R2475 – Lau Yiu Kwong

R2476 – Yee Ho Kei

R2509 – Chan Shui Yee

R2510 – Chiu Tak Kwong

R2511 – Fu Sin Tung

R2512 – Fu Tze Lok

R2513 – 陳國康

R2519 – Chan Mei Chi

R2799/C139 – Luk Hiu Wa Hilda

R2807/C87 – Alice Lau

R2842/C40 – Cheuk Ming Li

R2852/C146 – Lee Wai Kuen Katherine

R2916/C242 – Jayne Elizabeth Wright

R3159 – Ng Yuen Har

R3224 – Tsang Lai Sheung Kea

12. Mr Mok Kun Ki said that APCP was a coalition formed by various local residents of Kennedy Town. Representatives from Designing Hong Kong Limited (DHK), concern groups and Incorporated Owners (IO) of a number of buildings had been invited to make oral presentations on behalf of APCP. Retention of CSTG as a permanent public park to meet the basic needs of the local community was the main objective of APCP. He would give introductory remarks while the presentation by Mr Paul Zimmerman of DHK and other representatives of APCP would follow.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points:

- (a) CSTG should be retained as a permanent public park, especially when the whole area would be subject to construction works for 10 years or more;
- (b) open space was severely under-provided in the Kennedy Town and Mount Davis (KTMD) area and had been below the required standard specified in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) for a long time. CSTG was the only flat and barrier-free green park in the local area with over 80% green coverage and served as a breathing space for the local residents. Though it was only about 6,000m² in size, CSTG had been in use for about 18 years and was commonly considered as a permanent and widely used urban green space, with 196 trees, including a valuable tree species (i.e. *Aquilaria sinensis*);
- (c) there was an overwhelming local support to save CSTG. APCP's first signature campaign in 2015 collected over 1,200 residents' requests to retain CSTG, including a sizable number of online responses, indicating that at least 97% of residents objected to its removal. In May 2016, more than 5,000 residents signed and submitted representation letters requesting the same during the two-month exhibition period of the draft OZP. At least 27 Members of the Legislative Council (LegCo) signed petition letters in mid-2016 opposing the removal of CSTG, which were submitted to the Development Bureau (DEVB), the Board and PlanD;
- (d) on 19.10.2016, the Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island (the Task Force) of the Harbourfront Commission (HC) unanimously supported the retention of CSTG, and shared APCP's view that decontamination of CSTG was unnecessary and the retention of CSTG would create synergy with the proposed waterfront promenade/park; and

- (e) in January 2017, the Canada's Parks and Wilderness Society (CPAWS), an international environmental body, issued a letter requesting the retention of CSTG, on the rationale that CSTG contributed towards the reduction of the land of greenhouse gas emission, which was the policy directive for Hong Kong and was an international treaty to which the Government should abide.

14. Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of HC and the Task Force and had great sympathy to the views of APCP when it presented at the meeting of the Task Force earlier. He noted that the Task Force's advice provided at the meeting was not included in PlanD's presentation;
- (b) PlanD commented that the alternative proposal put forth by the local community was infeasible. In fact, it should be PlanD's responsibility to propose such alternative, but it had not done so despite the local residents' request in the past two years to retain CSTG and views of the Task Force. Providing the local community with a new waterfront park in the future was not a justification for taking away CSTG. Alternatives other than demolition of CSTG should be provided as a positive response to the community's request;
- (c) if there was no development, there would be no need for decontamination. If CSTG was to be maintained as a temporary park, there would be no legal obligation for decontamination. CSTG had been used by the public for so many years, there was no imminent need to decontaminate the subject area;
- (d) besides Amendment Item C2, DHK (R4112/C12) had made submissions in respect of the following:

Amendment Item B

- the building height (BH) restriction for the pier area under Amendment Item B was too restrictive to promote commercial, leisure and tourism related uses. As the ground level for marine use would need to provide sufficient headroom to accommodate related technical equipment and the upper levels would accommodate food and beverage uses, the stringent BH restriction might pre-empt the coexistence of the two functions and should be relaxed;

Amendment Item F

- the proposed new access road to the immediate north of CSTG aiming to resolve the traffic congestion at the junction of Victoria Road/Belcher's Street/Cadogen Street would act as a barrier hindering public access to the waterfront. The problem at that junction was due to the right-turn arrangement of a tram route at that junction, thereby affecting the road capacity. Extending the tram route along Victoria Road to Sai Ning Street and the new access road could be a solution which was suggested by DHK and discussed in the meeting of HC but had not been studied by TD. Contrary to the proposed access road with high-speed vehicular traffic, tram would be compatible with pedestrian traffic and integrate with the waterfront land uses; and

Mount Davis

- Mount Davis had the potential to be a nature park for recreational uses, such as zip lines and mountain biking trails, which would be compatible with the existing Jockey Club Mount Davis Youth Hostel. PlanD should consider the possible uses for Mount Davis

as a nature park for the local residents and the general public across the whole territory.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points:

- (a) the local residents, LegCo Members and professional bodies were against the demolition of CSTG for several major reasons, including (i) the draft OZP violated HKPSG and the Harbour Planning Principles (HPP); (ii) the removal of CSTG would bring about significant adverse social impact on the local area; (iii) the decontamination works would give rise to adverse environmental impacts on the surrounding areas; (iv) around 200 trees would be lost and biodiversity would be adversely affected which was contrary to that advocated under “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (Hong Kong 2030+) and in respect of biodiversity; (v) the proposals under the draft OZP would lead to over development for the area. The keeping of CSTG would reduce the number of residential units and traffic impact, resulting in a win-win situation for all; (vi) the proposals under the draft OZP would have adverse air ventilation and visual impacts on the local area; and there were alternative sites for compensating the flats proposed in the CSTG site;

Violating HKPSG

- (b) referring to the information provided by PlanD at the hearing on 7.2.2017, both the local open space (LO) and district open space (DO) provisions in the Planning Scheme Area (the Area) of the draft OZP were in deficit. As set out in the revised Explanatory Statement (ES) attached to the Metro Planning Committee Paper No. 1/60 (the MPC Paper), the current and planned open space provisions for the Area were 0.83m² and 0.87m² per person respectively, falling far short of the HKPSG’s requirement of 2m² per person (i.e. 1m² of DO and 1m² of LO per person). If CSTG was to be retained, the future open space provision would be 0.953m² per person,

which was still more than 50% below the HKPSG requirement. Members should safeguard and maximize the open space provision for the Area as far as possible;

