

**Minutes of 1141st Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 19.5.2017**

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

Professor K.C. Chau

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport) 3
Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr Andy S.H. Lam

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

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

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms Sally S.Y. Fong

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (a.m.)

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

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (a.m.)

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

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1140th Meeting held on 5.5.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1140th meeting held on 5.5.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 1A

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1134th Meeting held on 11.5.2017

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

2. The minutes of the 1134th meeting held on 11.5.2017 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

[Open Meeting]

Matters Arising

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Request for deferral of consideration of Outline Zoning Plans

3. The Secretary reported that a letter dated 20.4.2017 from the Chairman of Environment, Housing and Works Committee (EHWC) of Tai Po District Council (TPDC) was received. EHWC opposed to the draft Tai Po Kau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/NE-TPK/1 and the draft Cheung Sheung OZP No. S/NE-CS/1 and requested the Board to defer consideration of representations and comments in respect of the draft OZPs.

4. The Secretary said that as consideration of the draft OZPs was subject to a statutory time limit under the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), the request of EHWC of TPDC for deferral could not be acceded to. The meeting noted the request of

EHWC and agreed that the Secretariat would reply to them accordingly.

(ii) Abandonment of Town Planning Appeal

Town Planning Appeal No. 6 of 2016 (6/16)

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lots 1257 RP and 1258 in D.D. 19, Lam Tsuen San Tsuen, Tai Po, New Territories

(Application No. A/NE-LT/552)

5. The Secretary reported that an appeal had been abandoned by the Appellant on his own accord. Town Planning Appeal No. 6 of 2016 was received by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (TPAB) on 29.6.2016 against the decision of the Town Planning Board on 15.4.2016 to reject on review an application (No. A/NE-LT/552) for Small House development at the application site falling within an area zoned “Agriculture” on the approved Lam Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/NE-LT/11.

6. The appeal was abandoned by the Appellant on 5.5.2017. On 8.5.2017, the TPAB formally confirmed that the appeal was abandoned in accordance with Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations of the Town Planning Ordinance.

(iii) Appeal Statistics

7. The Secretary reported that as at 15.5.2017, a total of 12 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) and the decision of a case was still outstanding. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------------------|---|-------|
| Allowed | : | 35 |
| Dismissed | : | 148 |
| Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid | : | 198 |
| Yet to be Heard | : | 12 |
| Decision Outstanding | : | 1 |
| | | <hr/> |
| | : | 394 |

(iv) [Confidential item] [Closed Meeting]

8. The item was recorded under confidential cover.

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations in respect of Draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H20/22

(TPB Paper No. 10278)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

9. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A to the draft Chai Wan Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H20/22 was related to a proposed public housing development to be undertaken by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliations/business dealings with HKHA/HD or a representer (Ms Mary Mulvihill) (R4):

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee
(*as Director of Planning*) (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA, and co-owning a flat with spouse and spouse owning a property in Chai Wan area

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

Mr H.F. Leung - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Dr C.H. Hau |] | |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau |] | having current business dealings with HKHA |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai |] | |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho |] | |
| | | |
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firm having current business dealings with HKHA, |
| Mr Alex T.H Lai |] | and hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from |
| |] | time to time |
| | | |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu |] | |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu |] | having past business dealings with HKHA |
| Mr Franklin Yu |] | |
| | | |
| Mr Dominic K.K. Lam | - | being a Director of a company owning a property in Chai Wan area, and having past business dealings with HKHA |
| | | |
| Mr Sunny L.K. Ho | - | owning a flat and a car parking space and co-owning another flat with spouse in Chai Wan area |
| | | |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work |

10. Members noted that Messr Dominic K.K. Lam and K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since the interest of Messr Raymond K.W. Lee, Martin W.C. Kwan and Dr C.H. Hau were direct, they were invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item. Members agreed that Messr Ivan C.S. Fu, Stephen L.H. Liu, Alex T.H. Lai and Sunny L.K. Ho could stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project or their properties did not have a direct view of the representation site. Members also noted that Messr H.F. Leung, Patrick H.T. Lau, Thomas O.S. Ho, Franklin Yu, Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon had not yet arrived to join the meeting and the interest of Dr Poon and Mr Yu were indirect.

[Messr Raymond K.W. Lee and Martin W.C. Kwan and Dr C.H. Hau left the meeting

temporarily at this point.]

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

12. The following representatives of Planning Department (PlanD) and representer were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government's Representatives

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

Mr Jerry Austin - Senior Town Planner/HK(4) (STP/HK4), PlanD

Representer

R4 - Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

13. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representatives would be invited to brief Members on the representations. The representer would then be invited to make oral submission. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, the representer should be allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representer 2 minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after the representer had completed the oral submission. Members could direct their questions to the government representatives or representer. After the Q&A session, the representer and government representatives would

be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and inform the representers of the Board's decision in due course.

14. The Chairman then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations.

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Jerry Austin, STP/HK4, briefed Members on the representations, including the background of the proposed amendments, the grounds of the supportive and adverse representations, proposals of the representers, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations, as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10278 (the Paper).

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang and Miss Winnie W.M. Ng arrived to join the meeting during the presentation of STP/HK4.]

16. The Chairman then invited Ms Mary Mulvihill (R4) to elaborate on her representation.

17. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the plot ratio (PR) of 10 for the proposed public housing development was exceptionally high considering the site was adjacent to existing schools and the residential developments in the surrounding were about PR of 7 to 9. The proposed high-rise, high density development would likely have significant adverse visual and air ventilation impacts to the surrounding area. Besides, it was doubtful whether the proposed comprehensive residential development at the ex-bus depot of China Motor Bus Company Limited (the ex-CMB depot) across the road had been taken into account in respect of such technical aspects as air ventilation and open space requirement when assessing the impacts of the proposed public housing development;
- (b) it was not agreed that Hong Kong Island had a genuine need for public housing. The problem of sub-divided flats was mainly concentrated in Kowloon and further north. According to the 2016 By-census, the

population in Hong Kong had decreased in recent years. Whether it would still be necessary to increase the housing land supply was questionable;

- (c) the site was currently a planned local open space with good accessibility. Although HD had indicated that public open space with a children's playground would be provided at the proposed development, it would be accommodated on podium level and thus not easily accessible by the public, in particular the elderly. Besides, the future residents might oppose opening up the facilities to outsiders;
- (d) local open space was an essential facility particularly when the population was growing with the elderly population increasing at the same time. Provision of open space was not only about quantity, quality including convenience, accessibility and type of facilities to be provided, especially for elderly and children, was also important. Open space on podium was often not popular due to inaccessibility;
- (e) adequate open space and "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") sites should be provided as they served as breathing space in the congested urban area for a better living environment. Once an open space was developed for other use, it could not be reverted back. The open space provision in the district was inadequate to meet the standard of 2.5m² per person as advocated in the Hong Kong 2030+ Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030 (Hong Kong 2030+). Besides, the open space demand arising from the additional population due to the proposed housing development at the site and other new developments might be underestimated as domestic helpers of the residents were probably not included in the planned population;

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok and Mr Andy S.H. Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) the trees at the site and adjoining the site would be felled while the proposed compensatory planting would be on podium level instead of at-grade and would only be potted plants due to limitation of soil depth;

- (g) the air ventilation assessment had concluded that the proposed development would induce some localised impact. The wind flow to the surrounding low-rise school buildings would inevitably be blocked by such high-rise housing development, thus causing adverse air ventilation impact. Though the existing schools nearby might not be Band 1 schools, the students warranted a good learning environment; and
- (h) in view of the potential adverse impacts and reduction of public open space, the proposed public housing development would reduce the quality of life in the area.

18. As the presentation from government's representatives and the representer had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairman explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representer 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 then invited questions from Members.

