

**Minutes of 1171st Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 10.5.2018**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.F. Wong

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

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

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr Ricky W.K. Ho

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (a.m.)

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

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Mr T.C. Cheng (a.m.)

Ms Christine C.M. Cheung (p.m.)

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/25
(TPB Paper No. 10420)

[The meeting was conducted in English and Cantonese]

1. The Secretary reported that the draft Tseung Kwan O Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TKO/25 mainly involved rezoning of five sites to facilitate public housing developments. The following Members had declared interests on the item for owning properties in the Tseung Kwan O area and/or having affiliation with the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup), the consultant for the Preliminary Feasibility Study (FS) and technical assessments supporting the proposed public housing developments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD), the Conservancy Association (CA) (R62), Mary Mulvihill (R686), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK) (R755), Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBG) (R756), Mass Transit Railway Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R999), Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD) which was the mother company of the Hong Kong and China Gas Company Limited (Towngas) (R1000) and the Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) (C2) :

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

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

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with Arup, MTRCL, HLD and past business dealings with HKHA
- Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with HKHA and MTRCL
- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business dealings with
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] MTRCL, Arup, KFBG, HKHA and Towngas, past
business dealings with CA and hiring Mary Mulvihill
on a contract basis from time to time
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA, Arup,
MTRCL and HLD
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA, MTRCL
and HLD
- Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with Arup, and being
(Vice-chairperson) an employee of the University of Hong Kong (HKU)
which had received donation from a family member of
the Chairman of HLD before, and being a member of
the Advisory Committee for Accredited Programme of
MTR Academy
- Dr C.H. Hau - the institute he served having current business dealings
with HKHA; being an employee of HKU which had
received donation from a family member of the
Chairman of HLD before; being a life member of the
CA and his spouse was the Honorary Secretary of the
Board of Director of the CA; being a past member of
the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK;
and being an ordinary member of the HKBWS

- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of Governors of the Hong Kong Arts Centre which had collaboration with MTRCL on arts projects and had received donation from an Executive Director of HLD before
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr L.T. Kwok - his employer, Christian Family Service Centre, had 14 social service units in Tseung Kwan O district
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work
- Professor T.S. Liu - owning and co-owning properties with his spouse at Tseung Kwan O

2. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Dr C.H. Hau and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho were direct, they should be invited to leave the meeting. Members also noted that Professor T.S. Liu's properties had no direct view to the representation sites, and the interests of the remaining Members were indirect, they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

[Mr Martin W.C. Kwan, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho and Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon left the meeting at this point.]

3. The Chairperson 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

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

Planning Department (PlanD)'s representatives

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

Ms Kitty S.T. Lam - Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O (STP/TKO)

Miss Carol Y.M. Cheuk - Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD)

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)'s representatives

Mr Chiang Nin Tat, Eric - Chief Engineer/East Division 1 (CE/E1)

Mr Cheung Li Chun, Bruce - Senior Engineer/3(East) (SE/3(E))

Mr Fung Ching Cheung, Samuel - Engineer/8(East), (E/8(E))

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)'s representatives

- Ms Ho Ching Yee - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South
(SNC/S)
- Ms Cheng Chui Yu, Josephine - Nature Conservation Officer/Kowloon
(NC/K)

Representers/Commenters or their representatives

R28 – 蔡淑玲

R846 – Cheung Mei Hung (Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) member)

- Mr Cheung Mei Hung - Representer and Representer's
representative

R62 – Conservancy Association

R624 – Miffy Ng

- Ms Chan Wing Kwan, Charlotte - Representers' representatives
- Mr Ng Hei Man, Roy
- Dr Ng Ying Sim

R63/C1 – Green Sense

R675 – Daisy Lee

- Mr Roy Tam - Representers' and Commenter's
representative

R64 – Sai Kung District Council

- Mr Chan Kai Wai] Representer's representatives
- Mr Yung Hon Wa]

R65 – Concern Group for Tseung Kwan O People

- Mr Chan Chin Chun, Cyrus - Representer's representative

R66 – 富寧花園關注組

R655 – Man Tin Ying, Anita

R689 – 葉泳希

Mr Chan Yiu Chor, Andrew - Representers' representative

R68 – Chung Kam Lun (SKDC member)

Mr Chung Kam Lun - Representer

R69 – Chau Yin Ming (SKDC member)

Mr Chau Yin Ming, Francis - Representer

R70 – 將軍澳青年力量

Mr Chan Wai Lit - Representers' representative

R71 – Fong Kwok Shan (SKDC member)

Ms Fong Kwok Shan, Christine - Representer

R73 – Wong Heung Yin

Mr Wong Heung Yin, Julian - Representer

R76 – Wu Yin Cheong

Mr Wu Yin Cheong - Representer

R163 – Joseph Lee

Mr Joseph Lee - Representer

R188 – Lai Ming Chak

Mr Lai Ming Chak - Representer

R370 – Chan Kam Tim

R464 – Chan Hiu Sze and Chan Kam Tim

Mr Chan Kam Tim - Representer and Representer's representative

R471 – Wong Ho Chun

Mr Wong Ho Chun - Representer

R472 – Cheung Fung Kiu

Ms Cheung Fung Kiu - Representer

R487 – Lee Kwan Ho

Mr Lee Kwan Ho - Representer

R560 – Maggie Ho

Ms Maggie Ho - Representer

R686/C5 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer and Commenter

R687 – Pang Wai

Mr Pang Wai - Representer

R688 – Ng Chi Ming

Mr Ng Chi Ming - Representer

R699 – Cheung Wai Chiu

Mr Cheung Wai Chiu - Representer

R718 – Tsui Ka Long

Mr Tsui Ka Long - Representer

R729 – Mak Ka King

Mr Mak Ka King - Representer

R731 – Lui Man Kwong (SKDC member)

Mr Lui Man Kwong - Representer

R734 – 海悅豪園業主委員會

Mr Chum Man Hin] Representer's representatives

Mr Lai Wai Hung]

R739 – Lai Wai Tong

Mr Lai Wai Tong - Representer

R755 – World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)

Mr Chan Chung Ming, Andrew - Representer's representative

R756 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG)

C4 – Ada Ho

C6 – Vicky Chan

Mr Nip Hin Ming] Representer's and Commenters'

Mr Chiu Sein Tuck] representatives

R788 – 將軍澳村村代表

R789 – Chan Kat Cheung

R790 – Chan Pui Kan

Mr Chan Kat Cheung] Representers and Representer's

Mr Chan Pui Kan] representatives

R791 – 將軍澳原居民代表

R800 – 吳慧心

R810 – 陳六仔

R813 – 吳穎謙

Mr Chiang Yam Wang, Allan - Representers' representative

R795 – Ng Sik Wing

Mr Ng Sik Wing - Representer

R803 – Tommy Ng

Mr Tommy Ng - Representer

R805 – Ng Ping

Mr Ng Ping - Representer

R835 – 斧頭洲村村代表

Mr Yip Pak Lam - Representer's representative

R884 – 周小姐

Mr Cheng Siu Lun - Representer's representative

R916 – Tam Chung Sang

Mr Tam Chung Sang - Representer's representative

R993 – Wan Yuet Cheung (SKDC member)

Mr Wan Yuet Cheung - Representer

C2 – The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS)

Ms Wong Suet Mei - Representer's representative

C8 – 坑口民生及地區計劃關注協會

Ms Lam Lok Yee - Representer's representative

C9 – 維景灣畔業主委員會

Mr Lee Yim Sheung - Representer's representative

5. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly explained the procedures of the hearing. She 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 PlanD's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. After the Q&A session, PlanD's representatives, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting.

6. The Secretary reported that three petition letters from NeoDemocrats, Mr Wan Yuet Cheung (Sai Kung District Council (SKDC) member) and the Concern Group for Tseung Kwan O People's Livelihood were received before the meeting. As these written submissions were received after the statutory publication period, they would be considered as not having been made in accordance with the provision of the Town Planning Ordinance. That said, as the groups handing over the petition letters had previously submitted representations and were present in the meeting, their views could be presented to Members when they made their oral submission.

7. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

8. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Carol Y.M. Cheuk, STP/SD, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the 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. 10420 (the Paper).

[Mr Franklin Yu and Mr K.W. Leung arrived to join the meeting during PlanD's presentation.]

9. The Chairperson then invited the representers/commenters or their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R28 – 蔡淑玲

R846 – Cheung Mei Hung (SKDC member)

10. Mr Cheung Mei Hung made the following main points :

- (a) the Information Paper submitted to SKDC on the proposed amendments to the Tseung Kwan O OZP was too brief and not informative. It could not convince SKDC or the residents on the need to rezone the sites in question involving a total land area of about 11.2ha with a total population of more than 30,000, as well as felling of more than 15,000 trees. The OZP amendments would have significant impact on the area as a whole and should not be covered by a brief SKDC Information Paper containing only a dozen pages;
- (b) SKDC had reservation on the proposed rezoning at its meeting held on 19.4.2017 and its concern on the traffic capacity problem had not been addressed. The government departments indicated that the proposed public housing developments would not have any adverse impacts in terms of environmental, traffic and ecological aspects, but detailed assessment reports were not provided. While there was no practical solution to address various issues, the scale of the proposed public housing developments were not reduced/modified to take SKDC's views into consideration;
- (c) regarding the proposed public housing development at the site to the east of Hong Kong Movie City (Item E), SKDC had suggested the Government to explore the possibility of constructing a new road to connect the area to Tseung Kwan O town centre or to the urban area in Kowloon, or to widen Wan Po Road to solve the traffic congestion problem. However, there was no response to SKDC's proposal;

- (d) far more housing units could be built by utilising the brownfield sites in the New Territories, developing the golf course in Fanling or expediting the development of Area 137 in Tseung Kwan O for housing development; and
- (e) before introducing more housing development in the area, the Government should propose practical solutions to resolve the traffic congestion problem and to provide better medical, government, institution or community (GIC) and other supporting facilities, e.g. maternity wards in Tseung Kwan O Hospital, integrated indoor games hall and wet market.

11. Mr Cheung Mei Hung then read out the views of various SKDC members on the proposed amendments to the OZP as recorded in the minutes of the SKDC meeting held on 19.4.2017, which was attached at Annex VII of the Paper. He reiterated that while SKDC did not object to development of public housing, additional supporting facilities should be provided prior to considering additional public housing development in Tseung Kwan O.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join the meeting at this point of the meeting.]

