

**Minutes of the 1173rd Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on
17.5.2018, 21.5.2018 and 25.5.2018**

Present

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)

Transport Department

Mr Eddie S.K. Leung (17.5.2018 and 21.5.2018)

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr C.S. Lee (25.5.2018)

Chief Engineer (Works)

Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Elvis W.K. Au (17.5.2018 and 21.5.2018)

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment Group),
Environmental Protection Department

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung (25.5.2018)

Assistant Director (Regional 1)

Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang (17.5.2018 a.m., 21.5.2018 and 25.5.2018)

Assistant Director (Regional 3)

Lands Department

Ms Angela S.C. Chan (17.5.2018 p.m.)

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun

Chief Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (17.5.2018 a.m. and 25.5.2018 p.m.)

Ms W.H. Ho (17.5.2018 p.m. and 21.5.2018 a.m.)

Mr Kepler S.Y. Yuen (21.5.2018 p.m.)

Senior Town Planners/Town Planning Board

Mr Raymond H.F. Au (17.5.2018 a.m.)

Ms Annie H.Y. Wong (17.5.2018 p.m.)

Mr T.C. Cheng (21.5.2018 a.m.)

Miss Anissa W.Y. Lai (21.5.2018 p.m.)

Mr Alex C.Y. Kiu (25.5.2018 p.m.)

1. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session on 17.5.2018:

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

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong)
Transport Department
Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

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

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Elvis W.K. Au

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

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/16
(TPB Paper No. 10425)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

2. The Secretary reported that the following Members has declared interests on the item for owning properties in the area, being associated / having business dealings 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 consultants of the Preliminary Feasibility Study (FS) and technical assessments supporting the proposed public housing developments conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)), World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF-HK)(R4332), the Ebenezer School and Home for the Visually Impaired (Ebenezer School)(R4336) and Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1787/C129) :

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

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

Professor S.C. Wong - having current business dealings with
(*Vice-chairperson*) ARUP and being a traffic consultant of
ARUP

- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with ARUP and past business dealings with HKHA and owning a flat at Bel-Air

- Dr C.H. Hau - his institute having current business dealings with HKHA and being a former member of the Conservation Advisory Committee of WWF-HK

- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] dealings with HKHA, Arup and Ebenezer School, and hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract basis from time to time

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

- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with HKHA, and co-owning with spouse a flat at Fulham Garden, Pokfulam Road and two units at Chi Fu Fa Yuen

- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with HKHA and ARUP

- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not involved in planning work and ex-employee of Kerry

- Professor T.S. Liu - having current education programme with the Caritas Pokfulam Community Development Project Centre at Pok Fu Lam Village

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong - brother living in Wah Fu Estate (WFE)

3. Members noted that Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Thomas O.S. Ho had tendered apologies for being unable to attend this session of the meeting. As the interest of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan on the item was direct, he should be invited to leave the meeting. Members noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr Franklin Yu, Dr C.H. Hau and Professor T.S. Liu had no direct involvement in the subject public housing projects, and Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong's interest was indirect, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting.

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

4. 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

5. The following government representatives and consultants, as well as representers, commenters and their representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

Housing Department (HD)

- Ms Portia K.H. Yiu - Chief Planning Officer (CPO)
- Mr Theron K.K. Chan - Senior Planning Officer (SPO)
- Mr Joe B.M Leung - Senior Civil Engineer (SCE)
- Mr S.C. Lo - Senior Landscape Architect (SLA)
- Mr Anthony K.C. Chung - Senior Architect (SA)

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

- Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South (SNCO/S)
- Ms Chloe C.U. Ng - Nature Conservation Officer/Hong Kong (NCO/HK)

CEDD

- Mr James W.C. Yip - Senior Engineer (SE)

Consultants

- Professor S.Y. Chan - Associate Director, ARUP
- Dr K. Lo - Associate Director, ARUP
- Mr Chris Lee - Associate, ARUP
- Mr Brad Fong - Senior Engineer, ARUP
- Mr Tommy Hui - Senior Ecologist, AEC Limited