Amendment Item A

Open Space and Greening Provision

19. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions/views regarding open space and greening provision:
- (a) noting the existing open space provision of about 2.23m² per person for the district and the standard of 2.5m² per person as advocated under Hong Kong 2030+, the standard currently adopted by the Government in planning for open space and how the target of HK2030+ could be achieved in existing urban area;
 - (b) the distribution and location of the existing open space in the area, in particular, those in the vicinity of the proposed development, and whether they were at grade or on podium level;

- (c) whether there was any recreational facilities including clubhouse and open space within the proposed residential development at the adjacent CMB depot site;

[Mr Franklin Yu and Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (d) the provision of greening within the site and soil depth of planter, noting that successful tree planting at podium level was rare due to insufficient soil depth of planters;
- (e) whether HD would consider moving the ground floor facilities underground and release space on the ground floor for at-grade open space and whether the podium open space would be easily accessible;
- (f) whether compensatory tree planting at a 1:1 ratio referred to the number of trees or trees with the same diameter at breast height (DBH); and
- (g) whether the banding of schools in the surrounding was a planning consideration.

20. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), the standard for open space provision was a minimum of 2m² per person, comprising District Open Space (DO) and Local Open Space (LO);
- (b) referring to Plan H-1 of the Paper, the nearest DO in the area was the Chai Wan Park and there were a number of LO in the vicinity of the site. Besides, there were LO within the existing public housing estates which were open to the public. The overall provision of open space in the Eastern District was 2.23m² per person. The public open space provision target of 2.5m² per person advocated in the Hong Kong 2030+ was still under consultation and, if endorsed, might not be achievable immediately. Such open space provision target would be adopted for the new development areas while

opportunities would also be seized as far as practicable to provide more open space upon redevelopment in the existing built-up area;

- (c) the existing and planned provision of public open space for both Eastern District as a whole and the planning scheme area of Chai Wan were more than adequate to meet the requirements under the HKPSG for the planned population in the area. For the Eastern District, though there was a deficit of 0.52 hectare (ha) of LO, there was a surplus provision of 13.15 ha of DO. As for the area within the Chai Wan OZP boundary, while there was a deficit of 1.56 ha of LO, there was a surplus provision of 8.23 ha of DO. There would also be 4,000m² public open space in the adjacent ex-CMB depot under the approved Master Layout Plan of the proposed comprehensive residential development;
- (d) there were both at-grade and podium open space in the Chai Wan area. The nearby Wan Tsui Estate was an example where the public open space was at podium level. It was well-served with elevated walkways and easily accessible by nearby residents. According to HD, escalators would be provided in the proposed public housing development connecting the ground floor to the podium level (as indicated on Plans H-9 and H-10 of the Paper) to improve accessibility of the open space and children's play area; and
- (e) compensatory tree planting at a 1:1 ratio in terms of quantity would be adopted as far as practicable in accordance with Development Bureau Technical Circular (TC) (Works) No. 7/2015. There was however no detailed design available for the landscape and greenery at this stage. Referring to the indicative podium floor layout plan provided by HD at Plan H-10 of the Paper, a minimum of 20% green coverage would be provided which included the landscape area at podium level; and
- (f) school banding was not a consideration in the land use planning of an area.

Development Intensity

21. Some Members raised the following questions regarding development intensity of

the proposed public housing development:

- (a) whether the proposed development at the adjacent ex-CMB depot site was included in the technical assessments of the proposed public housing;
- (b) noting that a PR of 10 for the site and the large footprint of the tower block as shown on Plan H-10 of the Paper, whether the site coverage (SC) of the proposed public housing development would exceed that permissible under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R), and whether the submitted scheme could be improved at a later stage if the zoning of the site was agreed by the Board; and
- (c) information on flat mix and the number of units designated for the elderly.

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

- (a) the proposed comprehensive residential development at the adjacent ex-CMB depot site was approved by the Board on 23.8.2013 and the development had already been taken into account in the technical assessments of the proposed public housing development;
- (b) there was no information on the SC of the proposed public housing development, but it would comply with the permissible SC stipulated under B(P)R;
- (c) according to HD's proposal, about 800 flats would be provided in the proposed public housing development but the flat mix had not yet been finalised. There was also no information on the number of units to be designated for the elderly at this stage; and
- (d) if the "Residential (Group A)" ("R(A)") zoning was agreed by the Board, the site could be developed for residential use with a maximum BH of 120mPD while the maximum PR and SC would be governed by the B(P)R. The current scheme was only an indicative design submitted by HD, it would be

refined/enhanced at the detailed design stage.

Other Aspect

23. A Member asked whether the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) conducted had covered the air ventilation impact on the surrounding schools. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau said the AVA undertaken by HD had concluded that the proposed public housing development would not significantly affect the ventilation performance of the major breezeway of Chai Wan Road under the annual wind condition. Although some localized ventilation impact would be induced at the school sites under annual condition and at Chai Wan Road and the planned comprehensive residential development at the ex-CMB depot site under summer condition, the wind environment was expected to be alleviated with the provision of a 7m tower setback from Chai Wan Road, a 18m tower setback from the adjacent school and a 10m wide empty bay at the podium level.

24. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Louis K.H. Kau confirmed that universal design and barrier free access would be adopted for the proposed public housing development.

Amendment Item B

25. A Member raised the following questions regarding the proposed columbarium development:

- (a) whether there was any car parking space provided in the proposed columbarium development, and whether there was any passenger drop-off area on the ground floor; and
- (b) the planned use at the basement and ground levels, and whether it was possible to adjust the layout and enlarge the site area so that more space could be provided at the ground level for visitors.

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

- (a) as the site was not far away from Mass Transit Railway Chai Wan Station, it was expected that most visitors would use public transport and no visitor car park would be provided within the site. To improve pedestrian connectivity, construction of escalators from San Ha Street to the site was under planning by concerned government department; and
- (b) referring to the floor plans of the indicative scheme of the proposed columbarium development, the uses on the lower ground level were for supporting facilities and electrical/mechanical uses whereas landscape areas and some ancillary car parking spaces were provided on the ground level. There was adequate open area provided on ground level for gathering and circulation.

27. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations in the absence of the representers and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representer and the government's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

Amendment Item A

28. Members had the following major views:

- (a) the building bulk of the proposed public housing development at a PR of 10 appeared massive and it was doubtful if HD would have to be bounded by the SC limit under the B(P)R. While the need to increase housing land supply was acknowledged, the need to address such issues as overall urban design, visual and landscape impacts was equally important;
- (b) at-grade open space was preferable to podium open space in terms of accessibility, usage and tree planting. HD should consider providing at-grade open space for the subject public housing development;

- (c) while the “R(A)” zoning of the site was considered appropriate, HD should review the building layout with a view to reducing the building/podium footprint and improving the overall design; and
- (d) it was agreed that school banding was not a consideration in land use planning.

29. The Chairman and a Member noted that although HD was not required to submit building plans for its public housing developments to the Buildings Department (BD) for approval, HD would in practice usually follow the requirements under the B(P)R / Buildings Ordinance (BO) and provide open space/greenery as per, if not more than, the requirements under the HKPSG or relevant TC. A team of professional building surveyors of the BD had also been seconded to HD to give professional advice relating to the BO.

30. The Chairman continued to say that promoting good urban design was one of the major objectives of the Government in land use planning, particularly in areas warranted special attention. For example, urban design was given high priority in the planning of Site 3 in the Central harbourfront as well as in the New Development Areas. A Member remarked that the adoption of good urban design, particularly in the older urban district, could help achieve sustainable development and enhance the living environment.

31. After further discussion, Members in general considered the “R(A)” zoning appropriate for the site and HD should be advised to improve the design of the proposed housing development with a view to reducing the building bulk and enhancing greening and provision of open space at ground level at the detailed design stage.

Amendment Item B

32. A Member supported the construction of escalators facilitating grave sweepers to the planned columbarium development and considered the site under Amendment Item B suitable for columbarium development and that future expansion in that locality could be considered.

33. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of

Representations No. R1, R2 and R3 (part). The Board also decided not to uphold Representation No. R4 and the remaining part of R3 and considered that the draft Chai Wan OZP No. S/H20/22 should not be amended to meet the representations. The reasons were:

- “(a) the rezoning of the site for public housing development to meet the pressing demand for housing is considered appropriate as the site is suitable for residential development;
- (b) the proposed residential development at the representation site would not generate insurmountable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas from the visual, traffic, air ventilation, landscape and infrastructural aspects; and
- (c) there is no shortfall of open space provision in the area as per the requirement under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines.”