- (c) paragraph 6.2 of the MPC Paper had stated that there was no existing shortage of open space in the whole Central & Western (C&W) District. However, the existing parks within the C&W district, including the Sun Yat Sen Memorial Park (SYSMP), Hong Kong Park, New Central Harbourfront, and the Hong Kong Zoological and Botanical Gardens, were outside the area of the daily activities of the local residents and inconvenient to them;
- (d) the MPC Paper also mentioned that the additional open space of 1.7 ha arising from the land use proposals of the draft OZP could cater for the new additional population in line with HKPSG. That was not acceptable as it had totally ignored the fact that the open space provision was in deficit for the existing residents in the Area;
- (e) based on PlanD's figure of 16.99 ha LO in the C&W District and the related population figures of 2011 Population Census, each person had only 0.68 m² LO, which was below the required standard of 1m² LO per person as per HKPSG. As the standard of provision of LO (i.e. 1m² per person respectively) under the HKPSG should be met, PlanD's claim that the HKPSG's requirements had been fulfilled, by adding up both DO and LO of 1,56m² and 0.68m² per person respectively, was incorrect;
- (f) no matter it was the draft OZP or the whole C&W District, the Government had violated the HKPSG requirement in terms of quantity of open space provision and was contrary to the recently proposed plan under Hong Kong 2030+ to increase open space provision to 2.5m² per resident;
- (g) according to Sections 1.12.1 and 3 of Chapter 4: Recreation and Open Space of the HKPSG "*Open spaceshould also be accessible, suitable,*

functional and usable and not merely an area included to make up the required standards” and “LO should be located within short walking distance from the residents it intends to serve....” Hence, open space should be easily accessible to the local residents, preferably within 5-8 minutes’ walking distance, i.e. within an approximately 300m walking radius. Currently, there were two large open spaces in the Area (i.e. CSTG and BBP), each of which was just sufficient to serve the residents in the area within the 300m radius. If CSTG was demolished, the current residents living near the park and the future residents (i.e. about 2,340 public housing units and 1,000 private residential units on the western side of the KTMD area) would need to walk more than 600m - 900m to reach BBP. That was impractical, unreasonable and unacceptable to the local community;

- (h) there were no open spaces of same quality to replace CSTG. Those nearby open spaces, including Ka Wai Man Road Garden (KWMRG), Forbes Street Temporary Playground (FSTP), Smithfield Sitting-out Area (SSA), Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground (KTTRG) and the open space at North Street, were all unsuitable as a replacement for reasons such as hilly and isolated locations, poor design/hygiene, type/nature (some being active open spaces with little room for passive open space use), small sizes and/or limited planting, etc., while BBP was very overcrowded;

Violating HPP

- (i) the proposed waterfront promenade was not supposed to and could not replace CSTG;
- (j) it was anticipated that the proposed waterfront promenade/park would largely be hard-paved with commercial facilities and limited areas for greening and trees, similar to those in the Central and Tsim Sha Tsui waterfronts. The food and beverage facilities provided would be for the

high-spending community and not be affordable by the ordinary residents of Kennedy Town;

- (k) while the Government stated that the loss of trees at CSTG would be compensated at the new waterfront promenade/park as far as possible, it would not be feasible to compensate fully (i.e. 1:1 in diameter at breast height (DBH)) due to site constraint;
- (l) the future waterfront would have poor connectivity and accessibility due to its separation from the hinterland by a new proposed road to the north of CSTG. The public would have to gain access to the waterfront either via Cadogan Street or the footbridge through the podium of the future residential buildings in the CSTG site. Such arrangement was not convenient, particularly for the elderly, and public access via the footbridge of the private development would be subject to access restrictions for security reasons. As the proposed waterfront promenade/park would not be connected with the central waterfront promenade and not be easily accessible from the hinterland, it would unlikely attract local residents or visitors from other areas. As a result, the proposed waterfront promenade/park might become a “private garden” of those new residential buildings;
- (m) on the contrary, keeping CSTG would help fulfill HPP by maximizing opportunities for public enjoyment, providing unrestricted and convenient visual and physical access for pedestrians to the promenade, and addressing social needs for sustainable development;
- (n) on 19.10.2016, the Task Force unanimously supported the APCP’s request to retain CSTG and recognised that decontamination works for CSTG was unnecessary. The Task Force was of the view that CSTG, which could enhance connection between the hinterland and the waterfront, should be kept. The Government could identify other sites or use other means such as increasing building height over the territory to increase housing

production. The Task Force also shared the views of APCP that there were no compelling reasons to close the park for carrying out decontamination works given that CSTG had been open to the public for about 18 years and had not posed any threat to the health of people. CEDD should fully justify the need for carrying out decontamination works at the site concerned; and

- (o) with the proposals of Hong Kong 2030+ on the development of East Lantau Metropolis and on-going development/redevelopment in Kennedy Town, further and significant increase in the population of the KTMD area would be anticipated which would be more than the planned population envisaged under the draft OZP were expected. That would further aggravate the shortfall in open space provision. The local residents strongly requested that the CSTG be retained to mitigate the inadequate open space problem in the KTMD area, while improving the quality of life for the local community.

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

16. Mr Mok Kun Ki said that the following oral submissions by a number of APCP's representatives would focus on the social impacts arising from the removal of CSTG. He sought the Chairman's agreement for tabling a document entitled "Journey to Save CSTG", which contained information to be presented at the oral submission. The meeting agreed and the document was tabled for Members' reference.

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and video clippings, Ms Wong Kin Ching made the following main points:

- (a) CSTG was a unique and natural park at a convenient location. The aesthetic appeal of CSTG was further enhanced by the trees named Indian Almonds. The nearby open spaces of CSTG were beyond comparison;

- (b) it was a very popular leisure area enjoyed by all walks of life. The minimal provision at CSTG had allowed flexibility and creativity in using the park and enabled a wide range of individual and group activities, which in turn had enhanced community/family ties. APCP had organised general events such as bazaar at CSTG in the past and the turnout rate was over 60 to 100 people. Over 12,000 residents living in the vicinity would be affected by the removal of CSTG; and
- (c) APCP's organised events to save CSTG including a community picnic and forum, which took place in January 2015 and November 2016 respectively, were attended by many residents. The subject petition banners signed by many residents had been brought to the hearing and Members were welcome to inspect them.

18. Ms Lesley S.M. Lee made the following main points:

- (a) as a local resident, she strongly opposed the demolition of CSTG. The residents of the KTMD area deserved to have a park for their own use. The rights of the local residents should be respected.
- (b) it was unreasonable to ask the local residents to travel to those parks in Central and Sheung Wan. She visited BBP a few times only as it was not close by and overcrowded; and
- (c) the figures of open space provision provided by PlanD were biased and irrelevant. Inclusion of those parks outside the KTMD area in calculating the open space provision was unjustified.

19. Ms Cynthia K.S. Lau made the following main points:

- (a) her family had lived in the local area for five generations. Though she had moved away from the Western District, she still travelled to CSTG by bus in the mornings for jogging and other exercises. CSTG had the

unique ability to restore the physical and mental well-being of the users, which in turn had contributed positively to social harmony;

- (b) the MTR related construction works had reduced the number and size of open spaces throughout the Western District over the years. FTTP was mostly hard paved with no trees and was seldomly used as a result. It was also inaccessible to the elderly and disabled. The waterfront promenade fronting the SYSMP had similar problems. Retaining CSTG could indeed enhance the planned waterfront promenade/park to its north; and
- (c) like many new private developments in place in the Western District, there was no available public spaces and open area. The reprovisioned open spaces like the one near The Merton were often residual area not enjoyed by the public. The rare green open space i.e. CSTG should be cherished and protected.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left this session of the meeting at this point.]