Representers/commenters and their Representatives

R1/C1 - 民建聯南區支部 李慧琮 張國鈞議員辦事處 麥謝巧玲 朱立威區議員辦事處 黃才立社區辦事處 關注華富重建聯盟

R126 - 布愛芳

Mr Wong Choi Lap - Representers' and Commenter'
representative

R2 - Cheung Wai Nam

R115 - 潘富熾

R286 - Liu Wai Man

Mr Cheung Wai Nam - Representer and Representers'
representative

R3 - Cheng Kwok An

Mr Cheng Kwok An - Representer

R61 - Lai Hop Yee

R94 - 朱月妍

R425 - Keung Yee Ching

R465 - 陳靜

R475 - 陳蕙芳

R499 - 鄭玉鳳

R521 - 朱月妍

R532 - 傅榮森

R533 - 馮尉明

R545 - 高至雄

R546 - 高桂英

R547 - Ko Wai Kit

R548 - Ko Chun Kit

R554 - 鄧玉儀

R556 - 郭楚玲

R562 - 郭惠良

R589 - 黎松慶

R607 - 李健全

R611 - 梁梨妮

R627 - Law Pak Chuen

R667 - 譚燕清

R669 - 譚群鳳

R741 - 姜書涵

R742 - 叢改滋

R1067 - 黃翠儀

R1232 - 黎熙琳

Ms Li Shee Lin	-	Representer and Representers' representative
Mr Poon Ping Hong]	Representers' representative
Mr Yim Chun Ho]	

R79 - 陳烈

R1053 - 王麗芳

R1216 - Sinn Sook Fong

Mr Chai Man Hon]	Representers' representative
Mr Kwan Tong Kit]	

R101 - 陳茂遠

Mr Chan Mau Yuen	-	Representer
------------------	---	-------------

R130 - 彭世華

Mr Pang Sai Wah	-	Representer
-----------------	---	-------------

R227 - 張啟明

Mr Cheung Kai Ming	-	Representer
--------------------	---	-------------

R244 - 文靜媚

Ms Man Ching Mei	-	Representer
------------------	---	-------------

R270 - 許文進

Mr Hui Man Chun	-	Representer
-----------------	---	-------------

R281 – 黃秋影

Ms Wong Chau Ying - Representer

R282 - Choi Ngar Shan, Junny

Ms Choi Ngar Shan, Junny - Representer

R628 - 羅鳳仙

Ms Lo Fung Sin - Representer

R671 - 鄧佳洪

Mr Poon Hon Chow - Representer's representative

R676 - 曾榮富

Mr Tsang Wing Fu - Representer

R775 - 陳新民

Mr Chan Sun Man - Representer

R963 - 廖秀珍

Ms Liu Sau Chun, Christina - Representer

R1258 – The Wah Fu Swatow Christian Church

Rev Ng Kar Wai - Representer's representative

R1262 - Paul Zimmerman

R1886 – John Budge

Mr Paul Zimmerman - Representer and Representer's representative

R1274 - 馮錦霞

Ms Fung Kam Har - Representer

R1278 - 譚美寶
R1282 - 朱慶虹
R1283 - 楊燕芳
R1300 - 曾錦仁
R1327 - 曾守賢
R1435 - Kwan Oi Ying
R1436 - Kwan Shiu Kee
R1440 - 鄭榮傑
R1466 - Li Kam Kwong
R1475 - Leung Sui Fun
R1492 - 萬玉如
R1498 - 潘玉屏
R1559 - Chan Sui Wing
R1573 - Cheung Sing Cheong
R1574 - Cheung Wai Ting
R1588 - Fung Sau Chun
R1592 - Fung Suet Yee
R1612 - Kwan Kam Ki
R1613 - Kwan King Hei
R1616 - Kwan Mi Yu
R1618 - Kwan Oi Ki
R1620 - Kwan Wai Yu
R1621 - Kwan Yin Yu
R1639 - Lee Chi Yee
R1642 - Lee Ming Wai
R1644 - Lee Ting Yee
R1648 - Leung Kwok Kwong, Dominic
R1653 - Leung Yuk Mei, Magdalena
R1658 - Louze Wai Gee
R1661 - Lung Mandy
R1662 - Man Yuk Pui
R1701 - Wong Wan Hung
R1707 - Yen Yik Chong, Stephanie