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

[Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Messr H.F. Leung, Patrick H.T. Lau and Thomas O.S. Ho arrived and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan and Dr C.H. Hau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Hung Hom Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K9/25
(TPB Paper No. 10279)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

34. The Secretary reported that Amendment Item A was related to the rezoning of a site for a Senior Citizen Residences Scheme (SEN) by the Hong Kong Housing Society (HKHS) in Hung Hom. The following Members had declared interests on the item for having affiliation/business dealings with HKHS or its representative, Urbis Limited (Urbis)

and its consultant, CYS Associate (HK) Limited (CYS) or owning properties in Hung Hom:

- | | | |
|--|-----|--|
| Mr Raymond K.W. Lee (as Director of Planning) |]] | being ex-officio member of the Supervisory Board of HKHS |
| Ms Janice W.M. Lai | - | having current business dealings with HKHS and Urbis |
| Mr K.K. Cheung Mr Alex T.H. Lai |]] | their company having current business dealings with HKHS |
| Mr Stephen L.H. Liu | - | having past business dealings with HKHS and CYS |
| Mr Thomas O.S. Ho | - | having current business dealings with Urbis and past business dealings with HKHS |
| Mr Ivan C.S. Fu | - | having current business dealings with Urbis |
| Mr Franklin Yu | - | having past business dealings with Urbis |
| Mr Patrick H.T. Lau | - | having past business dealings with CYS |
| Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon | - | being an ex-employee of HKHS |
| Ms Christina M Lee | - | co-owning a flat with spouse in Hung Hom |
| Dr F.C. Chan | - | owning a flat in Hung Hom |

35. Members noted that Ms Christina M Lee and Mr. K. K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee had left the meeting temporarily and Ms Janice W.M. Lai had not yet arrived. Members agreed that Messr Alex T.H. Lai, Stephen L.H. Liu, Thomas O.S. Ho, Ivan C.S. Fu, Patrick H.T. Lau, Franklin Yu and Dr F.C. Chan could stay in the meeting as they had no direct involvement in the project or his property did not have a direct view of the representation site. Members

also agreed that the interest of Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon was indirect and he could stay at the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

37. The following representative of Planning Department (PlanD), representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government's Representative

Mr Tom C.K. Yip - District Planning Officer/Kowloon (DPO/K),
Planning Department (PlanD)

Representers, Commenters and their Representatives

R1 - Hong Kong Housing Society

Hong Kong Housing Society - Representer

(represented by

Mr Tsang Tak Ming Patrick

Mr Yeung Ka Hong

Mr Li Chi Cheong Markus

Mr Liu Chun Kit

Mr Alan MacDonald (Urbis)

Ms Winona Ip (Urbis)

R16 - Lui Tin Pak

Mr Lui Tin Pak - Representer

R32- Wong Pak Yin Candy

Ms Wong Pak Yin Candy - Representer

R44 / C9 - Lui Yik Fu

Mr Lui Yik Fu - Representer/commenter (attending only)

C16 – Ng Kwan Lung

Mr Ng Kwan Lung - Commenter (attending only)

C17 - Wan Yuen Tung

Ms Wan Yuen Tung - Commenter

C34 - Li Siu Ming Ian

Mr Li Siu Ming Ian - Commenter

38. The Chairman extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. He said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer, commenter or his representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government's representative, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in the absence of the representers, commenters, their representatives and the government's representatives, and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

39. The Chairman then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

40. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the proposed amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10279 (the Paper).

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

R16 - Lui Tin Pak

42. With the aid of the visualiser and a model of the area, Mr Lui Tin Pak made the following main points:

- (a) the proposed rezoning to residential use with increase in plot ratio (PR) and relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 11-storey to 110 metres above principle datum (mPD) were objected to. The site should be retained for "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") use to cater for future needs;
- (b) the conclusion of the technical assessments that the proposed development would not cause significant impact to the local areas was questionable. The proposed development were surrounded by high-rise developments including the Hung Hom Fire Station, Tsing Chau Street Customs Staff Quarters, La Lumiere, Ka Wai Chuen and a proposed residential development of 100mPD. Those surrounding developments should be taken into account in the technical assessments. The representers were not provided with the technical reports and some local impacts could not be quantified;
- (c) the purpose of the proposed high-rise residential development was only to meet the Government's housing target. It would detrimentally affect the surrounding environment and the living quality of the existing residents. The relaxation of BH restriction from 11 storeys to 110mPD would block the views of adjoining residential buildings. As reflected in the photomontages in Drawings 13 to 15 at Annex XI of the Paper, the proposed development

would cause adverse visual impact to the area and the building would block air ventilation and reduce sunlight penetration to the nearby residential developments. The vantage points adopted for producing the photomontages were also not appropriate and the visual impact was understated;

- (d) the surrounding roads including Lee Kung Street and Tsing Chau Street were very narrow with lots of roadside parking. Emergency vehicles serving the site might encounter difficulties in entering these streets. The seven parking spaces proposed for the development would be inadequate to serve the 300 units of elderly flats which would probably attract a large number of family visitors. Visitors parking outside the site would aggravate the traffic condition along the narrow streets;
- (e) referring to the model of the area, the proposed development was only about 12m to 15m away from the adjacent Tsing Chau Street Customs Staff Quarters and adverse impact on sunlight penetration was anticipated. While not opposing elderly housing, the site was not suitable for high density development and the proposed BH of 110mPD was not acceptable;
- (f) the latest HKSH's elderly residence project, namely, the Tanner Hill, in North Point was not well-received and many Long Lease flats had been changed to Short Lease units for generating revenue. That reflected the low demand for SEN residence. It was also questionable whether the proposed location was suitable for subsidised elderly housing; and
- (g) the Board was requested to reconsider the proposed infill development for SEN and a decision should be made by balancing the need for development and adverse impacts on the local residents.

R1 - Hong Kong Housing Society

43. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Alan MacDonald, Urbis, made the following main points:

- (a) ageing population had become a pressing social issue in Hong Kong. The demand for elderly housing was high as there would be more than 30% of the population within the elderly cohort, i.e. over the age of 65, in the coming decades;
- (b) the representation site was in a residential neighbourhood with Government, institution and community (GIC) and open space uses in the vicinity. It was served by well-connected road network and public transport. The Mass Transit Railway (MTR) Ho Man Tin Station of the Kwun Tong East Line was within walking distance from the site. There were a number of bus/mini-bus routes operating along Fat Kwong Street providing services to various railway stations. According to the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted, the traffic generation/attraction of the proposed development was insignificant and would not have adverse traffic impact on the nearby road network;
- (c) the proposed BH of 110mPD was compatible with the existing/planned residential developments in the vicinity which were subject to similar BH restrictions of 100mPD to 120mPD;
- (d) the proposed SEN development, with an area of approximately 1,680m², a proposed PR of 8.49 (7.44 for domestic and 1.05 for non-domestic) and a BH of 110mPD, would comprise a 34-storey building providing 305 SEN units and a residential care home for the elderly (RCHE) of 58 bed spaces with supporting facilities;
- (e) the objective of the SEN development was not only to provide housing support, it also provided social care and health care support for elderly in order to allow 'Ageing in Place'. To achieve the objective, in addition to providing a home for the elderly, ancillary facilities including rehabilitation centre and polyclinics were also provided within the SEN development;
- (f) to alleviate the visual impact, HKHS would incorporate design mitigation measures and provide a landscaped area/planting in the southern portion of the podium as shown on the proposed Landscape Master Plan;

- (g) according to the Hong Kong Population Projections from 2015 to 2064 published by the Census and Statistics Department, the population in the age of 60 or above would increase from 21% in 2014 to about 38% in 2064. Hong Kong would urgently need a planning and housing policy to cope with the ageing population. Currently, there were more than 720 applicants on the waiting list for the two existing SEN projects and the waiting time was more than 5 years on average. The proposed SEN development in Hung Hom would release public housing resources and promote public housing mobility as it would encourage elderly tenants in public rental housing (PRH) with improved economic ability to release their PRH units;
- (h) the proposed medical, health care and residential facilities were not just for SEN's residents, they also served the local community in order to provide elderly care and medical support resources to the public;
- (i) the proposed SEN development was supported by various technical assessments on visual, landscape, air ventilation, traffic, environment, sewerage and water supply aspects. With the proposed mitigation measures, the proposed SEN development would not cause significant impact to the local areas. Instead, the proposed project would add variety to the subsidized housing supply, catering for the needs of different age cohort and income segment in the community; and
- (j) the OZP amendment to facilitate the SEN development was supported as it demonstrated how planning could help population ageing in community and how the built environment could give support to the elderly.