R62 – Conservancy Association (CA)

R624 – Miffy Ng

12. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ng Hei Man, Roy and Dr Ng Ying Sim made the following main points :

- (a) CA objected to the rezoning of “Green Belt” (“GB”) sites on the OZP. While the need for public housing development was acknowledged, the ecological value of the woodland should be examined more carefully. Rezoning “GB” sites for development would inevitably affect the well-vegetated woodland. As there were alternative sites for public housing development, the OZP had not struck a balance between development and natural conservation;

- (b) the “GB” sites were densely vegetated, forming part and parcel of a bigger vegetated woodland in the adjoining areas and had high ecological, landscape and buffer values. Although compensatory planting or tree transplanting were proposed, such measures might not be practical due to the steep topography and site condition of those sites. Also, transplanting might involve massive trimming of trees, which would adversely affect their health and survival rate after being transplanted;

- (c) only trees that had a 95mm diameter-at-breast-height (dbh) would be recorded in the tree survey. Shrubs and tree seedlings/saplings in those “GB” sites, which also had ecological value, were not recorded for compensatory planting. The “GB” sites under the current rezoning were identified in Stage 2 of the “GB” review, which aimed to rezone “GB” sites at the urban fringe with some vegetation that had a relatively low buffer value. Although they might have a relatively lower ecological value, the secondary woodland at those sites would have potential to mature in the future with enhanced ecological value if they were not disturbed. In fact, some of those “GB” sites were reported to have moderate to high ecological value in the preliminary environmental assessment conducted by CEDD. The rezoning of those sites should be considered more carefully;

Amendment Item A

- (d) the northern part of the site was a plantation and the southern part was a secondary woodland. The ecological value was far greater than that concluded in the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcoIA) as *Pyrenaria spectabilis* (石筆木) and *Ormosia pachycarpa* (葶莢紅豆) could be found on the western side of the site near Little Hawaii Trail and the southern side respectively. They were either protected species of flora or species with conservation value, but not recorded in the habitat map of the EcoIA;

- (e) a considerable number of seedlings and saplings of *Aquilaria sinensis* (土沉香), a near threatened species, were found in the southern part of the site

and those seedlings and saplings should be preserved. In fact, section 7.7.3 of the preliminary environmental assessment recommended that development should avoid encroaching the southern part of the site. The proposed rezoning contravened the findings of the report;

- (f) the plantation and woodland at the site were growing well without human interference. The site should be preserved so as to avoid disturbance to the natural growth process, prevent adverse ecological impact and preserve those protected species;

Amendment Item D

- (g) similar to the situation of Amendment Item A, a considerable number of seedlings and saplings of *Aquilaria sinensis* were found within the site, especially on the slope facing Yau Yue Wan Village Road. The presences of *Aquilaria sinensis* seedlings and saplings were also not reflected in the habitat map. As seen from aerial photos taken over a period of time from 1985 to 2010, the secondary woodland at this site had become denser over time as there was no human disturbance;
- (h) according to the Hong Kong Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2016-2021 (BSAP) prepared by AFCD, *Aquilaria sinensis* had been identified as priority groups for which action plans would be formulated. The proposed rezoning was not in line with the BSAP;

[Professor T.S. Liu left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Amendment Items B and E

- (i) there were native species of high ecological value such as *Aquilaria sinensis* and *Pavetta hongkongensis* (香港大沙葉) at the Ying Yip Road site (Item B); and

- (j) in view of the remote location and the steep topography, there was no human disturbance to the woodland at the site (Item E) opposite Hong Kong Movie City. It had grown into a typical secondary woodland with dense shrubs and trees. The preliminary environmental assessment considered that the subject woodland had moderate to high ecological value. The rezoning of that site for development was questionable.

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

R63/C1 – Green Sense

R675 – Daisy Lee

13. Mr Roy Tam said that the 10-minute presentation time allocated to each presenter/commenter was not adequate to cover the issues involved as the OZP amendments involved the rezoning of several sites. He also suggested that presenters/commenters should be divided into groups and invited to attend either the morning or afternoon session of the meeting according to the scheduled presentation time so as to shorten the waiting time for making oral submission. He said that due to the lengthy meeting time devoted to the hearing of oral presentations, there might not be sufficient time for the Q&A session towards the end of the meeting.

14. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Roy Tam then made the following main points :

- (a) the government departments' general responses, i.e. further assessment would be made at detailed design stage, mitigation measures would be proposed to address any problems, and there would not be any insurmountable problems, were not acceptable. There were many examples where "GB" sites were rezoned for developments, but the further assessment and mitigation measures conducted could not address the various problems identified;

- (b) the Government was using the long waiting list for public housing as an excuse to develop “GB” sites, which was harmful to the environment. Rezoning “GB” sites for residential development would not improve the living condition of the public, nor lower the property price. While shortage of housing land supply was part of the housing problem in Hong Kong, the crux of the problem was caused by the lack of any population policy to restrict the number of immigrants and the inability of the Government to deter property speculation;

- (c) a vast number of people on the waiting list for public housing units were holders of one-way entry permit to Hong Kong for family reunion. The number of immigrants coming to Hong Kong far exceeded the number of public housing units built each year. While the public suffered from the loss of trees in rezoning “GB” sites for housing development, they could not benefit from the housing development as the units produced would be snatched up readily by property speculators. If there was no population policy nor any change in the public housing allocation priority, the increase in housing supply would not benefit the general public to improve their living condition by upgrading themselves in the property ladder nor shorten the waiting time for a public housing unit;

- (d) land use planning was a long-term process and the general public would reasonably expect that land use zonings would not be changed easily. The criteria on “GB” rezoning were not made known to the public and there was no public consultation on rezoning “GB” in general. The public would not know whether and if yes when the Government would stop the “GB” rezoning;

- (e) the function of the “GB” zoning was to prevent urban sprawl and provide a buffer between the developed area and the country parks. The fringe area of country parks would be affected if the buffer was removed by rezoning “GB” sites for development. The function and ecological value of “GB” had not been taken into consideration in the rezoning exercise;

- (f) the “GB” site under Amendment Item A was remote and its rezoning would affect Little Hawaii Trail and a hiking trail. The site was on a well-vegetated slope, which was visually pleasing and ideal for passive recreation and public enjoyment of the natural environment. It was also not suitable for public housing development from traffic point of view. Housing development on a slope would affect a large area beyond the site boundary as massive retaining walls and slope stabilization works would often be required, and the impact would be substantial;
- (g) the sites under Amendment Items B and D were similar and should also not be rezoned. As for the site under Amendment Item E near Hong Kong Movie City, it would be subject to noise and glare nuisance from the filming activities at the Movie City and was not suitable for residential development;
- (h) there was no plan to show the distribution of affected trees for site layout analysis. Apart from the preliminary environmental assessment conducted by CEDD, no environmental impact assessment (EIA) had been carried out. In-situ compensatory tree planting was not practicable due to the site constraints, while non-in-situ compensatory planting would not improve the local environment. The environmental impact was assessed on individual site, and the cumulative environmental impact in Tseung Kwan O was not assessed;
- (i) although there were practice notes on tree preservation, which encouraged retaining as many trees on the development site as possible, such practice notes and guidelines were not effective as developers could always justify their tree felling proposals. In public housing development projects, Housing Department (HD) would not be subject to any tree preservation clause under the lease. Hence, tree felling would not be overseen by any authority and the trees in those “GB” sites would likely be cleared; and

- (j) the Government should consult the public on the “GB” review in a comprehensive manner, reject any application to use residential sites in the urban area for commercial development and formulate a population policy. The population in Hong Kong had far exceeded the optimum carrying capacity of the territory. Continual development to accommodate the increasing population was not in line with the principle of sustainable development.

[The Chairperson left the meeting at this point and the Vice-chairperson took over the chairmanship of the meeting.]

R64 – Sai Kung District Council

15. Mr Chan Kai Wai, SKDC member, made the following main points :

- (a) CEDD, PlanD and a number of government departments consulted SKDC on 19.4.2017 on the rezoning of “GB” sites for public housing developments in Tseung Kwan O. SKDC members considered that the traffic capacity and supporting community facilities in Tseung Kwan O were already overloaded and they unanimously objected to the proposal. However, the proposed amendments to the Tseung Kwan O OZP were submitted to the Board without any adjustments addressing SKDC’s views. SKDC then passed a motion on 5.9.2017 to oppose to the proposed amendments to the Tseung Kwan O OZP for public housing developments before the traffic problem and shortage of parking and supporting community facilities were resolved;
- (b) despite that the MTR Tseung Kwan O Line had already been operating beyond its carrying capacity since 2014, 12 sites in Tseung Kwan O were disposed of for residential developments. Further rezoning five “GB” sites for public housing developments would add more than 11,000 flats in Tseung Kwan O, which was not acceptable;

- (c) traffic congestion at Tseung Kwan O Tunnel occurred as early as 6:30 a.m. every day. The government departments claimed that the traffic congestion would be relieved when the Tseung Kwan O – Lam Tin (TKO-LT) Tunnel was completed in 2021. According to the latest information, funding for the construction of the TKO-LT Tunnel had not been approved by the Legislative Council and its completion would be delayed to 2023. It was not practical in assuming that the TKO-LT Tunnel project, which had not been committed by the Government, could solve the traffic congestion problem;
- (d) as the traffic congestion problem at Clear Water Bay Road could not be solved, the Government should not aggravate the congestion problem by rezoning those “GB” sites for public housing development. SKDC members had been requesting the Government to tackle the traffic congestion problem at Clear Water Bay Road, to widen the Ying Yip Road/Silver Crest Road roundabout, and to provide a new road connecting Clear Water Bay to Pak Shing Kok for the past three terms of SKDC, but to no avail;
- (e) there was also an acute shortage of parking spaces in Tseung Kwan O. There was a serious mismatch in development and the provision of road/traffic infrastructure and facilities. Further development by rezoning those “GB” sites should not be proposed without solving the traffic problems in the first place;
- (f) government departments had failed to conduct proper compensatory tree planting and tree preservation in a number of projects. The building gap of 15m was not wide enough to mitigate the air ventilation problem; and
- (g) in general, there was inadequate open space and community, medical, leisure and recreation and shopping/market facilities in Tseung Kwan O. The problems would be aggravated if additional population was introduced to Tseung Kwan O. Piecemeal rezoning of the five “GB” sites was not

ideal as the planning and development of those sites would not be cost-effective. Instead, SKDC had urged the Government to expedite the development of Area 137, which was readily available for development, in a comprehensive manner.