20. Ms Ma Lai Ying made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident at The Merton and the CSTG should be retained as (i) the park served a diverse range of users of different age and ethnic groups and was blessed with lush greenery; (ii) BBP was beyond the ten-minute walking distance and could not be considered as a LO; and (iii) the monetary gain from selling the CSTG site could not outweigh the social benefits from keeping it, since it helped restore the physical and mental well-being of many individuals; and
- (b) an alternative site for residential development should be sought.

21. Mr David C.O. Fu made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of the IO of a 53-year old residential building (Sai Wan New Apartments) (SWNA) near CSTG;
- (b) SWNA was mostly occupied by elderly residents, including a residential care home for the elderly with over 150 beds. Through his home visits, he knew that the elderly residents used CSTG frequently at different times daily and had developed strong attachment to the park itself; and
- (c) the elderly residents considered BBP and KWMRG not suitable for use and strongly requested CSTG be retained. Drastic measures would be taken should demolition works of CSTG begin.

22. Ms Mak Lai Sum made the following main points:

- (a) Members should take heed of the comments of the local residents expressed so far. APCP had shouldered the responsibility to speak for the local residents to voice out their strong objections to the removal of CSTG;
- (b) construction of the planned waterfront promenade would take a long time to complete and unlikely be able to serve the current elderly residents. The waterfront promenade could not be considered as a replacement for CSTG, given their different nature; and
- (c) Members should visit CSTG to better appreciate the uniqueness and merits of CSTG which could be a model park for others to follow. The future development of the KTMD area should aim to achieve a better environment for its residents, and not to repeat the prevailing congested living conditions of other old districts such as Wan Chai.

23. With the aid of a PowerPoint Presentation and video clippings, Ms Wong Kin Ching made the following main points:

- (a) PlanD had admitted that the demolition of CSTG would cause significant adverse landscape impact on the area. Based on the DBH of the surveyed trees at CSTG and 4m radius per replacement tree, the proposed waterfront promenade did not have enough space to compensate for 196 trees at a ratio of 1:1. Together with other trees to be felled outside CSTG, the total number of trees to be affected might be about 500. Yet, no tree compensation plans had been proposed by the Government;
- (b) CSTG was a mature and rare habitat for plants and wildlife, including trees of the protective species i.e. *Aquilaria Sinensis*, butterflies, squirrels and bats. As bats were carriers of diseases, destroying CSTG including their habitat might pose safety and health risks to the neighbouring residents. It was also uncertain as to whether the bats, a protected species in Hong Kong, could survive once their habitat was destroyed;
- (c) bird nests were also identified at CSTG. According to PlanD, although there would be works near the trees with bird nests, the subject trees would only be felled when the birds had fled. That approach was considered inhumane;
- (d) according to the Hong Kong Observatory, the average temperature in the first month of 2017 had already risen by 2.2°C. As a slight increase in temperature would aid bacterial growth or spread of viruses, keeping CSTG would help moderate the temperature and benefit the health of the community;

Responses to the representations

- (e) APCP had the following views to the Government's responses on the representations/comments as provided in the Paper:

Automatic underground car park system

- (i) the Government's response i.e. parking should be provided at a level which would not unduly attract potential passengers to use private vehicles, was irrelevant to ACPC's suggestion of an automatic underground car park system, which aimed to reduce the area of the proposed car park at the site under Amendment Item C2 and to address insufficient car parking spaces in the district;
- (ii) using the automatic underground parking system also did not imply the provision of a large number of parking spaces, which would attract additional private cars;

Shortage of open space

- (iii) for the concern on the loss in open space due to the removal of CSTG, the Government responded that they would actively pursue the open space use at the Western District Public Cargo Working Area (WDPCWA). However, as such proposal was only preliminary and long term in nature, it should not be taken into consideration at the current stage;

Footpath widening

- (iv) the Government's footpath widening proposal for the southern kerbside of Forbes Street near Kennedy Town MTR Station to accommodate additional pedestrian traffic was unnecessary, as the footpath at that section was generally of sufficient width. Narrowing Forbes Street would also be dangerous to pedestrians, especially given the busy traffic of its connecting road, Smithfield;

Waterfront park

- (v) the concern that the waterfront park would likely become a private garden for the residential development under Amendment Item C2 had not been addressed. Metro Harbour View in Tai Kok Tsui was an example where the public open space located within the private development had caused serious management problems and conflicts between the public and residents. The concerned Government departments should act proactively to prevent similar problems;

Incompatible hotel development

- (vi) the proposed hotel use and wine cellar at the China Merchants Group site under Amendment Item B were incompatible with the nearby proposed primary school under Amendment Item D1. PlanD's response did not address the issue of land use incompatibility. Sufficient distances should be provided between educational and entertainment/wine related uses; and

Tree felling

- (vii) PlanD had responded that most of the trees within the proposed public housing site under Amendment Item C1 were common tree species. However, all trees should be valued and they would help purify the air. PlanD should also confirm whether those large trees along Victoria Road near Sai See Street and Sai Ning Street would be preserved.

24. Mr Sin Chung Kai made the following main points:

- (a) he became aware of the issue when the Public Works Sub-Committee of LegCo approved the funding to facilitate the decontamination works in

2015. Since then, much time had been spent in discussing the related issues with the representatives of DEVB and the concerned departments;

- (b) CSTG had served the local residents and became an important part of their everyday life. It acted as a breathing space for those nearby residents living in small apartments and a green lung amid the congested urban space. It could not be replaced by other parks including the future waterfront park that would serve different functions and cater for a wider range of users including visitors from other districts;
- (c) the related clearance, decontamination and construction works for the residential development under Amendment Item C2 would adversely affect the local residents for at least 10 years or so and result in a more congested living environment for both the existing and new residents;
- (d) the local residents had exhausted all their means to save CSTG. The welfare of the community should be the preamble of town planning and the amendment item that would take away a public park should be rejected; and
- (e) Members should pay a visit to CSTG or home visits to the nearby residential buildings so as to better understand the situation for themselves.

25. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:30 p.m.