R1708 - Yen Yik Ming, Ernest

R1709 - Yen Yuen Ho, Tony

R1765 - Ho Yuk Ngan

R1766 - Chan Shiu Mo

R2561 - Fong Chung Yu

R2565 - Kwok Hoi Yee

R2566 - Kwok Hoi Kit

R2585 - Lawrence Hon

R3125 - 方知行

R4333 - Kwok Tak Shing

Mr Chu Ching Hong - Representer and Representers' representative

Ms Lo Tsoi Yin - Representers' representative

R1273 - Cheng Kwan Wah

R1390 - 張希豪

R1470 - 梁莉年

R1472 - 梁英年

R1507 - 鄧志鵬

R1566 - Chen Chi Te

R1567 - Chen Chih Ming

R1568 - Chen Shuk Guey

R1602 - Hsu Hui Chu

R1617 - Chen Hui Feng

Ms Hsu Hui Chu - Representer and Representers' representative

R1422 - 何瑞基

Mr Ho Sui Kei - Representer

R1464 - Li Yuk Ching

Ms Li Yuk Ching, Christina - Representer

R1517 - 黃金淑

Ms Wong Kam Shuk - Representer

R1529 - Wu Wing Tsz

Ms Wu Wing Tsz - Representer

R1570 – Cheng Yee Wah

Ms Cheng Yee Wah - Representer

R1696 – Wong Shu Ho

Mr Wong Shu Ho - Representer

R1738 - 陳秀麗

Ms Chan Sau Lai, Sandy - Representer

R1743 – Ho Kit Fun, Polly

Ms Ho Kit Fun, Polly - Representer

R1762 - Lau Ho Fung

R4164 - 王淑華

Mr Lau Ho Fung - Representer and Representers' representative

R1787/C129 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

C83 – 黃澤芳

Ms Yeung Siu Pik - Commenters' representative

6. 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 according to their representation and comment number. To ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer,

commenter or their representative would be allotted 10 minutes for making oral submission. There was a timer device to alert the representers, commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire, and when the allotted time limit was up. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be held after all attending representers, commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government's representatives, representers, commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the representers, commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on all the representations and comments in a closed meeting after hearing all the oral submissions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

7. The Secretary reported that on 16.5.2018, an e-mail was received from Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1787/C129) who raised concerns that the information provided to the representers and commenters was incomplete and thus the participants of the meeting were deprived of the access to information necessary to make an informed presentation. The Secretary said that the arrangement for the hearing including the publication of TPB Paper No. 10425 (the Paper) had been following the Board's established practice and procedure.

8. Ms Mary Mulvihill (R1787/C129) said that since the names of representers and commenters were not provided in the Paper nor in the hyperlinks given in the notice of meeting, the representations and comments could not be read in context. Moreover, such practice was not in line with that adopted in other representation hearings. The Secretary explained that given the large number of representations and comments received, not all the written submissions of representers and commenters were attached to the TPB Paper. That said, in accordance with the established practice of the Board, a full set of the representations and comments had been made available at the Planning Enquiry Counters for public inspection and a gist of representations and an index of comments had been uploaded to the Board's website. The Chairperson said that the views of Ms Mulvihill were noted and would be recorded in the minutes of meeting.

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

10. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, 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 responses on the representations and comments as detailed in the Paper.

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

R1/C1 - 民建聯南區支部 李慧琼 張國鈞議員辦事處 麥謝巧玲 朱立威區議員辦事處 黃才立社區辦事處 關注華富重建聯盟

R126 - 布愛芳

12. Mr Wong Choi Lap made the following main points:

- (a) the OZP amendments were supported and should be approved to facilitate the redevelopment of WFE;
- (b) as several buildings in WFE had been subject to structural problems, maintenance and stabilisation works were on-going everywhere thus creating nuisance to the residents. While adverse impacts of the works should be minimised, the need for the WFE redevelopment (WFER) was imminent;
- (c) since the announcement of the Government's intention to redevelop WFE in 2014, it had taken more than four years for the departments to come up with a more concrete proposal for the WFER. The residents had become impatient about the slow progress of redevelopment;
- (d) though there was scope to further improve the current proposal, the residents of WFE had reluctantly supported it in order to avoid further delay in the redevelopment process;
- (e) before the subject OZP amendments, the residents had made numerous submissions to the Government in support of the redevelopment of WFE. However, the number of supportive representations was significantly fewer

than the opposing ones in the current representation consideration process and it was doubtful if those previous supportive views had been included as supportive representations. Moreover, given the long lead-time involved, some residents had started to query the commitment of the Government to redevelop WFE. The redevelopment process should be expedited to ease the concerns of the residents and to enhance the long term supply of public housing;

- (f) previously, representation sites D and E and the land in between together formed a much larger reception site. However, the two sites were separated under the current proposal, and in particular, representation site D had become isolated from the other reception sites. Pedestrian linkage and access to connect site D with other sites should be carefully examined;
- (g) representation site C was originally zoned “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) on the OZP. To minimise the potential traffic and air ventilation impacts on the adjoining Wah Fu Court, consideration should be given to developing site C for government, institution and community (GIC) uses; and
- (h) it was apparent that most of the opposing representations did not object to the redevelopment of WFE but only specific location of the reception sites. The Government should endeavour to liaise with the stakeholders and respond to their aspirations particularly regarding the concerns on ecological impact so as to expedite the redevelopment process.