R65 – Concern Group for Tseung Kwan O People

16. Mr Chan Chin Chun, Cyrus made the following main points :

- (a) he represented the Concern Group for Tseung Kwan O People as well as Mr Luk Ping Choi and Mr Tse Ching Fung, SKDC members;
- (b) although the concern group supported public housing development, consensus on site selection for such a purpose should be reached between the Government, local residents and SKDC. The subject “GB” sites were not suitable for public housing development as there would be traffic, environmental/noise nuisance problems. In particular, the site under Item E would be subject to noise nuisance from filming activities at the adjacent Hong Kong Movie City late at night and the fire drill practice from the Fire and Ambulance Services Academy nearby. Meeting the target for public housing supply without considering the living environment of the future residents was not practical;

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

- (c) piecemeal rezoning for single-block public housing development was not cost-effective and the quality of the future management services would be poor. Also, as those “GB” sites to be rezoned for public housing development were on slopes, the future slope maintenance would be costly. This would be a burden to the future residents if home ownership scheme developments were incorporated in those sites;

- (d) SKDC had already indicated their no objection to expedite the development of Area 137 into a well-planned community with adequate provision of supporting facilities;
- (e) Tseung Kwan O had suffered from traffic congestion and inadequate GIC and supporting infrastructure for years. Transport Department (TD)'s comment that there would not be any adverse traffic impact if road improvement works and traffic mitigation measures were implemented was questionable. TD had not carried out any comprehensive traffic and transport study for Hong Kong since 1997. Even though the future TKO-LT Tunnel might alleviate the traffic congestion in Tseung Kwan O, there would not be any improvement in the external road connection with the main urban area. The carrying capacity of the MTR Tseung Kwan O Line was already saturated and the Shatin to Central Link of East Rail would not bring much improvement;
- (f) the subject "GB" sites were far away from public transport routes. Future residents had to rely on shuttle bus service to connect to MTR stations. However, the public transport interchanges (PTIs) at Po Lam Station and Hang Hau Station were already fully occupied and could not accommodate any additional shuttle bus stops;
- (g) the planning intention of the "GB" zone was to prevent urban sprawl and to provide buffer to the country parks. The rezoning of those "GB" sites was not in line with the original planning intention;
- (h) villages in Tseung Kwan O were resited in the early days of Tseung Kwan O development. It was unfair to those villagers if their living environment was disrupted again by the proposed public housing developments; and
- (i) the site under Amendment C1 at Chiu Shun Road would adversely affect the air ventilation in the area.

R66 – 富寧花園關注組

R655 – Man Tin Ying, Anita

R689 – 葉泳希

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Yiu Chor, Andrew made the following main points :

- (a) he represented residents in Fu Ning Garden in objecting to the current “GB” rezoning, particularly the Ying Yip Road site (Amendment Item B);
- (b) Fu Ning Garden was well planned with supporting facilities including shops and a market. However, the original planning could not resist the market force and all the shops were closed. Residents of Fu Ning Garden had to shop at Hang Hau or East Point City. The future residents at the public housing development at Ying Yip Road would face the same problem. As the site was isolated and situated uphill, it would be even more difficult for the future residents to go shopping on foot. There would be a great demand for shuttle bus service and the traffic along Ying Yip Road would be adversely affected. Also, there would not be room at the MTR Hang Hau Station to accommodate any additional shuttle bus stop;
- (c) for over 20 years, SKDC had been urging the Government to solve the traffic congestion problem in Tseung Kwan O, but there was no practical solution. The government departments’ response that with suitable traffic mitigation measures, there would not be adverse traffic impact on the surrounding road network was not convincing. It was unlikely that the traffic congestion problem that had troubled Tseung Kwan O residents for so long without any practical solution could be resolved by the proposed developments;
- (d) it was proposed that the Ying Yip Road (northbound) would be widened to alleviate the traffic congestion problem. However, it was observed that

traffic congestion occurred along Ying Yip Road (southbound) instead, as illustrated by photos taken in Ying Yip Road and the Google map showing the traffic condition of the area. Widening Ying Yip Road (northbound) would not solve the problem as the congestion was caused by traffic tailing back from Tai Po Tsai along Clear Water Bay Road;

- (e) the Government should formulate a population policy to control the total population in Hong Kong. Without such a policy, planning and development could not meet the need of the ever-increasing population;
- (f) the Government had set a housing target of providing a total of 460,000 housing units in the coming ten years. Rezoning the subject “GB” sites would only provide about 11,260 public housing units, or about 2.39% of the housing target. It would be more efficient for the Government to consider housing developments in larger sites such as the Fanling Golf Course. In terms of economy of scale, developing a large site would be a better alternative than developing many in-fill developments; and
- (g) there was deficit in the provision of various facilities in Tseung Kwan O, including car parking, road traffic infrastructure, school places, open space/recreational facilities, medical facilities, market, MTR train frequency and even police service. The Government should not consider the rezoning without first providing adequate supporting facilities and solving the traffic congestion problem in Tseung Kwan O.

R68 – Chung Kam Lun (SKDC member)

18. Mr Chung Kam Lun made the following main points :

- (a) comparing with the extensive public engagement process for the further development of Tseung Kwan O in which a number of public forums were carried out over a period of 3 years, the consultation process for the current rezoning exercise was brief and inadequate;

- (b) SKDC was informed by the Development Bureau (DEVB) in 2014 about identifying potential sites in Tseung Kwan O for residential developments. Detailed location of those potential sites were not available then. SKDC was consulted again in April 2017 on “GB” rezoning as a follow-up on DEVB’s consultation. While development parameters for the proposed public housing developments were provided, there was no information on any mitigation measures to address the adverse impacts except an Executive Summary of the preliminary feasibility study carried out by CEDD;
- (c) it was expected that future residents at those public housing developments would use the MTR Hang Hau Station or Po Lam Station. Although MTRCL planned to upgrade the signalling system of the TKO Line, the upgraded signalling system could not increase the train frequency to enhance the carrying capacity of the TKO Line due to constraints in some of the MTR stations. There might also be problem providing shuttle bus service for the future residents to MTR Hang Hau Station and Po Lam Station as the PTIs at those stations were not able to accommodate any additional shuttle bus stops;
- (d) the provision of supporting facilities and improvement to public transport services should be addressed at the early planning stage rather than leaving it to the detailed design stage. Affected residents would not have the opportunity to give their views by then;
- (e) vehicular traffic would take Po Lam Road North to leave Tseung Kwan O when TKO Tunnel was congested. The diverted traffic had already increased the traffic along Po Lam Road North, causing inconvenience to residents of King Ming Court and Tsui Lam Estate. As it was likely that the traffic generated from the Anderson Road Quarry development would use Po Lam Road North, the road capacity would be overloaded; and

- (f) there was inadequate supporting facilities in Tseung Kwan O, e.g. Tseung Kwan O Hospital was originally designed to serve a population of 300,000. As the total population in Tseung Kwan O had reached over 400,000, the medical service at Tseung Kwan O Hospital was already stretched beyond its limit. It was not acceptable to rezone those “GB” sites without first providing additional supporting facilities in Tseung Kwan O.

R69 – Chau Yin Ming (SKDC member)

19. Mr Chau Yin Ming, Francis made the following main points :

- (a) previous representers and DC members had covered most of his views. The “GB” rezoning would destroy the consensus between the Government and SKDC on district development. HD would have great difficulties in implementing the public housing developments at a later stage;
- (b) some villages including Yau Yue Wan Village, Tin Ha Wan Village and Fu Tau Chau Village were resited in the early days of Tseung Kwan O development. For Amendment Item C1, the environment of the nearby Tin Ha Wan Village and Fu Tau Chau Village would be affected. It was not fair for those villages that they would be affected again by the public housing development. That site should be retained for development of the residential care home for the elderly or residential home for people with disabilities as originally planned, which would be compatible with the nearby villages in terms of development intensity and building height;
- (c) as SKDC members would have better local knowledge, they could take into account the local needs and constraints in commenting on the OZP or proposing any development. SKDC had proactively recommended developing Area 137 as a priority; and

- (d) more time would be required to allow SKDC to further discuss the feasibility of developing those sites under the current rezoning proposal with the relevant bureaux/departments.

R70 – 將軍澳青年力量

20. Mr Chan Wai Lit made the following main points :

- (a) while the group did not object to public housing development, they objected to the rezoning of “GB” sites;
- (b) the group had collected public views through street stands at different locations and interviews with hikers. Most of the views collected objected to the rezoning;
- (c) about 16,000 trees would be affected by the rezoning and public housing developments at the five “GB” sites, but only about a hundred trees would be transplanted. The number of trees to be felled would actually be more than 16,000 if seedlings and saplings were also taken into consideration. Compensatory planting might not be able to mitigate the adverse impact on the ecological value of those sites. It would be a better alternative to develop Area 137 or other sites;
- (d) development at some of those “GB” sites would also affect existing hiking trails, such as the Little Hawaii Trail, which was used by the elderly living nearby. Hikers walking through the diverted hiking trails might not be able to enjoy the same view along the original route;
- (e) the existing open space provision and the supporting community, medical and transport facilities in Tseung Kwan O were inadequate, but these problems were not solved. There was no development schedule for the Tiu Keng Leng Park. The service provided by Tseung Kwan O Hospital was over-stretched. Although a general clinic would be provided in Area

67, it could not help meeting the demand for hospital beds or address the needs for specialist clinic; and

- (f) there would not be any supporting facilities at in-fill developments. It was not a correct approach in meeting the housing target alone without providing supporting facilities correspondingly. Housing development should be comprehensively planned.