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

R32- Wong Pak Yin Candy

44. Ms Wong Pak Yin Candy made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of La Lumiere located near the proposed SEN

development. The site was considered not suitable for high-rise high density development as Lee Kung Street was very narrow and could not cope with the increased traffic brought about by the additional population. The proposed development would also block the open views of her flat. The wall effect of the development would adversely affect air ventilation, sunlight penetration and aggravate air quality in the area; and

- (b) the Government was urged to strike a balance between meeting the housing target and providing good quality living environment for the local residents, in reviewing the proposed SEN development at the site.

C17 - Wan Yuen Tung

45. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wan Yuen Tung made the following main points:

- (a) according to the 2011 Census, the total population of Kowloon City exceeded 370,000. While the proportion of population age 45 to 64 was about 30%, the population age 65 and above was only about 16%, and the number of children (i.e. age between 0 to 14) ranked the third highest in the district. With reference to economic characteristics, more than 180,000 people were non-working population and would thus often use the recreational facilities in the area;
- (b) taking the demographic characteristics of Ka Wai Chuen as an example, the population of 45 and over was about 59% and those 65 and over was about 25%, and the need for elderly recreational facilities was great. The large number of children also had a great demand for children's play facilities. There were many new and planned residential sites in the area, including the redevelopment projects of the Urban Renewal Authority, the provision of GIC facilities would be insufficient to cope with the increasing population;
- (c) according to the 2011 Population Census, only about 12.7% of elderly population lived alone and the statistics showed that the elderly in Hong

Kong tended to live with families (53%). Such household characteristic was more obvious in Kowloon City, thus the demand for SEN in the area would not be significant. As there were about 43% of the elderly population living in the New Territories, it would be more appropriate to develop SEN in the New Territories with better air quality and living environment;

- (d) as regards the provision of recreational facilities, there were currently five sports centres in Kowloon City, namely, Hung Hom Municipal Services Building Sports Centre, Fat Kwong Street Sports Centre, Ho Man Tin Sports Centre, Kowloon City Sports Centre and To Kwa Wan Sports Centre. However, only two of them had children's play facilities and none provided civic and recreational facilities for the elderly. As the nearest Sports Centre was in the Hung Hom Municipal Services Building, an additional sports centre in the area was required;
- (e) local open space in the vicinity included a garden, playground and sitting out area at Fat Kwong Street, Tsing Chau Street Playground and Station Lane Sitting Out Area. Only three of them provided with children play/elderly fitness facilities but their size were very small and the facilities were inadequate. There was no large-scale park and outdoor recreational facilities in the area. The nearest district open space was the Hutchison Park where only a few elderly fitness areas were included and the park was barely within walking distance; and
- (f) the increasing new development/redevelopment in the area would increase the age cohort of children which would further aggravate the demand for GIC facilities. The site should thus be retained for GIC or open space uses to provide sports, culture and recreational facilities and the BH restriction of 11 storeys should be maintained.

C34 - Li Siu Ming Ian

46. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Li Siu Ming Ian made the following main points:

- (a) Lee Kung Street was a very narrow street with busy traffic flow and serious illegal roadside parking problem. With reference to a number of photographs taken at different time during the week, illegal parking was observed both day and night and the vehicular entrance of La Lumiere was sometimes blocked. The traffic condition of the area would likely deteriorate with the proposed development in place. It was doubtful whether the La Lumiere development which was newly occupied and other new/planned developments in the area had been taken into account in the TIA for the proposed SEN development;
- (b) traffic generation from the high-rise, high-density SEN development would affect the fire engines and other emergency vehicles going in/out Hung Hom Fire Station and Lee Kung Street. That would affect the safety of both local residents in the area and the future residents of the SEN development; and
- (c) HKHS should carry out technical assessments to support the proposed development and revised the scheme to avoid the potential adverse impacts. In particular, the traffic condition at Lee Kung Street should be assessed since supporting facilities would be required to cope with the increased population in the SEN development with 300 additional flats. A development with the previous 11-storey BH restriction would be more appropriate for the site as it would cause less impact.

47. As the presentation from government's representative, the representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the 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'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 then invited questions from Members.

Elderly Housing Development

48. The Vice-Chairman and some Members raised the following questions on the

proposed SEN and elderly housing development:

- (a) the difference between the Tanner Hill and the SEN projects, and the current occupation rate of the projects;
- (b) the basis of the means test, whether the asset limit for SEN applicants would include the asset of their family members, and whether there were measures to avoid abuse of the scheme;
- (c) the target applicants of the SEN development, and whether the applicants were limited to Kowloon City; and
- (d) the most efficient scale for SEN development, and whether it would be feasible to attain a reasonable scale of development with the previous BH restriction of 11-storey for the SEN development.

49. In response, Mr Li Chi Cheong Markus and Mr Yeung Ka Hong, HKHS, made the following points:

- (a) the Tanner Hill project was developed under HKHS's self-financed 'Joyous Living Scheme' which targeted at higher income elderly with no asset limit. The SEN projects were subsidized housing and different from the Tanner Hill project in that they were to serve elderly of middle income group who would be subject to means test. The total asset limit included only the applicant(s)' income and assets;
- (b) the occupancy rate of the two existing SEN developments were 100% and the Tanner Hill project was currently at about 76%. The Tanner Hill project provided two different types of tenure, i.e. the Long and Short Lease, which respectively took up about 50% of the development in terms of the domestic gross floor area (GFA) allocation. At present, all the units under the Short Lease were fully occupied and there was a waiting list. For units under Long Lease, there were still some vacancies, mainly on the larger size units;
- (c) SEN was a type of subsidized housing scheme providing alternative housing

option to elderly throughout the territory and would not be limited to existing residents in the area. The two primary eligibility criteria for the SEN units were that the applicant(s) had to be aged 60 or above and within the asset limit. Tenants of PRH would need to remove their names from the registered occupier list or surrender their public rental units to the Hong Kong Housing Authority, where appropriate, upon moving into the SEN units. There were rules governing other occupiers as caregiver to prevent abuse of the scheme;

- (d) according to HKHS's experience, a development with about 200 to 300 flats was the most efficient taking into account the need to provide supporting facilities and 24-hour health care services; and
- (e) due to noise and air impacts from the adjacent Fat Kwong Street Flyover, the first residential floors of the development had to be raised to 31.4mPD. As such, if the proposed SEN development was subject to a BH restriction of 11-storey, only one residential floor could be provided and the development scheme would not be viable.

Technical Aspects

50. The Chairman and some Members raised the following questions relating to the technical assessments of the proposed development:

- (a) Lee Kung Street appeared to be very narrow with busy traffic, whether the proposed development would cause any adverse traffic impact to the area;
- (b) whether the technical assessments conducted had taken into account the concerns raised by the representers/commenters, and whether the reports of technical assessments were available for public inspection;
- (c) whether the pick up/drop off by emergency vehicles along Fat Kwong Street for access to the site was possible;
- (d) the location of the Homantin Station of the MTR Shatin to Central Link (SCL)

in relation to the proposed development; and

- (e) whether the proposed development would affect natural light penetration to the surrounding residential developments and whether the concerns on air and noise impacts on the proposed RCHE within the development below the level of the adjacent flyover could be addressed.

51. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) HKHS had conducted technical assessments on various aspects including visual, landscape, air ventilation, traffic, environment, sewerage and water supply for the subject SEN project. The OZP amendment was agreed by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Board on 14.9.2016 and a full set of the technical assessments were attached to the relevant MPC Paper, which was available for public inspection at the Planning Enquiry Counters of PlanD and the Board's website;
- (b) the TIA conducted by HKHS was completed in September 2016 and it had already taken into account all the new/planned developments in the surrounding area. The traffic generation data of the proposed development had made reference to the surveyed figures of the two existing SEN developments;
- (c) according to the TIA, the traffic generation/attraction of the development site at Lee Kung Street was insignificant and would not have adverse traffic impact on the nearby road network. Referring to paragraph 4.10.3 and Table-7 of the TIA submitted by HKHS (Attachment V of the MPC Paper No. 15/16), the proposed development would only generate a light traffic flows of 14 and 16 passenger car units (pcu) in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours respectively, and the assessment on the performance of the eight key junctions in the area had shown that all of them would operate satisfactorily at the design year;
- (d) the blockage of traffic flow at Lee Kung Street was mainly due to illegal

roadside parking and it was a matter of traffic management control. In case of emergency, Fat Kwong Street could be used to access the site;

- (e) as shown on Plan H-2a of the Paper, the MTR SCL Ho Man Tin Station was only about 300m away from the site;
- (f) to alleviate the potential visual impact, HKHS would incorporate design mitigation measures including setting back of the tower from Fat Kwong Street and Lee Kung Street and provision of landscaped area and greening. Taking into account the setback from Lee Kung Street within the site, there would be a distance of about 30m between the residential blocks of the SEN development and Government quarters development to the north. It was pointed out that the existing Hung Hom Fire Station was located to the immediate south of the residential tower of La Lumiere while the proposed development would be at least 20m away from the surrounding residential buildings; and
- (g) there were requirements under the Building (Planning) Regulations (B(P)R) to control the provision of natural lighting in habitable rooms. The proposed SEN development would have to be in compliance with B(P)R on such aspect, and would not cause adverse impact to the adjacent existing developments.

52. In response, Mr Li Chi Cheong Markus supplemented the following points:

- (a) as the site was currently used as a temporary public vehicle park, vehicles waiting for parking spaces would often result in illegal parking along Lee Kung Street;
- (b) HKHS would continue to liaise with concerned departments on the appropriate location of the vehicular access point for the proposed development; and
- (c) the provision of RCHE would require a licence from the Social Welfare Department and would be subject to requirements including natural lighting

provision. The RCHE would be provided with a central air conditioning system which could help mitigate the noise and air impacts from the adjacent Fat Kwong Street Flyover.

Provision of Ancillary Facilities

53. Some Members raised the following questions relating to provision of facilities in the proposed development:

- (a) whether recreation and fitness facilities for the elderly would be provided in the SEN development;
- (b) whether the landscaped area in the proposed development would be open to the general public, and whether connections would be provided to the surrounding public open space developments; and
- (c) whether the proposed car parking spaces were for visitors or staff use.

54. In response, Mr Tom C.K. Yip made the following points with the aid of the visualizer/some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) according to the indicative layout provided by HKHS, there would be a clubhouse and a landscaped podium garden in the development; and
- (b) at grade pedestrian connections to the surrounding open space were currently available.

55. In response, Mr Li Chi Cheong Markus and Mr Yeung Ka Hong made the following points:

- (a) while the landscaped podium area was only intended to serve the future SEN residents, the RCHE as well as the rehabilitation and medical centres would serve the general public. The two existing SEN projects and the Tanner Hill development had similar arrangement; and

- (b) the proposed car parking spaces within the SEN development would mainly be for visitors of the development. According to the traffic data collected from the two existing SEN projects, the parking demand from residents was rather low.

Other Aspects

56. In response to a Member's question on whether consideration had been given to reserve the site for other GIC uses, Mr Tom C.K. Yip said that the provision of major GIC facilities in the area was generally sufficient and concerned departments had no request to reserve the site for GIC and leisure/sports uses.

57. A Member asked whether HKHS had any plan to develop subsidized youth housing scheme and whether the site was suitable for such use. In response, Mr Yeung Ka Hong said that the Youth Hostel Scheme was a government plan supporting non-governmental organizations to use part of the GIC land granted to them for provision of youth hostels. Currently, there was no suitable land under the ownership of HKHS for such use. The subject site was considered suitable for SEN development as the location was convenient which would facilitate families to visit the elderly, while the elderly could remain in an established neighbourhood. The provision of social and health care services within the development would also enable the elderly to age in place.

58. Mr Lui Tin Pak (R16) supplemented that site suitability, road capacity and development intensity were essential planning considerations. Making reference to the model shown earlier, he said that the Board should consider amending the development parameters of the site by reducing the development density and BH.

59. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in the absence of the representers and commenters and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the government's representative for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Professor K.C. Chau and Mr Ivan C.S. Fu left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

[Mr Andy S.H. Lam left the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

60. Members in general supported the concept of “Ageing in Place” and considered that the site was suitable for elderly housing development as it was in an older urban area with sufficient open space provision nearby, in close proximity to MTR stations and well served by public transport, hence, enabling the elderly residents to maintain social and family ties. The proposed development intensity was considered not incompatible with the surrounding developments. It was considered that the concerns on BH and other technical issues raised by the representers and commenters had been addressed by the relevant assessments.

[Mr Thomas O.S. Ho left the meeting at this point.]

61. Some Members made the following suggestions :

- (a) HKHS should consider setting a priority system so that the elderly with special needs could be allocated a place first;
- (b) HKHS should consider a fine system for breaking tenancy agreement in order to prevent abuse of using subsidized housing;
- (c) the Government should consider allowing leisure farming activities in the nearby open space which could create an additional recreational opportunity for the elderly living in the area; and
- (d) HKHS should consider making available the landscaped area within the development for use by the nearby residents.

62. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of Representation No. R1 and comments/views of Representations No. R41 to R44. The Board also decided

not to uphold Representations No. R2 to R40 and considered that the draft Hung Hom OZP No. S/K9/25 should not be amended to meet the representations. The reasons were:

- “(a) land suitable for housing development in Hong Kong is scarce and there is a need for optimizing land available to meet different housing needs. The Site is considered suitable to be rezoned “Residential (Group A)” to meet the need for Senior Citizen Residences Scheme (SEN) development;
- (b) the proposed SEN development at the representation site with appropriate building height restriction and suitable mitigation measures would not generate unacceptable adverse impacts on the surrounding areas in terms of traffic, environmental, visual, air ventilation and infrastructural aspects (R3 to R9, R12 to R31, R33 to R40);
- (c) the proposed development at the representation site will be accessible via Lee Kung Street which will not affect the access of fire engines to the adjacent Fire Station via Fat Kwong Street (R14, R20 and R30); and
- (d) there is sufficient provision of open space and Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities to serve the local residents and the representation site is not required to be reserved for GIC, open space or car parking use (R5 to R11, R13 to R16).”

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung, Messr David Y.T. Lui, Alex T.H. Lai, Stephen L.H. Liu, Martin W.C. Kwan and Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:05 p.m.]

63. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m.

64. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Chairman

Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr H.F. Leung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Franklin Yu

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1), Environmental Protection
Department

Mr C.W. Tse

Assistant Director of Lands (Regional 3), Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

[Ms Janice W.M. Lai and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

65. As the applicant's representatives attending Agenda Item 5 had yet to arrive, Members agreed to proceed with consideration of Agenda Item 6.

Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KTS/443

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) – Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 911 S.A ss.4 in D.D. 100, Hang Tau Village, Sheung Shui, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 10282)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions

66. The Secretary reported that the applicant had indicated not attending the meeting but submitted further information (FI) in support of the review application, which was received on 12.5.2017. The FI was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

67. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, District Planning Officer/ Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East, Planning Department (DPO/ FS&YLE, PlanD), was invited to the meeting at this point.

68. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/ FS&YLE to brief Members on the review application.

69. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/ FS&YLE, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10282.

70. As the presentation of PlanD's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

71. As Members had no question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application. The Chairman thanked the representative of PlanD for attending the meeting. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

72. Members noted that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the "Agriculture" zone and land was still available within the "Village Type Development" zone of Hang Tau Village for Small House development. There was no major change in planning circumstances since the rejection of the application which warranted a departure from RNTPC's previous decision.

73. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of the “Agriculture” zone in the Hang Tau Village which is primarily to retain and safeguard good quality agricultural land/farm/fish ponds for agricultural purposes and to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation for cultivation and other agricultural purposes. There is no strong planning justification in the submission for a departure from the planning intention; and
- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of Hang Tau Village which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development close to the existing village cluster for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

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

[Mr Edwin W.K. Chan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Kowloon District

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/K14/734

Place of Recreation, Sports or Culture (Sports Training Ground) in "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" zone, 1/F, Kras Asia Industrial Building, 79 Hung To Road, Kwun Tong, Kowloon

(TPB Paper No. 10280)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

74. The Secretary reported that Dr C.H. Hau had declared an interest on the item as he personally knew Ms Betty S.F. Ho, the applicant's representative, as they were both the Board of Directors of the Conservancy Association. Members agreed that Dr C.H. Hau could stay in the meeting as he had no direct involvement in the project.

Presentation and Question Sessions

75. The following government representatives and the applicant's representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|--|
| Mr Tom C.K. Yip | - | District Planning Officer/Kowloon, Planning Department (DPO/K, PlanD) |
| Mr Y.K. Mau | - | Senior Divisional Officer/New Projects, Fire Services Department (Sr Div Offr/NP, FSD) |

| | | |
|------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| Mr K.C. Lui | - | Station Officer/New Projects, FSD |
| Mrs May Ho |] | Applicant's representatives |
| Ms Betty S.F. Ho |] | |
| Ms Ma Fung Yee |] | |
| Ms Chan Chi Lam |] | |

76. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited DPO/K to brief Members on the review application.

77. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tom C.K. Yip, DPO/K, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Metro Planning Committee (MPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10280 (the Paper).

78. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the review application. Ms Betty S.F. Ho made the following main points:

- (a) no written representation in support of the review application was submitted as various fire safety measures had already been proposed in the section 16 application stage. It was technically infeasible to propose additional fire service installations such as water tank;
- (b) the applied use was considered by PlanD as generally in line with the planning intention of the "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Business" ("OU(B)") zone and relevant government departments, except FSD, had no adverse comment on the application;
- (c) the scale of the applied use had been reduced from two storeys (i.e. 1/F and 2/F in the previous application No. A/K14/722) to one storey (i.e. 1/F in the current application). Given the specific requirements such as high headroom for sports training ground, the Premises was a suitable venue

for the applied use;

- (d) the potential risk for the applied use was low given that the staff and visitors could access directly to the ground floor through the staircase and there was no industrial use on the ground floor. Moreover, fire service installations would be provided and other fire safety management measures such as adoption of ‘visit-by-appointment’ system and prior briefing on fire escape route and evacuation procedures to all participants would be implemented;
- (e) the applied use, together with other recreational and cultural uses, had injected new synergy into Kwun Tong and made it a vibrant, distinctive business area with energetic mixed uses, which was in line with the Government’s initiative to transform Kowloon East into Central Business District 2. However, as most of those uses currently found within industrial buildings were not allowed under the stringent fire safety regulations, they would disappear if the Government took enforcement action in response to complaints;
- (f) without corresponding change in other policy arena, the Government’s initiative to encourage wholesale conversion of industrial buildings had not been achieved effectively. According to the 2014 Area Assessment of Industrial Land in the Territory undertaken by PlanD, 247 out of the 291 buildings/sites in the “OU(B)” zone in Kwun Tong were industrial buildings. According to the information of Lands Department, only 35 industrial buildings had been approved for wholesale conversion since 2012. Majority of the buildings still remained as industrial buildings due to various reasons; and
- (g) while it was understood that FSD would not support the current application due to the stringent requirements under F.S.D. Circular Letter No. 4/96, it was noted that the fire safety requirements were not unchangeable. For example, the emergency vehicular access requirement had been relaxed to facilitate Small House development. The Government was urged to further review and relax the fire safety

requirements for industrial buildings by incorporating reasonable fire safety measures such as the provision of fire service installations so as to allow more diversified mixed uses in industrial buildings and transform Kwun Tong into a vibrant business district.

79. Mrs May Ho, the spouse of the applicant, read out a letter from the applicant and made the following main points:

- (a) being a practicing neurologist and Medical Director of the Brain Centre at Canossa Hospital, the applicant understood the long term physical and emotional benefits of a physical active lifestyle for the society. With the mission to promote “Love Life, Love Sports” and a sporting lifestyle for the underprivileged kids and the people in Hong Kong, the applicant set up a baseball/softball and ski/snowboard training and recreation centre on 1/F and 2/F of the subject industrial building in 2011. However, the application to regularize the above-mentioned uses was subsequently rejected by the Board in 2015;
- (b) for the ski/snowboard training and recreation centre remained on 1/F of the same industrial building, the applicant had proposed various measures to enhance fire safety of the centre to address FSD’s concern;
- (c) vacant factories with high ceilings and large floor plates were ideal for using as all weather sports training grounds, which had positive contribution to the Government’s “East Kowloon Energizing” initiatives;
- (d) the centre had become a popular place and had given hope and satisfaction to the underprivileged and the disabled young people. However, those might be vanished by the decision of the Board; and
- (e) if the current application was rejected, the Board would have quashed the aspirations of individual citizens who had a heart for Hong Kong and thus wasting massive resources. The Board was urged to overrule FSD’s decision and give favourable consideration to the application.

80. The letter was tabled at the meeting for Members' reference.

81. As the presentation of PlanD's representative and the applicant's representatives had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

82. A Member asked whether the applicant had consulted FSD on the fire safety issues. In response, Ms Betty S.F. Ho said that although they had not consulted FSD, PlanD had provided them with FSD's comments at the section 16 application stage. They had made every effort to provide various fire safety measures with a view to addressing FSD's concern. Mrs May Ho supplemented that according to her understanding from a friend working in FSD, commercial uses within industrial building would unlikely be allowed under the prevailing regulations.

83. A Member asked whether commercial uses would be allowed in industrial building if the uses were separated from the upper industrial portion by a buffer floor, and if the applicant would consider providing a buffer floor on 2/F. In response, Mr Y.K. Mau, Sr Div Offr/NP, FSD said that commercial uses were always permitted in the purpose-designed non-industrial portion on the lower floors of an existing industrial building, provided that the uses were separated from the industrial uses located above by a buffer floor and no industrial uses were located within the non-industrial portion. Ms Betty S.F. Ho said that since the rejection of the previous application, the applicant had moved out from 2/F of the industrial building.

84. As Members had no further question, the Chairman informed the applicant's representatives that the hearing procedure for the review application had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's representatives and the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

85. Some Members opined that while the applicant's mission to promote a sporting lifestyle was appreciated, the rejection reason due to fire safety concern was compelling and

could not be compromised. Given the Premises was not separated from the industrial uses located above by a buffer floor, the applicant was well aware that the applied uses would not be accepted under the prevailing regulations. Since no additional information and fire safety measures had been provided in the review application to address FSD's concern, there was no strong justification to depart from the MPC's decision.

86. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review based on the following reason:

“the sports training ground is considered not acceptable in an industrial building from fire safety point of view.”

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang left the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 7

[Open meeting]

Consideration of New Draft Lok Ma Chau Loop Outline Zoning Plan
(TPB Paper No. 10283)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

87. The Secretary reported that the proposed Hong Kong-Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park (I&T Park) at Lok Ma Chau Loop (LMCL) would be developed and managed by the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation (HKSTPC) and the following Members had declared interests on the item:

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| Mr K.K. Cheung |] | their firm having current business dealings with |
| | | HKSTPC |
| Mr Alex T.H. Lai |] | |

88. Members noted that Mr K.K. Cheung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and Mr Alex T.H. Lai had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

89. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting:

- | | | |
|----------------------|---|--|
| Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin | - | District Planning Officer/ Fanling, Sheung Shui & Yuen Long East, Planning Department (DPO/ FS&YLE, PlanD) |
| Mr Wallace W.K. Tang | - | Senior Town Planner/North, PlanD |
| Mr W.M. Au Yeung | - | Town Planner/Yuen Long East (2), PlanD |
| Mr Johann C.Y. Wong | - | Deputy Commissioner for Innovation & Technology, Innovation and Technology Commission (DCIT, ITC) |
| Mr Richard C.K. Chan | - | Senior Manager (Capital Works), ITC |
| Mr K.S. Chan | - | Senior Engineer/9 (New Territories West), Civil Engineering and Development Department (Sr Engr/9 (NTW), CEDD) |
| Mr K.W. Cheung | - | Senior Nature Conservation Officer (North), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) |
| Ms Y.N. Chan | - | Nature Conservation Officer (Yuen Long), AFCD |

90. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited DPO/FS&YLE to brief Members on the Paper. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, briefed Members on the new draft Lok Ma Chau Loop Outline Zoning Plan (LMCL OZP), including its background, policy direction, location setting, traffic and transport connection, key features, land use proposals and implementation, as detailed in TPB

Paper No. 10283.