26. The meeting was resumed at 2:00 p.m. on 15.2.2017.

27. 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

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong),
Transport Department

Mr Peter C.K. Mak

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

Vice-Chairman

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

28. The following government representatives and consultants, as well as 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)

Mr Derek P.K. Tse - Senior Town Planner/HK5 (STP/HK5)

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip - Engineer/Central & Western 3 (E/C&W3)

Environmental Protection Department (EPD)

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

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung - Senior Engineer 7 (SE7)

Mr Derek H.F. Kwok - Engineer 5 (E5)

Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Limited (MMHK)

Mr Eric M.K. Ching - Director (Environment)

Mr P.K. Chan - Senior Environmental Consultant

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R140 – 徐曼詩

R150/C13 – Alliance for Protecting Cadogan Park (APCP)

R159 – Yiu Sau Fong

R184/C169 – Marcus Peter Lo

R186 – Ng Wing Chi

R346 – 李欽源
R347 – Yip Kark Yin
R353 – 呂照改
R354 – 黃楚華
R358 – Soo Hang Ping
R467 – 洪岳香
R537 – Law Chung Ting James
R645 – Lui Yuet Kwan
R650 – Lee Chi Kwan
R652 – Chan Mei Mei May
R653 – Lee Kwok On
R888 – Chan Kwok Chung
R935 – Leung Kam Sing
R1024 – Bridget Diane Steis
R1100 – Wong Yuk Lan
R1217 – Chan Yiu Kwong
R1220 – 鄭子桂
R1221 – 鄺惠
R1232 – Kong Siu Lan
R1234 – 蘇興女
R1236 – 陳柏樂
R1251 – Tsui Shing Hei
R1252 – Terry Tsui
R1253 – Fong Wai Yi
R1259 – Tse Mei Sin
R1267 – Cheng Hon Ming
R1409 – 李煥琮
R1449 – Law Oi Ling Jessie
R1452/C255 – Wu Sai Mui
R1524 – Lam Wai
R1525/C74 – Lam Wai Choi Danny

R1605 – Fu Wing Sze
R1622/C175 – Ho Man Man Lucretia
R1737 – Chan Ngan Ying
R1791/C290 – Lau Ka Sin Cynthia
R1801 – Yeung Ming Yan
R1835/C297 – Jon Colbear
R1884 – Ruth King
R1898 – Lam Ching Man
R1919 – Mok Koon Yip
R1920 – Ernie Mok Kai Shing
R1922 – Ng Yee Man
R1927 – Cheng Wai Sum
R1928 – Kwong Mun Fong
R1942 – 黃惠玉
R1946 – Fung Ming Kong
R1947 – Leung Yuet Ching Nancy
R1950 – 鄭何淑貞
R2031 – 鄭振鏗
R2038 – Kan Chun Kong
R2076 – Hung Sau Yung Vanessa
R2149 – Chan Wai Chi
R2300 – 莫秋景
R2360 – Lau Suk Ling
R2361 – Cheng Lap Hung
R2380 – Cheng Bik Fai Anna
R2472 – Wong Yun Fun
R2473 – Lau Chi Ling
R2474 – Lau Chi Ming
R2475 – Lau Yiu Kwong
R2476 – Yee Ho Kei
R2509 – Chan Shui Yee
R2510 – Chiu Tak Kwong

R2511 – Fu Sin Tung

R2512 – Fu Tze Lok

R2513 – 陳國康

R2519 – Chan Mei Chi

R2799/C139 – Luk Hiu Wa Hilda

R2807/C87 – Alice Lau

R2842/C40 – Cheuk Ming Li

R2852/C146 – Lee Wai Kuen Katherine

R2916/C242 – Jayne Elizabeth Wright

R3159 – Ng Yuen Har

R3224 – Tsang Lai Sheung Kea

APCP

(Represented by Mr Mok Kun Ki,

Mr Samson W.S. Chan,

Ms Wong Kin Ching,

Mr Fu Chee On,

Ms Mak Lai Sum,

Dr Chiu Siu Wai,

Ms Lee So Mui, Lesley,

Ms Ma Lai Ying,

Ms Amy T.Y. Tse, and

Dr Charlton Cheung)

- Representor, Commentor, and
Representors' and Commentors'
representative

29. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the above representors, commentors and their representatives to continue their oral submission.

30. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Dr Charlton Cheung made the following main points :

- (a) the history of the Cadogan Street Temporary Garden (CSTG) site and its adjoining area showed that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted to support the proposed amendments was not comprehensive and

a wrong focus had been taken in the assessment. The CSTG site was used as a wholesale vegetable/fish market in the 1960s. There were three chimneys in the area for the ex-Kennedy Town Incineration Plant and Abattoir sites. Two of the chimneys were incinerators for municipal solid waste and one was for disposal of animal carcasses from the abattoir;

- (b) there were various types of contaminants found in the area. Benzo(a)pyrene, a type of polyaromatic hydrocarbon (PAH), was frequently found exceeding the contamination standard according to the EIA reports. Benzo(a)pyrene which was caused by incomplete combustion, was carcinogenic and most dangerous. He then used Benzo(a)pyrene as an example to explain the EIA findings on land contamination. In terms of amount and depth of the contaminants, the level of contamination was higher along the road side, such as along the Victoria Road and Cadogan Street rather than at the ex-Kennedy Town Incinerator area. As such, whether the former incinerators were the major source of contaminants was questionable. Contamination at the CSTG site was also found at deep soil level, while those near the former incinerators were found closer to the surface;
- (c) contamination found near the surface could be explained as follows, (i) the area in Grid 20 was an open area used for stocking coal for the incinerator at the abattoir, a high contamination level (110mg at 1.5m below ground) was found at the surface; and (ii) the contamination found at Grid 4R (6mg at 0.5m below ground) was likely related to the current location of the bus terminus;
- (d) the distribution and depth of the contaminants varied in Grid 20 could be due to the reason that the area was a government pier before reclamation. As shown on the old photo and topographic map, the Cadogan Street area was named Lap-Sap Wan (registered under Marine Lots) meaning 'refuse bay'. According to the old government scavenging contract, the area was covered by sea in 1863. The contract included burning of refuse at

Lap-Sap Wan. The reclamation plan commenced in 1883 and scavenging was moved to Mount Davis when the Cadogan Street area was reclaimed;

- (e) the adjoining area of the CSTG site was previously used as a government pier and The Merton site was previously a warehouse of oil companies. The depth of the contaminants corresponded to the former depth of the sea bed. The deep contamination in Grid 16 was due to relocation of the pier in the 1950s. There might also be ship-wrecking in the area. The samples taken in the EIA had reached the levels of the previous sea bed which was likely contaminated by the engine oil and the coal tar from the vessels. Other levels of contamination were also recorded, surface soil at 1.5m and deep soil at 6 to 7.5m, reflecting different stages of reclamation. There was also evidence of coal tar storage in the area. The contamination at the surface (about 1.5m) was related to the change in coastline for the open air vegetable/fish market development, and the deep contamination was related to the former sea bed. The level of contamination revealed that contaminants from incinerators was highly related to heavy metals and not PAH;

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

- (f) there was also contamination by heavy metals. Lead contamination was found most severe around the ex-incinerators and along the roads connecting to the ex-incinerator area. Most areas with severe surface contamination were less than 4.5m in depth. The CSTG site was relatively 'clean' from heavy metal compared to the ex-incinerator area, and most contamination was at deep soil level; and
- (g) the current EIA was mainly based on the result of the land contamination assessment previously conducted in 1999, additional site investigation with four boreholes was carried out at the bus depot area which was considered as possible location of land contamination. To sum up, there were two fundamental problems of the EIA, (i) wrong sampling, mainly focus along

the waterfront and incinerator area with insufficient samples taken in CSTG and car parking area; and (ii) insufficient coverage as the samples from the area west of Sai See Street and the China Merchant site were inadequate.