R71 – Fong Kwok Shan (SKDC member)

21. Ms Fong Kwok Shan, Christine made the following main points :

- (a) residents, SKDC members, concern groups and environmentalists had expressed their objections to the rezoning of the “GB” sites in Tseung Kwan O due to the inadequate provision of various facilities, traffic congestion problems and impact on the ecological value of those sites. The views should be considered and the “GB” rezoning should be withheld;
- (b) a large number of trees would be felled, the ecology destroyed, and the problems related to traffic and inadequate provision of open space and supporting facilities that had not been solved in the past decade would be aggravated;
- (c) the rezoning proposal was made hastily, which was only based on a preliminary environmental assessment. The proposed widening of Ying Yip Road was only a minor improvement, which would not be able to solve the traffic problem;
- (d) in the past, supporting facilities, including market, would be incorporated in public housing development. However, no public market was provided in Tseung Kwan O with a total population of 500,000;

- (e) piecemeal developments at the five “GB” sites were not cost-effective as they were isolated and situated on slopes. SKDC had proposed to develop Area 137, where adequate land could be set aside for the provision of supporting facilities. However, Area 137 was only identified for development in the medium- to long-term; and

[Mr C.F. Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (f) local residents’ views as well as that of SKDC should be considered as they had better local knowledge, e.g. some “GB” sites under the current proposal were at prime locations and should not be used for public housing development. The upper floors of the future public housing development at those sites would have full sea view towards Silverstrand.

22. As requested by Mr Wan Yuet Cheung (R993) upon the registration in the morning, the Vice-chairperson invited him to make oral submission ahead of schedule, taking into consideration that there was no objection from other representers/commenters at the meeting.

[Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R993 – Wan Yuet Cheung (SKDC member)

23. Mr Wan Yuet Cheung made the following main points :

- (a) SKDC objected to DEVB’s proposal to rezone 11 “GB” sites for residential development several years ago. PlanD consulted SKDC again last year on the “GB” rezoning regarding five of those sites. While SKDC unanimously opposed the rezoning, he could not understand why the rezoning was still submitted to the Board, knowing that SKDC would raise objection;

- (b) the reason for not accepting SKDC's proposal to expedite the development of Area 137 was also unknown. The development intensity in Area 137 could match that of Lohas Park, accommodating a population of about 100,000. The area could be planned comprehensively for housing development while providing the necessary supporting facilities. This alternative was better than ad hoc developments at in-fill sites;

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

- (c) SKDC objected to the rezoning of "GB" sites on grounds related to traffic and the lack of open space, medical and other supporting facilities, and inadequate MTR service. Further housing developments would require better transport infrastructure such as an extension of the MTR TKO Line, the provision of light rail service and/or a new cross harbour tunnel connecting Tseung Kwan O to Siu Sai Wan;
- (d) the population in Tseung Kwan O had already exceeded the planned traffic capacity. Taking into account the transportation need of the population in Sai Kung and the future population in Area 137, the traffic infrastructure would need to be enhanced before considering more public housing development at those "GB" sites; and
- (e) he was concerned that the Government might proceed with the rezoning of the remaining "GB" sites identified by DEVB if the five sites under the current OZP amendment were approved.

R73 – Wong Heung Yin

24. Mr Wong Heung Yin, Julian made the following main points :

- (a) although there was a need for public housing development to meet the housing demand, rezoning the five "GB" sites in question should not go

ahead before the problems related to traffic and provision of supporting facilities were solved;

- (b) the intention of the “GB” zone was to provide a buffer between the country park and the urban area, and to improve the air quality as well as mitigating the heat island effect in the urban area. Rezoning the “GB” sites would result in felling more than 15,000 trees. Urban development would infringe the area zoned “GB” and destroy the natural environment;
- (c) only those deserted “GB” sites that had no vegetation should be rezoned for development. It was not acceptable to rezone “GB” sites that were densely vegetated, containing rare and valuable species that should be protected and had medium or high ecological value;
- (d) Tseung Kwan O had a population of about 400,000. The population would be increased to over 600,000 after the “GB” rezoning and the future development in Area 137, which would exceed the planned infrastructure capacity of Tseung Kwan O and overload the traffic, GIC and supporting facilities. SKDC and residents could not support further development in Tseung Kwan O that would result in population increase without first solving the traffic problem and providing additional facilities;
- (e) traffic at Ying Yip Road, Po Hong Road and Wan Po Road was saturated and there was no spare capacity to accommodate any additional traffic generated from public housing developments at the five “GB” sites. Widening the northbound carriageway of Ying Yip Road might slightly improve the situation, but the traffic problem could not be solved. Moreover, the future residents at those sites would need to rely on shuttle bus services to connect to the MTR stations. The PTIs at the MTR Po Lam Station and Hang Hau Station were already overcrowded and could not accommodate such shuttle bus service;

- (f) there were already about 4,000 heavy vehicle trips along Wan Po Road everyday. Developing the site at Pak Shing Kok Road would generate additional traffic along Wan Po Road and affect Lohas Park and The Beaumont. As there was only one bus route serving this area, the bus would have to be re-routed to serve the future development, which would cause delay due to a longer journey; and
- (g) the five “GB” sites were isolated. Without supporting facilities, future residents had to compete with existing population for existing facilities at Hang Hau and Po Lam. The rezoning should be withheld.

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left the meeting and Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

25. Ms Fong Kwok Shan, Christine (R71) supplemented that there were electricity substations near the “GB” site to the north of Tseung Kwan O Village, which posed health hazards to the future residents. The proposed road (Road J) connecting Ying Yip Road and Silverstrand was abandoned without any reason. Chiu Shun Road was a very important air corridor in Hang Hau. The “GB” site to the south of Chiu Shun Road (Item C) was relatively small (about 4,600m²). Allowing housing development on this site would adversely affect the air ventilation in the area. Lastly, Hong Kong Television Broadcasts Limited (TVB) moved from Broadcast Drive to the Hong Kong Movie City, away from the residential area in order to avoid causing any noise nuisance generated from filming activities during late hours. Notwithstanding, there were complaints about noise and glare from residents living as far away as Lohas Park. It was unreasonable to rezone the adjoining “GB” site (Item E) for public housing development as future residents would be affected by the operations in the Hong Kong Movie City.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:25 p.m.]

26. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 10.5.2018.

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

Professor S.C. Wong Vice-Chairperson

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (NTE)

Transport Department

Mr Ricky W.K. Ho

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr C.F. Wong

Sai Kung & Islands District

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Tsueng Kwan O Zoning Plan No. S/TKO/25
(TPB Paper No. 10420)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Ms Donna Y.P. Tam | - District Planning Officer/ Sai Kung & Islands (DPO/SKIs) |
| Ms Kitty S.T. Lam | - Senior Town Planner/Tseung Kwan O (STP/TKO) |
| Miss Carol Y.M. Cheuk | - Senior Town Planner/Special Duties (STP/SD) |

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mr Eric N.T. Chiang | - Chief Engineer/East Division 1 (CE/E1) |
| Mr Bruce L.C. Cheung | - Senior Engineer/3 (East) (SE/3(E)) |

Mr Samuel C.C. Fung - Engineer/8 (East) (E/8(E))

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South
(SNC/S)

Ms Josephine C.Y. Cheng - Nature Conservation Officer/Kowloon
(NC/K)

Representers, Commenters and their representatives

R62 – Conservancy Association

R624 – Miffy Ng

Ms Chan Wing Kwan Charlotte] Representers' Representatives

Mr Ng Hei Man, Roy]

Dr Ng Ying Sim]

R64 – Sai Kung District Council (SKDC)

Mr Yung Hon Wah - Representer's Representative

R66 – 富寧花園關注組

R655 – Man Tin Ying Anita

R689 – 葉泳希

Mr Chan Yiu Chor, Andrew - Representers' Representative

R76 – Wu Yiu Cheong

Mr Wu Yiu Cheong - Representer

R163 – Joseph Lee

Mr Joseph Lee - Representer

R188 – Lai Ming Chak

Mr Lai Mong Chak - Representer

R370 – Chan Kam Tim

R464 – Chan Hiu Sze and Chan Kam Tim

Mr Chan Kam Tim - Representers and Representatives' Representative

R471 – Wong Ho Chun

Mr Wong Ho Chun - Representers

R472 – Cheung Fung Kiu

Ms Cheung Fung Kiu - Representers

R560 – Maggie Ho

Ms Maggie Ho - Representers

R686/C5 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representers and Commenters

R699 – Cheung Wai Chiu

Mr Cheung Wai Chiu - Representers

R718 – Tsui Ka Long

Mr Tsui Ka Long - Representers

R729 – Mak Ka King

Mr Mak Ka King - Representers

R731 – Lui Man Kwong (SKDC member)

Mr Lui Man Kwong - Representers

R734 – 海悅豪園業主委員會

Mr Chum Man Him] Representers' Representatives

Mr Lai Wai Hung]

R739 – Lai Wai Tong

Mr Lai Wai Tong - Representer

R755 – World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)

Mr Chan Chung Ming, Andrew - Representer's Representative

R756 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden (KFBG)

C4 – Ada Ho

C6 – Vicky Chan

Mr Nip Hin Ming] Representer's and Commenters'

Mr Chiu Sein Tuck] Representatives

R791 – 將軍澳原居民代表陳吉祥、陳培根

R800 – 吳慧心

R810 – 陳六仔

R813 – 吳穎謙

Mr Chiang Yam Wang, Allan - Representers' Representative

R795 – Ng Sik Wing

Mr Ng Sik Wing - Representer

R916 – Tam Chung San

Mr Tam Chung San - Representer

R994/C3 – 坑口民生及地區計劃關注協會

Mr Choi Ming Hei - Representer's Representative

C2 – The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS)

Ms Wong Suet Mei - Commenter's Representative

29. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers/commenters and their representatives. He then invited the representers/commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R76 – Wu Yiu Cheong

30. Mr Wu Yiu Cheong made the following main points:

- (a) there was a change in the “Green Belt” (“GB”) review policy. In the 2013 Policy Address, it was considered that “GB” sites which were devegetated, deserted or formed would be suitable for rezoning for residential use. In 2014, the Government indicated that “GB” sites with relatively lower value as conservation or buffer zones, including sites which were close to developed areas with existing infrastructure and potential for further development, would also be considered for residential development. However, there was no public consultation on the change of the “GB” review policy and the criteria for rezoning “GB” sites were not clear. He had concerns that the rezoning of the five representation sites without strong justifications would set an undesirable precedent for similar rezoning of “GB” sites;
- (b) Hang Hau had long been suffering from the problem of wall effect. The proposed housing development at Item C1 site would result in wall effect and block the only air ventilation corridor in Hang Hau, i.e. Ngan O Road, which would affect the air ventilation for nearby residential developments. The Government simply responded that Ngan O Road was not identified as a major district wind corridor and further enhancement features would be considered at the detailed design stage. Such response was considered insufficient in addressing the concerns of the residents in Hang Hau;

- (c) part of the Item C site was previously zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”). The SKDC had proposed to provide community facilities such as elderly care centre and car park to meet the need of the residents in Tseung Kwan O (TKO). However, the Government had not accepted these proposals arguing that there was no demand for these facilities;
- (d) there were alternative sources of land supply in Hong Kong. According to a research conducted by the Liber Research Community, there were 94 clusters of brownfield sites in Hong Kong. Among these clusters, 13 of them were not included in any new development areas or with any development programme. The area of the 13 brownfield clusters was larger than the total area of the five representation sites;
- (e) the SKDC members in general objected to the proposed rezoning of the five representation sites. However, the Government had disregarded the views of SKDC and no adjustments to the amendment items were made. Moreover, the Government did not consult the views of stakeholders; and
- (f) according to the previous “Further Development of TKO – Feasibility Study” conducted by CEDD, the maximum population of TKO was 480,000. The existing population of TKO already reached 400,000. Together with the additional population of 30,000 and 100,000 at the five representation sites and TKO Area 137 respectively, there would be over 610,000 people living in TKO. Such population would cause serious burden for transport and community facilities and was considered undesirable from planning point of view.