91. As the presentation of DPO/FS&YLE was completed, the Chairman invited questions and comments from Members.

Hong Kong/Shenzhen Co-operation

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

- (a) how the development of the LMCL could achieve a synergy effect with the adjacent Shenzhen area in respect of innovation and technology (I&T) development;
- (b) the development on the northern side of Shenzhen River and in the area adjacent to the LMCL would have great implication on LMCL development. Whether there was any mechanism to ensure that the development on both sides of Shenzhen River would be complementary to each other; and
- (c) whether the relevant authorities in Hong Kong and Shenzhen had any plan to improve the water quality of Shenzhen River.

93. Mr Johann C.Y. Wong, DCIT of ITC, and Mr K.S. Chan, Sr Engr/9 (NTW) of CEDD, made the following responses:

- (a) Shenzhen had made notable progress in the I&T arena in recent years. In 2015, the value-add of emerging industries of strategic importance in Shenzhen already reached RMB 700 billion. While Shenzhen was very strong in productisation and manufacturing, Hong Kong still had its advantages in higher education and scientific research, as well as a sound legal system based on the rule of law which offered strong legal protection for intellectual property. The development of the LMCL, which enjoyed a strategic geographical location, would provide an

excellent opportunity to strengthen the co-operation of the two places. According to the “Memorandum of Understanding on Jointly Developing the Lok Ma Chau Loop by Hong Kong and Shenzhen” (MOU) signed between the Hong Kong and Shenzhen Governments, Shenzhen was planning to develop the area on the northern side of Shenzhen River and adjacent to the LMCL into an I&T zone, which in conjunction with the I&T Park in LMCL could collectively form a “Shenzhen-Hong Kong Innovation and Technology Co-operation Zone” to complement the strength of both places and realise the synergy effects;

- (b) under the MOU, a Joint Task Force on the Development of the Hong Kong/Shenzhen Innovation and Technology Park in the Loop (Joint Task Force), comprising the relevant authorities and personnel from both sides and chaired by the Secretary for Innovation and Technology, had been set up for studying and coordinating major issues arising from the development of the LMCL. The SAR Government would liaise with the Shenzhen authorities through the Joint Task Force to ensure that the development of the I&T zone and the I&T Park on both sides of Shenzhen River would be complementary to each other; and
- (c) medium and long term improvement measures had been proposed in another joint study by relevant authorities in Hong Kong and Shenzhen to improve the water quality of Shenzhen River. Bioremediation treatment would be carried out to mitigate the odour impact of Shenzhen River near the LMCL before the commissioning of the I&T Park.

Development Mix/Intensity

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

- (a) given that adequate housing/staff quarters and supporting facilities were essential in attracting high-quality research and development (R&D)

companies and recruiting overseas and Mainland talents to the I&T Park, whether essential facilities including staff quarters/hostel and other supporting facilities such as international school would be provided in the I&T Park in order to attract overseas and Mainland talents;

- (b) noting that a number of local universities had already developed their own campus in the Mainland, whether there was a need to reserve such a considerable amount of land in the LMCL for education purpose;
- (c) the relatively low density development in the LMCL was considered appropriate. However, to cater for the future expansion of the I&T Park, whether consideration would be given to explore the possibility of increasing the overall development intensity so as to facilitate more intensive development in a less ecologically sensitive location;
- (d) whether feasibility of underground development had been explored to better utilize the land resources in LMCL; and
- (e) the target student population in the I&T Park, and whether sufficient land had been reserved for the provision of hostels to cater for their needs.

95. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin, DPO/FS&YLE, and Mr Johann C.Y. Wong made the following responses:

- (a) the OZP provided a statutory land use framework to facilitate the development of the LMCL. Flexibility had been provided in the OZP to facilitate the provision of the required supporting facilities. Pursuant to the MOU, applied technical R&D would be the main purpose of the I&T Park, and this would be supplemented with facilities for higher education and the cultural and creative industries. HKSTPC/its subsidiary company responsible for the implementation of the I&T Park would conduct further studies on the positioning, mode of operations as well as superstructure planning of the Park and prepare a master plan for the LMCL development. Subject to the recommendation of the further

study, staff quarters/residential institutions and other supporting facilities could be planned at suitable locations to meet the needs of the working/student population;

- (b) to allow flexibility in the future land use of the LMCL, about 38.6ha (37%) of land had been designated as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Research and Development, Education, and Cultural and Creative Industries)” (“OU(R&D, Edu & C&C)”) zone, with the intention to allow a flexible mix of development comprising research, design and development centre, creative industries, teaching and research facilities, offices, etc. to meet the development needs of the three main uses, namely, high-tech R&D, higher education and cultural & creative (C&C) industries;
- (c) the development intensity of LMCL with a gross floor area (GFA) of 1.2 million m² was proposed with planned infrastructure/supporting facilities under the Planning and Engineering Study on Development of Lok Ma Chau Loop (the P&E Study). Technical assessments such as transport and traffic impact assessment (TTIA) and environmental impact assessment (EIA) had been conducted. The EIA was approved by Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and the Environmental Permit (EP) was granted in November 2013. Should the HKSTPC/its subsidiary company considered it necessary to increase the development intensity subsequently, further technical assessments should be carried out to confirm the feasibility of the intensified development in accordance with the requirements of relevant ordinances;
- (d) underground car parks had been proposed for the two transport termini at the southwestern and northeastern ends of the LMCL as per the P&E Study. Subject to the further study by HKSTPC/its subsidiary company, underground developments could be explored with supporting technical assessments to meet the development needs of the I&T Park; and

- (e) as the development of the I&T Park was to establish a key base for co-operation between Hong Kong and Shenzhen in technical R&D and C&C industries, the higher education portion would focus on postgraduate research rather than undergraduate education. The main theme of the R&D should focus on applied research rather than fundamental research. Upon further study by the HKSTPC/its subsidiary company, student hostels, which were always permitted under the “OU(R&D, Edu & C&C)” zone in the OZP could be incorporated into the more detailed master plan to cater for anticipated needs.

96. Regarding the provision of land in the LMCL to cater for higher educational use, the Vice-chairman considered it necessary to provide flexibility in the future land use in order to cater for the expansion plan for the local universities in particular in the high-tech R&D field.

97. Noting some Members’ views on the need to allow flexibility in the building height restriction of the proposed development in LMCL, the Chairman drew Members attention to paragraphs 4.3 and 4.4 of the Paper that the building height profile was part of the ecological mitigation measures as set out in the approved EIA. While flexibility might be allowed in the design of future development, the building height profile, together with other ecological mitigation measures, should be included in the Ecological Mitigation/Habitat Creation and Management Plan to be submitted in meeting the EP requirements. For any proposed variation to the Plan, the EP holder shall submit a Revised Plan to EPD for approval.

Traffic and Transport Connections

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

- (a) further elaboration on the connectivity between LMCL and the Shenzhen area/urban areas of Hong Kong;

- (b) the design of the dedicated direct link to the MTR LMC Station, and whether pedestrian walkway had been planned in the direct link; and
- (c) whether environmentally friendly transport system such as cycle track and segregated road system would be provided for both internal and external transportation of the LMCL.

99. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin and Mr K.S. Chan made the following responses:

- (a) a TTIA had been undertaken under the P&E Study. For road transport, the LMCL would be connected with different parts of Hong Kong and the surrounding areas by two main roads, namely the Western Connection Road (WCR) and the Eastern Connection Road (ECR). The WCR would connect the LMCL to San Tin Highway while the ECR was proposed to link with the proposed road network of the Kwu Tung North New Development Area (KTN NDA), subject to further study. For rail transport, the LMCL users would have the choice of using the MTR LMC Station via the direct link or the proposed MTR Kwu Tung Station at KTN NDA;
- (b) a dedicated direct link between the southwestern part of the LMCL and the MTR LMC Station was proposed in the form of a viaduct for use by environmentally friendly transport facilities passing above San Sham Road alongside the existing LMC Spurline viaduct, subject to detailed design. According to the existing security policy and restriction in LMC Spur Line Control Point, pedestrian access between the LMCL and MTR LMC Station/LMC Spur Line Control Point was not allowed. Subject to future change in policy, the provision of a pedestrian walkway in the direct link could be explored so as to reduce road traffic; and
- (c) according to the P&E Study, road-based environmentally friendly transport mode might be introduced to serve the internal circular public transport route, and cycle tracks had been planned along the internal

roads and WCR to connect with the cycle network outside LMCL. CEDD would undertake further study on the internal and external transport connections and facilities, including park-and-ride facilities, cycle tracks, as well as road linkages with the existing and proposed rail stations and KTN NDA.

Building Design/Green Initiatives

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

- (a) green building design and green initiatives should be adopted in the I&T Park as a showcase to demonstrate a sustainable development balancing development needs and ecological conservation;
- (b) a study should be carried out to examine the operational needs of the future R&D companies. Sufficient flexibility should be allowed in building design and height of the future developments within the I&T Park so as to meet the operational requirements of those companies; and
- (c) whether district cooling system and centralized refuse collection system had been considered and the electricity generated from renewable energy could be connected to the grid of the electricity company.

101. Mr Johann C.Y. Wong, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin and Mr K.S. Chan made the following responses:

- (a) green building design and green initiatives were encouraged in the future development of the I&T Park to create a smart and green community. Further studies would be carried out on the feasibility of green and resilient infrastructure including renewable energy and water installations, reuse of treated effluent, etc.;

- (b) in order to increase building design flexibility, floor spaces which were interchangeable for office and laboratory uses had already been provided in the Hong Kong Science Park (HKSP) in Pak Shek Kok to cater for the operation needs of the R&D companies. Given the HKSTPC had experiences in operating and managing the HKSP, it was commissioned to undertake further study on the detailed planning and design of the I&T Park with a view to enhancing the operation efficiency of the future development; and
- (c) district cooling system and centralized refuse collection system were part of the green initiatives proposed under the P&E Study, the implementation of which would be subject to future detailed study. Two electricity substations had been planned in the I&T Park and the electricity generated from renewable energy could be connected to the grid of the electricity company in future.

Wind/Visual Corridors

102. Noting that the layout of LMCL was different from that on the Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP), a Member asked if the wind/visual corridors recommended on the RODP had been maintained. Making reference to Plans 1 and 8 of the Paper, Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin said that the major east-west amenity/activity corridor in the central part of the LMCL on the RODP would be designated as “Open Space” on the draft OZP for the provision of outdoor open-air public space for recreational use. It would also be linked and integrated with the retained reedbed and the Ecological Area. The major northeast/southwest breezeway on the RODP was proposed as a Pedestrian Boulevard to serve as a major activity corridor, subject to further study. The other east-west visual corridors/breezeways on the RODP could be provided in the form of local open space subject to further study by the HKSTPC/its subsidiary company. The ES of the OZP had provided an urban design and landscape framework on wind/visual corridors as well as building height profile, on the basis of which further studies on effective wind enhancement measures could be carried out at the detailed design stage. Other local breezeways/air paths could also be incorporated in the form of local open space, road, green walkways, pedestrian streets,

tree-lined avenues and boulevards linkage.

Boundary Crossing Facilities/Arrangement

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

- (a) whether land had been reserved in the LMCL for the future direct linkage to Shenzhen;
- (b) in anticipation that some future working/student population of the I&T Park would be living in Shenzhen, whether there was any measure to facilitate their daily commuting;
- (c) whether private cars could use the dedicated direct link, and how the vehicles from Shenzhen could access the I&T Park; and
- (d) whether the existing Boundary Patrol Road, which was zoned “Open Space” on the OZP, would be open for public use.

104. Ms Maggie M.Y. Chin and Mr K.S. Chan made the following responses:

- (a) land had been reserved in the north-eastern part of LMCL for the possible boundary crossing facilities, subject to further study, to facilitate people flow and interaction between the two places;
- (b) as LMCL was located in Hong Kong, people commuting between Hong Kong and Shenzhen should follow the existing boundary control arrangement and the relevant legislations of the two places. The origin of the workers of the I&T Park would depend on the recruitment requirements and profile of the companies to be established in the I&T Park. For the existing HKSP at Pak Shek Kok, it was estimated that more than 70% of the working population were from Hong Kong, about 10% were from Mainland and the remaining were from overseas;

- (c) private cars would not be allowed to use the dedicated direct link between the LMCL and the MTR LMC Station/LMC Spur Line Control Point. Vehicles from Shenzhen could access I&T Park via the planned WCR; and
- (d) Boundary Patrol Road, which was an existing road along the bank of Shenzhen River and mainly used for patrol purpose, would not be opened for public use in future.

Implementation Programme

105. In response to a Member's question on the implementation programme for the I&T Park, Mr Johann C.Y. Wong said that site formation works and the provision of infrastructures would be carried out in phases. It was anticipated that the first site would be handed to the HKSTPC/its subsidiary company in around 2021. There was no definite implementation programme for the LMCL development. However, reference could be made to the development of HKSP (about 22ha) which was developed in three phases with a timespan of about 10 years. The Chairman added that given the construction works would normally take three to four years, it was expected that the first batch of companies could move in the I&T Park in about 2024/25. According to the phasing plan, the western part of the I&T Park would be developed first due to its proximity to MTR LMC station.

106. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning, said that the Hong Kong and Shenzhen Government had discussed LMCL development for years. In 2008, the 'Hong Kong-Shenzhen Joint Task Force on Boundary District Development' agreed that both sides would undertake a joint study on planning, environmental and engineering feasibility for development of LMCL and extensive public engagement exercise on future land use of LMCL was undertaken in Hong Kong and Shenzhen. In 2009, the P&E Study was commissioned. According to the RODP of the P&E Study, the planned infrastructures and facilities for LMCL could support development of higher education, high-tech R&D and C&C industries up to a maximum GFA of 1.2 million m². Under the MOU signed between Hong Kong and Shenzhen in January this year, LMCL would be developed as the I&T Park. While the HKSTPC would commission further study on the detailed planning and design of the I&T Park, the OZP was prepared to provide a statutory planning framework to enable

early implementation of infrastructure works for the development. The OZP was prepared based on the recommendations of the P&E Study. It aimed to provide flexibility in terms of land use zoning and mix of development, with the development parameters set out in the Explanatory Statement (ES) instead of the Notes of the OZP. The HKSTPC would take account of the development parameters and urban design framework as set out in the ES in conducting further study on the detailed development mix and building design to meet future market demand.

107. A Member considered that the current draft OZP, which provided a broad land use framework with detailed design of the I&T Park to be controlled through the submission of master plan under the lease, was appropriate.

108. Members noted that the development of the I&T Park was essential to the future economic development of Hong Kong. Given its large-scale development and long development timespan, flexibility should be provided to allow future developments to suit the changing circumstances.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho, Mr H.F. Leung and Mr C.W. Tse left the meeting during the question and answer session.]

109. After deliberation, Members agreed that:

- (a) the draft Lok Ma Chau Loop OZP No. S/LMCL/E (to be renumbered as S/LMCL/1) and its Notes (Annexes I and II of Appendix A of TPB Paper No. 10283) were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance); and
- (b) the ES (Annex III of Appendix A of TPB Paper No. 10283) was suitable to serve as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zonings of the draft Lok Ma Chau Loop OZP and that the ES should be issued under the name of the Board and published together with the draft OZP.

110. Members noted that, as a general practice, the Secretariat of the Board would undertake detailed checking and refinement of the draft OZP including the Notes and ES, if appropriate, before its publication under the Ordinance. Any major revision would be submitted for the Board's consideration.

111. The Chairman thanked the government representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

112. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:50 p.m.