[Professor S.C. Wong returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

31. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Dr Chiu Siu Wai made the following main points :

- (a) the borehole samples of the EIA were not obtained through random sampling. It seemed that the location of boreholes and sampling sequence were just taken as a matter of convenience. Besides, there was a lack of complete assessment of current level of contamination of the area. The latest EIA report approved in 2015 was based on the data of the EIA report collected in the late 1990s, which was considered outdated. Taking one sample per grid in the CSTG site was not up to international standards. There were only a few new samples taken in the 2014 site investigation and they were mostly outside the CSTG site. Thus most of the samples were taken before 2002 and the assessment on the level of contamination was outdated. In the previous meeting, government officials had indirectly admitted that if CSTG would be retained as an open space and kept as it was, there was no need for decontamination. She also had doubts on the government response that contaminants did not reduce over time;
- (b) according to the EIA reports, the CSTG site was used as a temporary public vehicle park prior to construction of CSTG, and thus heavy metals such as lead, mercury and arsenic, Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons, and PAH including Benzo(a)pyrene were found on the CSTG site. The level of contamination at the CSTG site, even at level close to ground surface, had exceeded the level for residential purposes and in some locations, they even exceeded the level for public parks. The Government's response that CSTG was safe was misleading and concealing the truth, the contamination level at the site should have been reduced overtime and would be much safer

than before. Phytoremediation was an effective bioremediation method using plant as the organism for decontamination. With phytoremediation which leveraged the metabolism of plants, such as blossoming and withering of the flowers, leaves and fruits, contaminants could be moved to plant organs and then removed from the site by sweeping away the withered leaves and branches. The contamination level in area covered by trees within the park should have been reduced significantly after 19 years;

- (c) phytoremediation was an effective and much cheaper method than biopile for decontamination. About 20% of the trees in the CSTG were *Ficus microcarpa* which had long roots up to 10m. Their roots could reach deep into the soil and effectively extend soil contacts, accelerating root growth to go deeper and degrading or transforming organic contaminants. It should be noted that most of the contaminants were located at a depth of less than 10m;
- (d) it usually took only three to five years for effective phytoremediation. Besides, natural weathering such as climate change and annual rainfall would shorten the phytoremediation process. The annual rainy seasons in Hong Kong should help wash away certain contaminants. Comparing the findings on two of the boreholes which were sampled in site investigations of the two EIAs, a reduction in the level of contamination could be observed. The current decontamination proposal was just an excuse to clear the site for development. Having been engaged in many decontamination projects of both public and private sectors, she was well aware of the effectiveness of phytoremediation and validity of the site data obtained more than 14 years ago;
- (e) the computer models adopted in the current EIA were based on an outdated model adopted in the United States which was designed for short-term decontamination project and not targeted for projects of medium to long term. It should be noted that the government of the United States had no longer used that model since 2007. The Kennedy Town decontamination

would last for 7 years and a short-term model was not appropriate to assess the risks. The EIA Ordinance required the use of updated models up to international standards, and an EIA report based on an outdated model was clearly not up to standard. Besides, the model adopted did not take into account the prevailing wind flow direction in Kennedy Town. The health risk assessment focusing mainly on Benzo(a)pyrene was not sufficient since there were many other PAH and heavy metals that were equally carcinogenic and dangerous;

- (f) a 7-year decontamination period was considered too long. Long-term exposure to contaminants during the excavation works in the decontamination process would increase the risk. Without appropriate work procedure and air pollution monitoring measures, the health of the local residents might be at risk. Noting that the incinerators were removed by vessels immediately after their demolition, it was questionable to adopt an on-site decontamination method with extensive excavation lasting for seven years;
- (g) global warming had been causing health problems. Hong Kong needed to follow the mitigation actions that the Mainland had pledged to enhance actions which involved a new agreement on the global efforts in addressing climate change (the Paris Agreement). One of the committed actions was to lower carbon intensity by 60 to 65% by 2030. According to the 2014 greenhouse gas (GHG) inventory for Hong Kong released lately, the GHG emissions in 2014 amounted to 44.9 million tonnes of carbon dioxide (CO₂). Electricity generation remained the major source of emissions, amounting to 31.2 million tonnes or 69.6% of the total. It would take enormous on-going effort of the whole community to reduce our carbon emission;
- (h) urban greening was a key measure for carbon sequestration in view of carbon absorption by planting of trees. There were rising trends in both population and energy consumption in Hong Kong. About 90% of the electricity consumption was for residential uses. Electricity consumption

generated heat and loss of greening reduced the heat absorption capacity which together accelerated the urban heat islands process. According to the findings of many overseas studies, planting of trees was an effective mitigation measure in temperature reduction and energy saving; and

- (i) Hong Kong was ranked No. 9 in the 2016 global competitiveness index whereas New York City and London were ranked No. 1 and No. 3 respectively. The large green areas such as the Central Park and Regent's Park in the two cities provided areas for relaxation and enhanced their competitiveness; and
- (j) many researches had identified association between air pollution and hospital admission relating to respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. Using the i-Tree software, she had conducted researches on the dust-trapping effect of leaves. Many dusts and carbon particles were found on a leaf specimen collected outside a power plant in Hong Kong. The larger the tree and leaf area, the greater screening effect could be attained. Removal of CSTG and the trees therein would mean removal of the natural screen against contaminants dispersion during the excavation process of the decontamination works. To sum up, CSTG not only provided the community with a landscaped area, purified air, reduced pollution, but also regulated the micro-climate and increased absorption of CO₂ emission, heat as well as contaminants.

32. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points :

- (a) the Traffic Review had flaws and was misleading. It did not reflect the recent increase in traffic due to newly completed developments, the rising population in the area, and future traffic increase. The proposed road junction improvements were not effective. Traffic to the west was mainly via Victoria Road while to the east was via New Praya Kennedy Town, and both roads did not have any room for widening. The junction of Belcher's

Street/Victoria Road was an existing traffic bottleneck and new bottlenecks would be created when the number of vehicles increased significantly. A simple estimation based on the population increase indicated that around 90 more double-decker buses or 644 more mini-buses would be travelling along Victoria Road. The traffic flow would be even higher when the new residents used their private cars. Even if the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) could absorb about 50% of the road traffic, the traffic volume would still be increased by more than twofold. The current utilization of the road capacity at the junction of Belcher's Street/Cadogan Street had already exceeded 60%;

- (b) the proposed underground car park at the CSTG site could not solve the traffic problem. The source of traffic congestion was not due to shortage of car parking spaces as the existing vehicle parks nearby were often under-utilized in daytime and occupied mostly by lorries at night time. On the contrary, the additional parking spaces would aggravate the problem by attracting more traffic coming into the neighbourhood; and
- (c) comparing with Lei King Wan the maximum building height of 70m was substantially lower than that stipulated for the Kennedy Town area which was mostly around 100m to 140m. According to TD, widening of the surrounding roads including Ka Wai Man Road, Victoria Road and Belcher's Street was not feasible. Thus, the only solution was to reduce the number of residential units by 30% to 40% which would be comparable to that of Lei King Wan. It would be a win-win situation to relocate some units to other sites, while retaining CSTG to address shortage in open space in the area.

33. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms Wong Kin Ching made the following main points :

- (a) in response to PlanD's comment on the representers' population estimation during the hearing meeting, their estimation of the population for 13 new

private residential buildings since 2012 had already deducted the population of the demolished old buildings. The planned population in the OZP was under-estimated and rendered the traffic assessment not accurate;

- (b) referring to Annex XIV of TPB Paper No. 10244 regarding the traffic review, the growth factors adopted, i.e. 3.81% for 2015 to 2016, 0% for 2016 to 2021, 1.88% for 2021 to 2026, and 0.34% for 2026 to 2031, were unrealistic. Based on their observation, the growth factor for 2015 to 2016 was 20% and a 0% growth for 2016 to 2021 was unbelievable. The growth for 2016 to 2031 would probably exceed 60%;
- (c) traffic assessment should not be limited by the OZP boundary. It was necessary to identify the problem at source. The traffic jam of Kennedy Town in the morning peak, in particular the west bound traffic, often started at junction of Shing Sai Road and the elevated section of Connaught Road West. The east bound traffic condition in the morning was slightly better. The Traffic Review had only assessed the junction performance which did not reflect the real situation. The inherent traffic problem in Kennedy Town was mainly due to illegal parking on both sides of the road and only one lane could be used most of the time. The buses at Forbes Street often could not turn into Cadogan Street due to illegal parking. The loading/unloading activities by lorries and parking of private cars for shopping or dining had often caused traffic blockage and affected other road users. The situation was even worse during events and weekends. The Traffic Review should take into account the actual road condition instead of the design capacity;
- (d) some might expect that the local road condition would be improved after the commission of the MTR West Island Line. However, it was even worse, in particular during night time when the increased eating places were in business. The CSTG site was not an appropriate location for a new car park which could not solve the parking problem. Though there was

existing parking spaces at the nearby Sai See Street, it was not fully utilized most of the time;

[Mr David Y.T. Lui left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (e) as regards the proposed amendment to change the China Merchant Godown area into a tourist site, including a cruise terminal, she doubted whether the area could cater for an additional population of 8,500 as well as tourist. She then showed a video clip taken in the area during the berthing of a navy vessel with a capacity of 1,000 passengers at the China Merchant Wharf. The streets were so crowded with tourists. In conclusion, the methodology and traffic model adopted in the traffic assessment had limitations and the conclusion relating to traffic capacity as well as pedestrian flow might not be correct; and
- (f) the proposed East Lantau Metropolis (ELM) growth area under the Hong Kong 2030+ Study, which was under a feasibility study and would be completed a few years after the completion of Kennedy Town developments, had not been taken into account. The ELM would cater for 700,000 population. Even if only 10% the traffic generated would go through the proposed new bridge to be connected to the western part of Kennedy Town, the traffic volume in the area would be increased. The only solution might be through construction of a by-pass and it would have adverse impacts on the proposed promenade. Besides, there was no local consultation on the traffic review and she considered the data of the Traffic Review was unreliable and misleading.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left this session of the meeting at this point.]

34. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points :

Air Ventilation

- (a) the CSTG site allowed air ventilation to the buildings to its south, east and west. The proposed development at the CSTG site would reduce air flow and lead to air traps. It was noted that the proposed building height of the scheme adopted in the Expert Evaluation on Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA EE) conducted by PlanD was not the same as the building height restriction (BHR) stipulated on the OZP. The AVA EE was based on a previous scheme with proposed building heights of 100mPD to the west and 140mPD to the east. However, the BHR on the OZP at the western part of the site was reduced to 40mPD. With no change to the plot ratio (6.5) and gross floor area restrictions, the proposed bulk of the building on the western part of the site would be increased and become ‘fatter’ with a reduced building height. When the buildings became “fatter” with less permeable spaces in between, wind penetration would be hindered;

- (b) according to PlanD, as the building gap did not change in both schemes, the findings of the AVA EE should not be affected. The explanation was not justified for the following reasons:
 - (i) a 15m building gap was a general practice for long building façade and not a mitigation measure;

 - (ii) the findings of AVA EE were not correct and the effectiveness of proposed mitigation measures was in doubt;

 - (iii) as the plot ratio remained the same, the resultant building would become ‘fatter’ and create wall effect;

 - (iv) the Board should not accept the AVA report and the air ventilation impacts should be reassessed;

- (c) although a building gap of 15m was proposed to provide an air ventilation corridor, it would be for buildings above the podium of the proposed development. The size of the podium would be huge since there would be a bus terminus, public vehicle park, as well as other community and social welfare facilities. A building gap above the podium level would not help wind penetration on street level and future pedestrian would suffer from poor air ventilation;

Visual

- (d) the vantage points selected for the visual assessment were biased. It failed to provide an objective assessment. Some important vantage points commonly used by the local residents were not chosen. For example, when viewing at the junction of Cadogan Street and Victoria Street where the proposed development would be out-of-context and nearby roads would be shadowed with no sunlight, while the view of waterfront would be blocked when viewing from the Victoria Harbour;

Alternative sites available

- (e) they did not agree that a “housing target” should be pursued at the expense of strong local objections, adverse social impact and unjustified technical feasibility on traffic, air ventilation, landscape and visual impacts. The real intention was to sell the site with an unobstructed sea view and a nice promenade for luxury private residential development. Residential development after 7 to 10 years of decontamination works would not help solve the imminent housing needs. CSTG had been in use for about 18 years, its current function should not be ignored. The Belcher’s Bay Park nearby was also temporary in the past and had been converted into a permanent park;
- (f) based on their research, a number of alternative sites were identified for residential development for the proposed 2,247 flats as follows:

- (i) Ka Wai Man Road Garden, 3,796m² in area, could produce about 353 flats. While PlanD claimed that it formed an integral part of an air path between the waterfront and the hillside, the CSTG site was also an integral part of the air path between waterfront and inland streets;
- (ii) Sai Wan Estate, 15,409m² in area, could produce about 833 new flats (in addition to the existing 600 flats). Though PlanD responded that it was currently a public housing estate without any redevelopment plan, its redevelopment would have significant impact on Mount Davis and Kennedy Town area, the OZP should consider its redevelopment for long term and sustainable development of the district. Excluding the redevelopment of Sai Wan Estate was not fair to the existing residents as it took away their opportunities to relocate within the same district;
- (iii) the site on the slope of Rock Hill Street, 5,500 m² in area, could produce about 512 flats. PlanD responded that the site was zoned “Green Belt” (“GB”) which was not for development in general and the technical feasibility was uncertain due to the steep topography. They considered that the Government had rezoned a number of “GB” sites to residential uses in the past few years. Technical feasibility was only an excuse, as many buildings on Hong Kong Island were built on steep slope and all of them were safe;
- (g) land was still available and there was no need to close CSTG as it would take a long time for decontamination. Brownfield sites should be the priority sites for development. The timing to develop a brownfield site was no more than that of the CSTG site and the cost should be even lower. Brownfield site should be removed instead as it was mostly occupied by unauthorized development and the land was polluted by illegal activities such as dumping of construction waste. The CSTG was so valuable to people in Hong Kong and the local community. The Government should

not allow illegal activities to continue and to deprive the basic needs of the local residents;

Alternative land use proposals

- (h) there was no justification/data provided for a new primary school at Site 3b (Amendment Item D1) apart from that it was requested by the Education Bureau. However, a community hall was long requested by the local residents and the proposed school site could be used for community hall to cater for the needs of the residents in the neighbourhood. The proposed bus terminus and underground car park could be relocated to the proposed school site. The proposed primary school, if required, could be provided within the proposed public housing site (Amendment Item C1) in a comprehensive manner taking account of the former school at Ka Wai Man Road (i.e. the ex-Hong Kong Academy school). It would be much safer and more sensible for a school to be located near Ka Wai Man Road. By swapping the two sites, the production of flats would be increased. The re-use of the Hong Kong Academy would be a better utilization of the existing resources. Besides, as future students did not need to cross the street to attend school, the risk of traffic accidents and air pollution would be reduced;

- (i) the Board should consider accommodating the proposed bus terminus in Area 7 (Amendment Item C3) given it was an existing bus terminus, land was readily available, and no decontamination works would be required. Retaining the bus terminus at the site could also serve the new population as it was closer to other proposed new housing developments. The Government could make reference to the underground car park in Tokyo, which was a mature high-tech underground parking system and had been successfully adopted in many high density cities with constraint in space. If the proposed public car park at the CSTG site could be relocated underground, the proposed number of flats could be incorporated there;

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

- (j) he had gone through all the seven key rationales for retaining CSTG including not in line with planning guidelines and harbourfront planning principles, potential social impact, loss of open space and Government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, adverse environmental and air ventilation impacts, conservation of urban trees and biodiversity, incorrect Traffic Review and visual impact assessment, and there were alternative sites in the area for residential development; and
- (k) to sum up, the OZP had violated guidelines and the Town Planning Ordinance, the technical feasibility of the proposed amendments was doubtful. The Board should be the gatekeeper to ensure that land use was properly planned for the benefits of the local residents. No decontamination would be needed if there was no development. It would cost taxpayers for housing development at the CSTG site but the flats produced would be expensive and not affordable. Developing the CSTG site could not meet the immediate housing demand, the Government should come up with other appropriate solutions. The proposed promenade was not assured and was something in the far future.

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

[Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

35. As the presentation from the government's representatives, and the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Question and Answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman briefed attendees that the Q&A session was for Members to raise questions on matters of concerns. Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as

an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairman invited questions from Members.

Ground Decontamination Works

36. A number of Members had the following questions on the decontamination works:
- (a) the methodology for assessing level of contamination and any other more effective method for site investigation than random sampling;
 - (b) the methodology, current status and programme of the proposed decontamination works;
 - (c) whether the decontamination process would affect the health of the nearby local residents and how to reduce the risk;
 - (d) the proposed mitigation measures on potential environmental impacts of the decontamination works;
 - (e) the implication on the decontamination works if the CSTG site was to be retained, and clarification on the need for decontamination works if there would be no development on the CSTG site;
 - (f) the phasing plan relating to closure of the park and opening of the promenade; whether it would be a seamless transition with no impact on open space provision;
 - (g) more information on the method of phytoremediation for decontamination such as the depth of the roots of the trees; and
 - (h) noting that the i-Tree system mentioned was only a data-base and assessment tool used to strengthen tree management, how the tool could be applied in the proposed method of phytoremediation for decontamination.

37. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, Ms Carrie K.Y. Leung, SE/CEDD, Mr H.F. Kwok, E/CEDD and Mr Eric M.K. Ching, MMHK made the following main points:

- (a) a total of 189 site investigation boreholes were carried out at the project site in 2000 and 2003 to identify the contaminants. In order to assess the potential contamination caused by the continual operation of the bus depot after 2003, four additional boreholes were carried out within the bus depot area in 2013. The results of those 4 boreholes did not conclude that the contaminants within the project site had reduced. The contaminants, given their properties, could not be degraded, or were very difficult to be degraded, by themselves over time, and in particular in the underground environment;
- (b) the method of biopiling involving heaping contaminated soil into biopiles and stimulating aerobic microbial activity within the soil to break down the hydrocarbons would be adopted;
- (c) if CSTG needed to be retained/reprovisioned, the decontamination works would need to be implemented in two phases, each lasting for about seven years. However, the 13 to 14-year implementation period was considered too long and not supported by the Central and Western District Council (C&WDC). CEDD had also consulted the relevant stakeholders with a 7-year implementation proposal, without retaining/reprovisioning of the CSTG, which was generally accepted by the consultees. As the EIA was approved, CEDD was preparing submission of application for project funding approval by the Legislative Council to commence the decontamination works;
- (d) the EIA had assessed the potential air quality and health impacts associated with the decontamination works, including the impacts from dusts, and the contaminants including heavy metals and hydrocarbons. The dispersion assessment was carried out through air quality modelling in accordance with EPD's guidelines and references to other international standards were made.

The new model mentioned by the representers/commenters had incorporated the features of two separated models in one modelling platform with some additional modelling features to allow for refined simulation. Since all the above models were developed based on similar mathematical formulation, the results produced by the models would be very similar when using the same set of input data;

- (e) the air quality models adopted were listed as commonly used for EIA studies by EPD. The models adopted were only technical tools to support the assessments and the assumptions made behind the assessments should be more essential. Dust generated from excavation and the associated decontamination processes were the primary concern during the carrying out of the decontamination works. A very conservative scenario of dispersion of all dusts and contaminants from the works site to the air during excavation had been assumed. In fact, such assumption would not happen given the appropriate mitigation measures would be implemented. The meteorological factors such as wind speed and direction had already been taken into account in the assessment. It should be noted that the directions of winds in the area were predominantly blowing off shore;