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

R163 – Joseph Lee

31. Mr Joseph Lee made the following points:
- (a) the representation sites were well-covered with natural woodlands of high ecological value. The site selection criteria were not clear. It was not reasonable to rezone the representation sites without any mechanism to monitor the “GB” rezoning exercise. Noting that there were other sources of land supply such as brownfield sites, it was not justifiable to destroy the “GB” sites;
 - (b) local consultation for the rezoning exercise was inadequate and the opposing views of SKDC were not respected. There was no mechanism to balance the views of different stakeholders. The current rezoning proposal had no credibility; and
 - (c) he wondered why the Government further intensified the development of TKO which was already densely populated. The Government was trying to resolve the housing problem of Hong Kong at the expense of the TKO residents’ interest.

R188 – Lai Ming Chak

32. Mr Lai Ming Chak made the following points:
- (a) Item C1 site involved rezoning a site from “G/IC” to “Residential (Group A) 7” (“R(A)7”). The site was the only undeveloped “G/IC” site in Hang Hau. Instead of rezoning the site for residential development which would lead to various impacts in the area, local residents would support to have a GIC development such as elderly care centre, parking or market facilities at the site in accordance with the original planning intention;

- (b) although the Government claimed that the provision of open space and a range of GIC facilities were in general adequate to meet the need of the planned population in TKO, the existing undeveloped open space and “G/IC” sites might also be rezoned to other uses arising from the change in policy initiatives;
- (c) noting that the Government had previously proposed to rezone 11 “GB” sites for residential developments, including the current five “GB” sites, together with the proposed comprehensive development at TKO Area 137, TKO might not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the increase in population arising from the proposed public housing developments;
- (d) most of the TKO residents needed to travel to other districts for work and for school. The road capacity of TKO, including the TKO Tunnel, was already overloaded. The additional population would only worsen the existing traffic conditions and the TKO-Lam Tin Tunnel (TKO-LTT) might not be able to support the additional traffic. The TKO-LTT was planned to connect to the Trunk Road T2 of Kai Tak Development and Central Kowloon Route (CKR) in order to divert the traffic to Kowloon West. However, in view of the fact that the CKR was expected to be completed in 2025 and the Trunk Road T2 was under detailed design, the completion of TKO-LTT would only divert the traffic to Kwun Tong and aggravate the traffic congestion problem in the short term;
- (e) although the overall carrying capacity of MTR TKO Line would be enhanced by 10% after the upgrading of signaling system in 2021, it might not be able to support the increase in population of the five representation sites and LOHAS Park. Also, there was no pedestrian linkage provided for Item C1 site; and
- (f) for Item B site, he had concern on Ying Yip Road which was hilly

and narrow and the site might not be suitable for the proposed housing development. For Item E site, it was far away from the town centre of TKO and future residents might be isolated from other areas.

R370 – Chan Kam Tim

R464 – Chan Hiu Sze and Chan Kam Tim

33. Mr Chan Kam Tim made the following points:
- (a) he had specific concern on Item C1 as he lived in Yuk Ming Court which was next to the site and would be affected by the proposed housing development;
 - (b) the Town Planning Board (TPB) Paper No. 10420 (the Paper) was incomplete which had not included all the representations and comments. There was no record of Members' declaration of interest. He also questioned whether Members would be required to update the information on their interests;
 - (c) the building design of the proposed housing development at Item C1 site could not address the air ventilation problem;
 - (d) the views of the residents of Yuk Ming Court and Le Cite Noble which were located immediately adjacent to Item C1 site should be given more weight;
 - (e) Article 29 of Basic Law stated that 'the homes and other premises of Hong Kong residents shall be inviolable'. The proposed housing development at the representation sites posed adverse impacts on the existing residents and it was in breach of the Basic Law;
 - (f) the government officials had no knowledge of the local context.

He doubted whether the future residents of the proposed housing development would complain about the activities of burning joss paper at Chiu Shun Road; and

- (g) the current rezoning proposal was poor as no SWOT analysis was conducted.

34. In response to Mr Chan Kam Tim's query on Members' conflict of interest, the Vice-Chairperson clarified that Members had declared interests at the beginning of the meeting and there was an established mechanism for Members to update their interests in accordance with the Board's Practice and Procedures.

R472 – Cheung Fung Kiu

35. Ms Cheung Fung Kiu made the following points:

- (a) the current population of TKO was about 400,000 and would be increased to 447,000 with the completion of developments in TKO South. The major transport facilities were the MTR and TKO Tunnel. While the population continued to increase, the traffic problem was not resolved. Firstly, it was expected that the future residents of the proposed housing developments would rely on the MTR for commuting. It would be problematic if there was any breakdown of MTR services. The proposed housing developments at Item B and C1 sites were infill developments, which would overload the Hang Hau MTR Station. Secondly, the TKO Tunnel, which was completed in 1990s, was designed for a population of about 200,000. It was questionable whether the tunnel could cope with the additional population;
- (b) the living environment of the proposed housing development at Item C1 site was not desirable. It would lead to wall effect and affect the wind flow;

- (c) TKO Hospital was planned to serve a population of 300,000. It was questionable how it could cope with the current population of 400,000 and the population of more than 600,000 upon full development;
- (d) there were other alternatives for land supply in the short and medium terms. For example, the Liber Research Community indicated that there were 927 sites with a total area of 142 ha, which could be used for development in the short-term. Other alternatives such as Wang Chau brownfield sites and Fanling Golf Course, which were much bigger than the representation sites, were also available;
- (e) the current vacancy rate of public housing units was about 0.5% constituting 3,700 units. The Government could make use of these vacant units to accommodate those in need; and
- (f) the Government should resolve the housing shortage problem with the population policy by controlling the number of “one-way permit” entrants.

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

R560 – Maggie Ho

36. Ms Maggie Ho made the following points:

- (a) greening was important to human health. It was particularly important for the residents in TKO, where there was a landfill. The “GB” sites also provided a breathing space for the residents, which were good for physical and mental health;

- (b) the planning of TKO was inferior to that of Shatin in that there were many locally unwanted land uses designated within TKO. The residents in TKO had been suffering from the densely-populated development for years;
- (c) the local consultation for the rezoning exercise was not adequate. It was noted that SKDC opposed to the proposed amendments and more than 90% of the public comments were objections;
- (d) the proposed housing development would adversely affect the ruin of water dam near Little Hawaii Trail;
- (e) the result of the preliminary environmental study (PES) report had not been fully disclosed;
- (f) the Director of Planning serving as the Chairperson of RNTPC involved conflict of interest; and
- (g) she only received the Paper seven days before the meeting and there was not sufficient time for her to go through the bulky document.

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

R686/C5 – Mary Mulvihill

37. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following points:

- (a) different people had different views on how to make better use of land resource but it should not be an excuse to rezone “G/IC”, “GB” sites and open space for building more housing units. The Government should address such issues as Small House Policy and brownfield sites to tackle the housing problem;

- (b) the removal of the 15,000 trees would have impact on the general environment. As per the previous experience in projects such as Star Avenue in Tsim Sha Tsui, it was difficult to transplant or compensate the removed trees. The loss of trees not only resulted in the loss of habitats, but also the loss of green spaces for the TKO residents, who had been suffering from the impacts of the landfill in the district;
- (c) the 2017 Policy Address mentioned that a range of community facilities would be provided in the territory. There was also an urgent need to provide elderly facilities. It was questionable why the “G/IC” site at Chiu Shun Road, which was readily available, was not used for providing these facilities;
- (d) in the representation hearing for Sha Tin OZP, the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) indicated that the single-block development was not suitable for public rental housing, but could be used for subsidised sale flat development. In the case of TKO, the representation sites were to be used for single-block public rental housing, which was contradictory to HKHA’s previous stance;
- (e) the judgment of the judicial review in relation to the draft OZPs of Hoi Ha, Pak Lap and So Lo Pun areas ruled that the Board should inquire into matters raised by the representations before endorsing the OZPs;
- (f) she had concerns on the piecemeal approach of planning TKO and quoted a proposal done by Farrells;
- (g) an interim consultation should be in place to resolve any misunderstanding of the local residents before proceeding to gazette the proposed amendments; and

- (h) the current “GB” rezoning proposal was not in line with the planning concept of TKO as shown in PlanD’s website, that was “the rest of the sub-region will mainly be planned for conservation and recreation purposes with low-density residential developments at suitable locations to form the hinterland of the New Town”.

R699 – Cheung Wai Chiu

38. Mr Cheung Wai Chiu made the following points:

- (a) it was currently difficult to board the train at TKO Station. The government representatives stated that the train frequency would be increased with the completion of the upgrading of the signaling system. However, currently, the train frequency at MTR TKO Line was about one train trip per minute during the peak hour. It was questionable how the train frequency could be further enhanced;
- (b) similar to Tsui Lam Estate, the representation sites were also at the fringe of the town centre where feeder transport services such as bus and minibus, would be required to connect the developments to the nearby MTR stations. Taking Tsui Lam as an example, residents often had to wait for 10 minibuses before getting on board. These feeder transport services might overload the local traffic;
- (c) the construction cost of TKO-LTT was high and might have to charge a higher toll fee and would discourage the usage. It was therefore doubtful whether TKO-LTT could help resolve the traffic problem in TKO; and
- (d) it was also questionable whether other new infrastructure projects such as the new bus-to-bus interchange at TKO Tunnel Toll Plaza in support of the development of the former Anderson Road Quarry site, would induce more traffic to TKO Tunnel.

R729 – Mak Ka King

39. Mr Mak Ka King made the following points:
- (a) he had been living in Tsui Lam of TKO for 30 years. Tsui Lam was located away from the town centre. He witnessed and suffered from the lagging behind provision of supporting public transport facilities. Item A site was similar in that it was far away from the town centre and would require shuttle bus to connect the site to MTR stations; and
 - (b) the conditions of the five representation sites were similar to that of Tsui Lam which would be subject to lacking of sufficient transport facilities. The living environment of the five representation sites would not be desirable.

R731 – Lui Man Kwong (SKDC member)

40. Mr Lui Man Kwong made the following points:
- (a) according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), “GB” was “to primarily conserve the existing natural environment amid the built-up areas/at the urban fringe, to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, to define the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features, to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets, with a general presumption against development”. It was doubtful why these “GB” sites, which had been assumed not suitable for development, were now considered appropriate for rezoning for residential uses. While he had no objection to build more housing units, the Government should consider the local context and whether the identified sites were suitable for development. The

Government should clearly explain the criteria of selecting particular “GB” sites for rezoning;

- (b) TKO Tunnel and MTR were the main transport facilities for TKO. In 2014, the loading of TKO Line during the morning peak was about 102%. Upon completion of the proposed housing developments, the condition of TKO Station would be critical. Also, it was doubtful if TKO-LTT could alleviate the traffic problem in TKO, in view of the fact that the CKR was still under construction and Trunk Road T2 was only under design;
- (c) the ecological importance of the representation sites should be observed. While the technical assessments conducted by CEDD confirmed that the impacts on the ecological habitat of these sites were unavoidable, it was contentious why these sites were selected for development;
- (d) there were alternative land supply sources, such as brownfield sites and abandoned military sites. Priority should be given to developing those areas before rezoning “GB” sites; and
- (e) the Government did not respect public views to proceed with the proposed amendments while SKDC had opposed and large number of objections had been received.

R734 – 海悅豪園業主委員會

41. Mr Lai Wai Hung made the following points:

- (a) it was unreasonable that the Government had sold out all developable land in TKO for private residential developments and then rezoned the “GB” sites for public housing development;

- (b) according to CEDD's previous study, the planned population of TKO was 400,000. Together with the additional population of 50,000 and 100,000 at TKO South and TKO Area 137 respectively, as well as the estimated population growth of 50,000, there would be over 600,000 people living in TKO. This would lead to deficit in the provision of community facilities and a very crowded living environment. It was unfair to both the existing and future residents in TKO;
- (c) Hang Hau had the highest development intensity, but with the least open space provision in TKO. The proposed housing development in Hang Hau would affect the wind corridor while the Hang Hau residents were already suffering from the problem of wall effect and poor air quality; and
- (d) the wet market in Hang Hau was no longer affordable for the residents after renovation. It was not able to meet the demand of residents in Hang Hau.

R739 – Lai Wai Tong

42. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lai Wai Tong made the following points:

- (a) he referred to the definitions of terms including “GB”, “urban sprawl” and “sustainable development” adopted from various sources and questioned that the rezoning of these “GB” sites would defeat their original purposes;
- (b) Professor Wong Koon Kwai of the Department of Geography of the Hong Kong Baptist University indicated that simply increasing the land supply would not help solve the long-term housing problem and a reasonable population policy would be required. To build a

sustainable city without compromising the environment and the living standard, it was necessary to evaluate the carrying capacity of the city;

- (c) the key problems of Hong Kong were the lack of population policy and the defect of land use planning policy which led to infill developments in TKO; and
- (d) the issues now faced by the TKO residents included the saturated carrying capacity of the rail and road networks, the deficit in healthcare services, and the insufficient provision of supporting facilities. The current planning in TKO was not able to meet the need of the residents and the proposed housing developments would further aggravate these problems. With the completion of TKO Area 137 development, the population of TKO would increase to 600,000. However, the Government did not have any plan to increase the supporting facilities in TKO.

R755 – WWF-HK

43. With the aid of the PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chan Chung Ming, Andrew made the following points:

- (a) in the deliberation session on 13.2.2015 (1074th TPB meeting) of the Tai Po OZP amendments, the then Vice-Chairman mentioned that “the existing condition of the “GB” sites and whether they were performing the intended function of a buffer and landscape area should be given more weight”. Mr. K. K. Ling, the then Director of Planning also pointed out that “site history was one of the considerations that would be taken into account during the site selection process. Under normal circumstances, priority would be given to preserve those “GB” sites which were in natural state and had remained intact”;

- (b) as shown in the aerial photos and site photos, among the five representation sites, four (Item A, B, D and E sites) were currently covered by intact vegetation. The dominant habitat of these four sites was mainly secondary woodlands and mostly comprised of native / self-seeded plant species. The maturity and structural complexity could be further enhanced through natural succession over time. They were also ecologically linked to the adjacent hill streams, watercourse and secondary woodland. Species of conservation importance such as *Aquilaria sinensis* and *Gnetum luofuense* were recorded. These sites were subject to limited disturbance and of “moderate” to “moderate to high” ecological value;
- (c) the four representation sites with vegetation cover were ecologically linked to the surrounding secondary woodland. They were performing important buffer function to prevent encroachment by development into the inner secondary woodlands, which was in line with the planning intention of "GB" zone;
- (d) the development of TKO New Town had commenced since 1983 and the four sites had survived from the urbanisation process. There was only little disturbance to the vegetation at their fringes, thus they were all in natural state and remained intact; and
- (e) balance between conservation and development could not be reflected in this GB rezoning exercise as the proposed sites were ecologically sensitive. As such, the four representation sites should be preserved.

R756 – KFBG

C4 – Ada Ho

C6 – Vicky Chan

44. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Nip Hin Ming made the following points:

- (a) the Government claimed that there was a lack of land supply for housing development in Hong Kong. However, there were many brownfield sites in the rural area being used for various operations such as rural workshops, temporary car parks and open storage uses. Some of the brownfield sites were large in scale and largely vacant, which could be used for public housing development;
- (b) it was doubtful that there was no more suitable land for housing in Hong Kong. In the old urban areas, the urban renewal projects comprised mainly luxury residential developments, instead of public housing development for the low-income residents. The Government had also sold out the former public housing sites for private residential developments. While the ratio of public to private housing units was 60:40 as set out in the Long Term Housing Strategy (LTHS), he queried why the Government could not designate more land for public housing development in the recent development proposals such as Tung Chung New Town Extension and Yuen Long South Development Area;
- (c) among the five representation sites, 4 (Item A, B, D and E sites) were covered by intact vegetation. The proposed public housing developments would lead to the removal of 15,000 trees, and only 160 trees would be transplanted. The survival rate of those transplanted trees was uncertain, which would finally result in a net loss in green area;
- (d) greeneries were necessary for a healthy community. Green belts and country parks were important for the well-being of all Hong Kong people. They served as a breathing space for the residents.

According to the statistics provided by AFCD, the number of visitors to country parks in Hong Kong was about 13 million in 2017. The Little Hawaii Trail, which was a popular trail for Hong Kong people, would be affected by the proposed housing development;

- (e) it was not reasonable to rezone the representation sites for public housing development. The total area of the five sites was about 11.2 ha and would provide about 11,260 public housing units. On the other hand, with the area of about 172 ha, the Fanling Golf Course would only provide 13,200 units according to the Government's estimation and argument to retain the trees. It was questionable why the trees in the Fanling Golf Course were required to be preserved while those in the five representation sites could be felled;
- (f) the Board had no obligation to follow the Government's policy initiative and accept "GB" rezoning proposals. In early 2015, the representations for protecting the "GB" zones at Tai Po were upheld by the Board and thereby protecting at least two pieces of well-vegetated "GB" zones from the rezoning proposal submitted by the Government. At that time, the Board considered that the proposed residential development on the sites which required substantial felling of trees was unacceptable and the existing condition of the "GB" sites and whether they were performing the intended function of a buffer and landscape area should be given more weight;
- (g) the Item A, B, D, and E sites were integral parts of a larger "GB" or well-wooded zone and well connected with country parks and conservation areas ecologically. These sites had important landscape value as intended by the original "GB" zoning, which served as buffer for the surrounding high-density residential areas.

The rezoning of these sites would lead to substantial felling of trees;
and

- (h) in 2014, the Government indicated that only those “GB” sites with relatively lower value as conservation or buffer zones, including sites which were close to developed areas with existing infrastructure and potential for further development, would be considered for residential development. The Item A, B, D, and E sites obviously did not match with these criteria.