- (f) the carcinogenic risk arising from the contaminants was assessed by the estimated incremental lifetime cancer risk, which was measured by the increase in the number of cancer cases per million population that was attributable to the identified contaminants. The calculation of incremental lifetime cancer risk for the contaminants was based on the change to the ambient air concentrations due to the decontamination works. According to the United States' standard, the total incremental lifetime cancer risk of one in a million was considered negligible. The total incremental lifetime cancer risk associated with the current decontamination works was only about three in ten million which was much lower than the abovesaid risk value. With the display of an extract of Table 3.16 of the EIA report on the visualiser, the summary of incremental lifetime cancer risk estimation associated with the proposed decontamination works was explained;

- (g) the potential environmental impacts of the decontamination works would be controlled through suitable environmental mitigation measures. There would be control on the excavation area to about 10% of the whole area at any one time to minimize dust generation and release of contaminants during excavation. Additional measures including control of surface run-off, installation of movable barriers and temporary canopies at excavation areas and stockpiling areas respectively to shield dust and noise and mitigate visual impact. Monitoring of air quality would be carried out regularly. A works liaison group would be set up with the local representatives to discuss the related environmental issues and further improvement of the mitigation measures, if necessary, to strengthen community liaison;
- (h) the EIA reports and site investigation indicated that the underground soil of the CSTG site was contaminated with heavy metals and hydrocarbons which exceeded the relevant standards. The depth of the contaminants within the whole site was up to 9m to 12m, decontamination works were thus required at the site irrespective of whether it was proposed for residential use or open space development. To eliminate the health risks and to prepare the area for future development for better land utilization, it would be more appropriate to carry out the decontamination works to cover the whole site including the CSTG site in one-go; and
- (i) decontamination works were required prior to any development at the site including for open space development. CSTG would need to be closed when the decontamination works commenced. The construction works of the proposed waterfront promenade would commence only after the completion of decontamination works.

38. In response, Dr Charlton Cheung, Dr Chiu Siu Wai, and Mr Mok Kun Ki made the following main points:

- (a) the current EIA was based mainly on the data from the 1999 land contamination assessment with only a few additional boreholes newly taken. As regards the sampling method, random sampling was the most acceptable and scientific approach. However, the Government had taken samples just as a matter of convenience and the site investigation was carried out 19 years ago. The findings were not reliable and there was no strong justification to support the proposed decontamination works at the CSTG site. Government officials had admitted previously that as the site was generally under a stable condition, decontamination works was not necessary if the open space use remained unchanged. They were surprised to hear that decontamination works would be required. CSTG should have closed long ago if the contamination was so serious;
- (b) the ex-Kennedy Town incinerator and abattoir sites were used as works area for the construction of the MTR West Island Line after the demolition works. The CSTG site was subsequently developed into a temporary park and had been a very popular local open space located conveniently in the midst of residential developments;
- (c) the contamination assessment model was for 'short-term' projects and not appropriate for decontamination works lasting for seven years. The technique and modeling on impact assessment regarding decontamination had already been updated. A new comprehensive EIA should be conducted;
- (d) phytoremediation required a longer time for effective decontamination, it usually took more than 5 years for a completed process. The CSTG site was used as a park with a large green coverage for about 19 years which was long enough to complete the phytoremediation process. The Government should conduct new site investigation at the CSTG site to verify the situation of contamination;

- (e) they had no information on the length and depth of the existing tree roots at CSTG. Based on the previous experience in tree study, it was anticipated that the longest roots might be up to 15m as most of the trees in the CSTG site had crowns of 20-25m. The i-Tree programme itself was not a method for decontamination, but users could use the tree management function to help assess tree and environmental quality for more effective decision-making on decontamination; and

- (f) the effectiveness of controlling surface run-off and covering up the excavation areas was doubtful as they could be covered only after the excavation works and there were uncontrollable natural incidence such as typhoons. Small scale excavation was also not supported as that would lengthen the works period. The shorter the works period and the smaller the total decontamination works area involved, the lesser adverse impact would be expected. Biopiling involving excavation was not the best method of decontamination, there were other new techniques which did not require excavation. Cement solidification would be sufficient and practical for promenade use.

Open Space

39. The Vice-chairman asked whether it was feasible for early development of the promenade or temporary conversion of other “Open Space” (“O”) sites in the neighbourhood for passive open space use, such as the Shing Sai Road “O” site and the existing Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground, before the opening of the proposed promenade. The Government might consider the proposal of using part of the Public Cargo Working Area adjoining the Shing Sai Road “O” site to form a larger open space. Further extension of the open space development by converting or widening of the New Praya Kennedy Town to connect the proposed promenade to form a continuous open space might also be considered.

40. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the Shing Sai Road “O” site could not be released for open space development for the time being. It was currently occupied by an existing bus terminus which could only be released for open space use until it was relocated to a

new public transport terminus (PPT) at the “R(A)6” site (Amendment Item C2) in order to maintain the existing level of bus services. Further expansion of the open space along the New Praya Kennedy Town would be difficult due to space limitation and the possible need for reclamation. Regarding the Kennedy Town Temporary Recreation Ground, it was the only recreation ground providing sports facilities in the neighbourhood and needed to be retained. He further said that as the design of the proposed waterfront park had not yet been finalised, the concerned departments would consult the District Council and Task Force on Harbourfront Developments on Hong Kong Island of the Harbourfront Commission in due course.

Traffic Aspect

41. The Vice-chairman said that Mr Paul Zimmerman, a representative of the Representers and Commenters, had proposed extension of tram services from Cadogan Street to Sai Ning Street. He asked whether it was a feasible solution to improve the traffic condition in the area, in particular if the existing tram terminus could be relocated to the proposed PTT at the “R(A)6” site. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the Traffic Review had proposed a new access road to connect Victoria Road and Cadogan Street in order to address the capacity problem at the junction of Belcher’s Street and Cadogan Street. The proposed PTT at the “R(A)6” site was to accommodate the two existing bus termini at Victoria Road and Shing Sai Road, and there would not be enough space to incorporate an additional tram terminus. Mr Gordon W.Y. Yip, E/C&W3, said that as the proposed alignment of tram route extension to Sai Ning Street would occupy part of the existing roads, it would adversely affect the traffic flow on the concerned roads and its feasibility remained uncertain.

Air Ventilation

42. In response to a Member’s question on the concern on air ventilation from the proposed development at the CSTG site, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that a building gap of 15m wide had already been recommended to increase the permeability for wind movement. Dr Charlton Cheung said that the AVA EE was based on a previous scheme, the reduced BHR for part of the site had not been taken into account.

Public Cargo Working Area

43. In response to a Member's question on the impact of the proposed developments on the Public Cargo Working Area (PCWA) and concern of the industry, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said that the Marine Department had reviewed the use of the Western District PCWA and had already released three berths for other uses. The released berths were returned to the Government in August 2016. The Development Bureau was consulting the C&WDC and actively pursuing the use of the released area as temporary open space.

44. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure on the day was completed. He thanked the government's representatives and consultants as well as representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would continue the hearing session on 16.2.2017, 21.2.2017 and 1.3.2017. The Board would deliberate the representations and comments 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 and consultants as well as representers, commenters and their representatives left this session of the meeting at this point.

45. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m.