R791 – 將軍澳原居民代表陳吉祥、陳培根

R800 – 吳慧心

R810 – 陳六仔

R813 – 吳穎謙

45. Mr Chiang Yam Wang, Allan made the following points:

- (a) as indicated in paragraph 6.3.21 of the Paper, CEDD confirmed that the development at the sites would inevitably affect some rare and native species such as the existing *Aquilaria sinensis*, *Pavetta hongkongensis* and *Pyrenaria spectabilis*. However, the Paper did not mention that *Aquilaria sinensis* was scheduled under Cap. 586 Protection of Endangered Species of Animals and Plants Ordinance and was listed as vulnerable on the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List. It was questionable whether the affected species of conservation importance could be transplanted to other locations. The Paper only stated that AFCD noted the assessment of the ecological assessment and the proposed mitigation measures. The proposed "GB" rezoning was contradictory to the objective of AFCD which was to conserve the natural environment;

- (b) Little Hawaii Trail was a popular hiking trail for residents and visitors. Although the Government proposed to divert only a section of Little Hawaii Trail to facilitate the development and the associated road improvement works, it would still affect the ecology and reduce the public enjoyment of places;
- (c) regarding the traffic impact, as mentioned in paragraph 6.3.9 of the Paper, the v/c ratio for TKO Tunnel and TKO-LTT would be 0.95 and 0.91 in 2029 (five years after population intake) respectively indicating both tunnels would be operating with spare capacity. It was not certain how the figures were derived and whether most of the time the v/c ratio exceeded 1.0. Also, in paragraph 6.3.10 of the Paper, it was stated that the housing development at the five representation sites would not pose unacceptable impact to TKO Line but no data was given to support it; and
- (d) as mentioned in paragraph 6.3.40 of the Paper, the Item A site was not a suitable location for residential development in view of its close proximity to the TKO 400kV substation and the site was prone to natural terrain hazard. As advised by CEDD/HD, Preliminary Natural Terrain Hazard assessment was conducted for the Preliminary Feasibility Study (PFS). Item A site fell within the “Alert” criteria. There was a concern on the cost-effectiveness of the proposed housing development. As indicated in paragraph 6.3.45 of the Paper, HD only advised that optimal and cost-effective layout would be designed, as far as practicable, to meet the acute public housing demand. It was questionable whether the cost-effectiveness issue could be resolved.

R916 – Tam Chung San

46. Mr Tam Chung San made the following points:

- (a) the LOHAS Park had long been lack of GIC facilities and residents needed to travel to Hang Hau for these facilities. The provision of transport facilities including MTR and bus services were also limited. The population in the LOHAS Park had been increasing in view of the newly completed residential developments in the area. The proposed housing development at Item E site would create extra burden to the existing community and transport facilities;
- (b) the proposed housing development would affect the ecological value of the natural environment;
- (c) developments on slope would incur higher development and maintenance costs which was not cost-effective;
- (d) the proposed development would create wall effect and affect the air quality in TKO; and
- (e) the Government should consider speeding up the development in TKO Area 137, which would be a more comprehensive development.

R994/C3 – 坑口民生及地區計劃關注協會

47. Mr Choi Ming Hei made the following points:

- (a) the existing population of TKO already reached 400,000, which was close to the planned population. Together with the additional population generated from the developments in TKO South and former Anderson Road Quarry, there would be over 610,000 people living in TKO. The Paper stated that the provision of open space and a range of GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the need of the planned population in TKO, which included the increase in population arising from the proposed public housing

developments in accordance with the requirements in the HKPSG. The Government should consider providing those planned GIC facilities and completing all relevant technical assessments before proceeding with those proposed housing developments. Priority should also be given to the development of TKO Area 137 and other brownfield sites;

- (b) the proposed housing development would result in various environmental impacts including the removal of 16,000 trees, visual impact and air ventilation issues. Retaining walls would be required for developments on slope which might incur extra maintenance cost;
- (c) the transport facilities in TKO were inadequate. The carrying capacity of MTR TKO Line had exceeded 100%. Even with the upgrading of the signaling system, it was still difficult to cope with the additional population induced by the proposed housing developments. The TKO tunnel was also severely congested, with a v/c ratio of 1.2 in 2016. It was doubtful if the TKO-LTT could be in place by 2021;
- (d) the provision of GIC facilities such as wet market, medical services, schools, libraries and elderly care facilities was inadequate in TKO;
- (e) the materials and information for the “GB” rezoning provided for consideration by SKDC were too flimsy and could not address the concerns of the members. The Government should provide various technical assessments in details for consideration by the SKDC and the local residents; and
- (f) priority should be given to developing TKO Area 137, existing brownfield sites and the Fanling Golf Course before rezoning the “GB” sites.

C2 – HKBWS

48. With the aid of the PowerPoint presentation, Ms Wong Suet Mei made the following points:

- (a) according to the draft OZP, the planning intention of “GB” zone was primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There was a general presumption against development within this zone. Chapter 10 of HKPSG also stated that the Town Planning Ordinance empowered the Board to prepare town plans with statutory land use zones under clause 4(1)(g) for country parks, coastal protection areas, sites of special scientific interest, green belts or other specified uses to promote conservation or protection of the environment;

- (b) the Government had changed the approach of the “GB” review. It was mentioned in Policy Address 2011-12 that “GB” sites which were devegetated, deserted or formed, thus no longer performing their original functions, would be converted into housing sites. In Policy Address 2013, it was stated that 13 sites in “GB” areas, which were devegetated, deserted or formed, would be considered suitable for rezoning for residential use and PlanD was engaged in the next stage of Green Belt review, with the purpose of releasing more sites for housing development. In 2013, the Secretary for Development mentioned in “My Blog” that the “GB” review had entered its second stage. “GB” sites, which were in the fringe of built-up areas that were closer to existing urban areas and new towns, as well as supporting infrastructure facilities, vegetated but had an insignificant buffering effect and relatively low conservation value, would be considered suitable for urban expansion;

- (c) it was noted that the Item A, B, D and E sites and the surrounding areas were in fact performing buffer function and most of the secondary woodland located within these sites had been evaluated to have “moderate” or even “moderate to high” ecological values. As such, these sites were still performing the functions of a green belt, and thus the “GB” zones should be retained; and
- (d) the current rezoning of vegetated “GB” sites was inconsistent with the second stage “GB” review criteria. It would undermine the good planning intention of “GB” zones. It would also set an undesirable precedent for more similar “GB” rezoning for development, leading to a loss in “GB” zones in Hong Kong. Vegetated green belts with ecological value and buffering effect should only be considered for development when other suitable land options were exhausted.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung returned to join the meeting during the presentation. Mr Daniel K. S. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point. Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Professor John C.Y. Ng left the meeting during the presentation.]

49. As the presentation from government’s representatives, representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question-and-answer (Q&A) session. The Vice-Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and would invite the government’s representatives and/or representers/commenters and their 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 Vice-Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

Land Use Planning and Housing Supply

50. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the programme of the development of TKO Area 137;
- (b) whether there would be other “GB” rezoning proposals in TKO;
- (c) why the “GB” sites were proposed for development; and
- (d) whether all “GB” sites which were devegetated, deserted or formed had been reviewed.

51. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) the Government was currently undertaking a Planning and Engineering study for Re-planning of TKO Area 137 for residential, commercial and other development uses, which was expected to be completed in 2019. Subject to the technical feasibility of development at TKO Area 137, it was roughly estimated that it would take about 10 years to implement the project. While the development in TKO Area 137 was a medium to long-term land supply measure, there was a need to develop the five representation sites to meet the short to medium-term housing needs;
- (b) nine sites in TKO had been identified for public housing developments under the “GB” review. According to the findings of the PFS, it was concluded that there was no insurmountable technical problem for the proposed public housing development in five of the sites. These five sites involved about 1.47% of the original “GB” zone on the OZP. As for the remaining sites, the rezoning proposal would be subject to further study;
- (c) the land use zoning would be reviewed from time to time in view of changing planning circumstances. The Government had adopted a multi-pronged strategy to increase land supply, which included the rezoning of “GB” sites. There were two stages of “GB” review.

The first stage of the “GB” review focused on devegetated, deserted or formed “GB” sites and the second stage covered “GB” sites in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and new towns. These “GB” sites, though vegetated, had relatively less buffering effect and lower conservation value. As these sites were close to supporting infrastructure facilities, they were considered having good potential to be rezoned for housing purpose; and

- (d) the second stage of the GB review was already underway, and would focus on sites located on the fringe of urban or new towns, with relatively lower value as buffer zones in particular sites which were close to developed areas with existing infrastructure and potential for further development.

Traffic and Transport Aspects

52. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) when the TKO-LTT and planned Cross Bay Link (CBL) would be completed;
- (b) proposed measures and traffic arrangements to address the traffic problem; and
- (c) whether the completion of the infrastructure projects would be lagged behind the proposed housing developments.

53. Mr Eric N.T. Chiang, CE/E1, CEDD made the following response:

- (a) the TKO-LTT was under construction and expected to be completed in 2021. The CBL was subject to funding approval by LegCo Finance Committee. Subject to the funding approval, the CBL was planned to commence construction in 2018 for completion in 2022;

- (b) improvement measures were proposed to alleviate the traffic concerns. Key traffic improvement measures included the widening of Ying Yip Road by providing an additional northbound climbing lane, providing a new access road for connection with the site north of TKO Village, improvements at junction of Po Lam Road North/Po Hong Road and conversion of roundabout at Po Ning Road/Sheung Ning Road/Ying Yip Road to a signalized junction. In view of safety concern on the bend at Ying Yip Road, a footbridge and associated lift towers instead of at-grade crossing were proposed at Item B site to provide a passage across the road. Item C and D sites were within walking distance of MTR Hang Hau Station and Po Lam Station respectively, and there were also existing Green Mini Bus (GMB) /bus routes near these sites. In this connection, these two sites could be served by MTR, GMB/bus routes. Item A, B and E sites were beyond walking distance of MTR stations. Hence, feeder-bus services and GMB to/from nearby MTR stations were proposed to serve residents of these three sites. Long haul bus routes might be provided to meet the public transport demand of these sites, subject to further investigation at the next stage of the Project; and
- (c) the population intake of the five proposed housing developments would be in 2024. The TKO-LTT and CBL were expected to be completed in 2021 and 2022 respectively. Also, Shatin Central Link (SCL) would serve as the fourth cross-harbour railway line. With the full commissioning of SCL in 2021, it was anticipated that some passengers who travelled via the existing MTR Tsuen Wan Line, TKO Line and Tung Chung Line for crossing the harbour would switch to SCL for their cross-harbour journey. The completion of the upgrading of signaling system of TKO Line in 2021 would also be conducive to relieving the burden of the existing TKO Line. It was anticipated that the performance forecast of

TKO Line (Yau Tong to Quarry Bay section) with the proposed housing developments would be 84% in 2031, as compared to 81% without the proposed housing developments. The proposed East Kowloon Line (EKL) was not taken into account in the Preliminary Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment (TTIA).

Ecological and Environmental Impacts

54. Some Members raised the following questions on the ecological survey conducted by CEDD:

- (a) whether the habitat map had missed any information on the native species along Little Hawaii Trail;
- (b) whether the seedlings of *Aquilaria sinensis* would be transplanted;
- (c) whether the diversion of a section of Little Hawaii Trail would affect the riparian zone of an existing stream; and
- (d) whether the existing stream and ruin of the water dam would be affected by the proposed development.

55. Mr Eric N.T. Chiang, CE/E1, CEDD made the following responses:

- (a) the plant species along Little Hawaii Trail in the vicinity of Item A site had been listed in the PES report. *Aquilaria sinensis* and *Pyrenaria spectabilis* were also found within the Item A site. According to the broad brush tree survey for the five representation sites, a total of about 15,250 existing trees would be affected, of which 15,090 trees and 160 trees were proposed to be felled and transplanted respectively. Preliminary locations of potential woodland compensation areas in the vicinity of the representation sites had been identified, within which about 25,800 trees were

proposed to be planted;

- (b) about 160 number of trees would be transplanted including the *Aquilaria sinensis* subject to the detailed tree survey;
- (c) the Little Hawaii Trail, with a length of 1.2km, connected Tseng Lan Shue to TKO Village. A section of the Little Hawaii Trail (about 160m) would be diverted in view of the proposed housing development at Item A site. As for the section of semi-natural stream to be affected by the proposed access road and the diverted section of Little Hawaii Trail, the PFS also recommended to introduce green channels for re-provision of the affected/diverted watercourses which would be considered at the detailed design stage of the project as far as practicable; and
- (d) the ecological survey had covered the area within 500m of Item A site including the affected section of the Little Hawaii Trail. Majority of the riparian zone of the existing semi-natural stream and the popular water dam would not be affected by the proposed development at Item A site.

56. Some Members raised the following questions on the conservation value of the representation sites:

- (a) the views of the AFCD on the rare plant species being found in the rezoning sites;
- (b) whether those rare plant species could only be revealed in detailed tree surveys;
- (c) whether the proposed housing developments at the “GB” sites were acceptable from conservation point of view;

- (d) the condition of the existing stream flowing from Tseng Lan Shue;
- (e) the acceptability of the transplantation proposal;
- (f) the importance of *Aquilaria sinensis*; and
- (g) how to determine the ecological importance of a site and whether it could be quantified.

57. Ms C.Y. Ho, SNC/S, AFCD made the following responses:

- (a) the ecological surveys by the consultants and those by the representers were undertaken at different times and this might have led to the difference in the survey results. The plant species mentioned by the representers such as *Aquilaria sinensis* were not uncommon in the territory;
- (b) for the purpose of assessing the ecological impact of a land use rezoning proposal, usually ecological assessment of a broad-brush nature would be required, as detailed tree surveys could be carried out when the engineering design and building layout were available to reveal whether and how individual trees could be preserved;
- (c) from the ecological perspective, rezoning a “GB” site for development was not ideal. However, when relevant government departments put forward development proposals of major public interest, AFCD would provide professional advice on the acceptability of the ecological assessments associated with these proposals;
- (d) there was no Ecologically Important Stream in TKO. The existing stream to the further west of the Item A site was natural and the condition was good;

- (e) as the proposed housing sites were mostly on slopes and site formation works would be required, AFCD would presume a loss of all vegetation therein when considering the ecological impact of the land use rezoning and the transplantation proposal would not be a major factor of consideration;
- (f) *Aquilaria sinensis* especially its seedlings were often found in natural woodland habitats, therefore any development proposals affecting such habitats would likely result in impact to this species; and
- (g) the ecological importance of a site would be subject to a number of factors such as the size of the site, the habitat types, its structural complexity, biodiversity, the presence of important flora/fauna species, the ecological linkages, etc., all of which would be difficult to be quantified.

58. Some Members raised the following questions for the representers' representatives:

- (a) the quantity of *Aquilaria sinensis* found in Item D site;
- (b) the conditions for Item A site to change from grassland to densely vegetated plantation area over the years as shown in the PowerPoint slide provided by R62;
- (c) whether the ecological impact would be reduced if the boundary of Item A site was shifted to the north in order to avoid encroaching onto the secondary woodland in the south;
- (d) the importance of *Aquilaria sinensis*; and

- (e) how long it would take for the seedlings of *Aquilaria sinensis* to be fully grown.

59. The representers' representatives made the following responses:

- (a) Dr Ng Ying Sim, the representative of R62, indicated that a number of *Aquilaria sinensis* which were large in size and a couple of young/semi-mature *Aquilaria sinensis* were found in Yau Yue Wan Village;
- (b) the representatives of R62, Mr Ng Hei Man Roy and Dr Ng Ying Sim, pointed out that the northern part of Item A site was a plantation area while the southern part was a secondary woodland. It was considered that afforestation with fast-growing species might have been carried out in the plantation area. The environment of Item A site was in general favourable for the growth of trees. Diverse tree-related structures including multi-layered canopies and canopy gaps, greatly varying tree heights and diameters, and diverse tree species were found in the area, which provided diverse wildlife habitats. It usually took about 20 to 30 years for the development of a plantation area and about 50 to 60 years for the formation of a secondary woodland;
- (c) Mr Nip Hin Ming, the representative of R756, responded that shifting the boundary of Item A site to the north would isolate the secondary woodland in the south and affect its ecological linkage with the surrounding area;
- (d) Dr Ng Ying Sim, the representative of R62, responded that *Aquilaria sinensis* was endemic to China and was nearly threatened. It was scheduled under Cap. 586 Protection of Endangered Species of Animals and Plants Ordinance and listed as vulnerable on the IUCN Red List. Due to the illegal felling of this species, wild

populations had become rare and large trees become uncommon. The local populations of *Aquilaria sinensis* in Hong Kong might represent some of the remaining healthy populations in China, and were of conservation value; and

- (e) Dr Ng Ying Sim, the representative of R62, responded that it would take decades for the seedlings of *Aquilaria sinensis* to be fully grown.

60. Noting that a representer quoted part of the minutes for the deliberation session on 13.2.2015 (1074th TPB meeting) of the Tai Po OZP amendments on the consideration of “GB” rezoning, a Member enquired about the relevance of the quoted part. The Vice-Chairperson said that it would be more appropriate for the Board to be acquainted with the minutes in full to establish its relevance. The Secretariat of the Board then provided a full set of the minutes for Members’ reference at the meeting.

Provision of GIC Facilities

61. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the original planned use of the previous “G/IC” portion of Item C1 site;
- (b) whether government departments had made any request to provide GIC facilities in the previous “G/IC” portion of Item C1 site;
- (c) any deficit in GIC provision in TKO; and
- (d) the age profile of TKO and the provision of elderly facilities in TKO.

62. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) the previous “G/IC” portion of Item C1 site was a temporary works area by Highways Department with no long-term planned use;
- (b) government departments had been consulted on the proposed rezoning of the representation sites. No request had been received on reserving the previous “G/IC” portion of Item C1 site for provision of GIC facilities. Having said that, various social welfare facilities including elderly care facilities could be provided in the proposed housing developments upon departments’ request;
- (c) the provision of open space and a range of GIC facilities, except for primary school classrooms, hospital beds and clinic/health centre, were generally adequate to meet the need of the planned population in TKO in accordance with the requirements in the HKPSG. A table summarising the provision of GIC facilities, which were based on population, had been attached to the Paper. On provision of primary school, the Education Bureau (EDB) advised that it was anticipated that there would be surplus supply of public sector primary school places in Sai Kung District as there were still a number of planned school sites in TKO which were yet to be developed. EDB would keep under review the latest population projections in the district and launch the school building programmes concerned as and when appropriate. For the shortfall of hospital beds, Food and Health Bureau (FHB) advised that Hospital Authority (HA) had taken into account a number of factors in planning for its service, including the increase in service demand as a result of population growth and demographic changes, advancement of medical technology, manpower availability as well as organization of services of clusters and hospitals and the service demand of local community. HA planned its services on cluster basis. Hospitals in the cluster were playing different roles and supplemented each other to provide a full range of medical services

(including Obstetrics and Gynecology service) to the residents in the catchment area. It was noted in the Ten-year Hospital Development Plan for the Kowloon Region of HA that Haven of Hope Hospital would be expanded with 160 additional beds and United Christian Hospital with 560 additional beds. For the provision of public wet market in TKO, there were existing wet markets operated by the Link and in private developments. The Food, Environment and Health Department (FEHD) would review the need of providing public wet market in the area. Also, an Indoor Swimming Pool had been planned in Area 65. As a number of sports facilities had been provided in TKO, such as Hong Kong Velodrome, there might not be an imminent need to provide an additional sports ground in TKO based on a planned population of about 480,000; and

- (d) according to the 2016 Population By-census, 14% of the population in TKO aged above 65. Currently, according to the HKPSG, the provision of elderly facilities was not population-based, but subject to individual circumstances of each district and at the advice of SWD. HD advised that social welfare facilities, such as residential care home for elderly, day care centre and child care centre, as well as kindergarten had been initially planned at the public housing developments. HD would further liaise with concerned departments and the EDB on exact provisions and locations of such facilities.

Consultation with SKDC

63. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether sufficient information was provided to SKDC during the consultation; and

- (b) whether any adjustment had been made to the amendment items in view of the SKDC's objection.

64. Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, PlanD made the following responses:

- (a) SKDC was consulted in accordance with the established mechanism. A paper detailing the findings of the PFS and the proposed rezoning of the five representation sites was prepared for consideration by the SKDC. The technical assessments, which contained very technical details, were not attached to the DC paper, but they had been deposited in CEDD's office for public inspection; and
- (b) the major concerns raised by SKDC members were on the extra burden on the existing transport infrastructures and community facilities arising from the additional housing developments. As details in the RNTPC paper, relevant technical assessments had been conducted and it was confirmed that there was no insurmountable technical problems in developing the five representative sites for housing developments with the implementation of the proposed mitigation measures. Also, the provision of open space and a range of GIC facilities were generally adequate to meet the need of the planned population in TKO. In view that the concerns of DC members would be satisfactorily addressed, it was considered that the rezoning of the five representation sites was appropriate. Concerns of DC members and TKO residents on traffic impact and provision of GIC facilities including social welfare facilities would be further addressed in the detailed design of the housing development projects.

[Mr Peter K.T. Yuen left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

65. As Members did not have any further questions, the Vice-Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. He thanked the government

representatives as well as the representers/commenter and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives as well as the representers/commenter and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

66. The meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m..