R2 - Cheung Wai Nam

R115 - 潘富熾

R286 - Liu Wai Man

13. Mr Cheung Wai Nam made the following main points:

- (a) he was a member of the Mutual Aid Committee of Wah Mei House;

- (b) the OZP amendments were supported. As compared with the previous proposal, the reduction in the total area of the reception sites from 18 to 13 hectares in the current proposal was already a compromise to the objectors. While the number of supportive representations might not be in majority, their views should not be overlooked;
- (c) the need for WFER had been under discussion for over 10 years. The redevelopment of WFE should be expedited in view of the structural safety of the old buildings. In fact, many of the buildings required external structural support and several floors of Wah Cheong House had been vacated for carrying out the reinforcement works;
- (d) as the reception sites were scattered, pedestrian connections such as subways and footbridges should be provided to enable convenient linkages between the reception sites and the original site of WFE and to meet the needs of the elderly people and people with disabilities. That requirement was particularly relevant for representation site D at Kai Lung Wan which was isolated from the main building clusters;
- (e) retail, GIC and open space facilities should be provided at convenient locations to serve the future residents on the reception sites. The existing social welfare and elderly facilities operated by non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in WFE should be reprovisioned on the reception sites; and
- (f) the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) should be commissioned as soon as possible to tie in with WFER.

R3 – Cheng Kwok An

14. Mr Cheng Kwok An made the following main points:

- (a) the redevelopment of WFE was supported;

- (b) there should be provision of government out-patient clinic in WFER to serve the elderly people, thus minimising their needs to travel outside of WFE for medical service; and
- (c) consideration should be given to constructing a 50-storey car park building to solve the traffic and parking problems in the area.

R61 - Lai Hop Yee

R94 - 朱月妍

R425 - Keung Yee Ching

R465 - 陳靜

R475 - 陳蕙芳

R499 - 鄭玉鳳

R521 - 朱月妍

R532 - 傅榮森

R533 - 馮尉明

R545 - 高至雄

R546 - 高桂英

R547 - 高偉杰

R548 - 高俊杰

R554 - 鄧玉儀

R556 - 郭楚玲

R562 - 郭惠良

R589 - 黎松慶

R607 - 李健全

R611 - 梁梨妮

R627 - 羅伯全

R667 - 譚燕清

R669 - 譚群鳳

R741 - 姜書涵

R742 - 叢改滋

R1067 - 黃翠儀

R1232 - 黎熙琳

15. Ms Li Shee Lin made the following main points:

- (a) the mainstream views collected from the residents of WFE were to expedite the redevelopment process and to make use of the five reception sites as well as the original site of WFE for public housing development;
- (b) many of the buildings in WFE were in run-down state, with concrete patches falling off from the external walls as well as the ceilings of the housing units. However, the associated maintenance works had been very disturbing to the residents. The residents had become impatient with the situation and hoped that the redevelopment of WFE could be sped up;
- (c) according to the survey conducted by the Democratic Party (DP), over 86% of the residents supported the redevelopment of WFE. In particular, the elderly people hoped that the rehousing sites would be located close to the centre of WFE and conveniently served by transport and pedestrian facilities;
- (d) traffic was the main issue of concern by the residents. The MTR SIL(W) project should be commissioned as soon as possible and the alignment should route through WFER and Wah Kwai Estate to serve the residents. The provision of other public transport facilities including bus terminus, minibus stops and taxi stands should also be given due consideration in the planning and design of WFER;
- (e) about 20% of the existing residents in WFE were elderly people. Upon redevelopment, they should be rehoused to those housing units which were located close to the centre supported by open space, elderly facilities and community facilities operated by NGOs. Representation site C could be developed into a low to medium-rise GIC complex providing the above facilities;

- (f) in view of the large site areas and hilly topography of WFE and the reception sites, a comprehensive pedestrian circulation system comprising escalators and footbridges should be provided to link up the sites and to enhance the integrity of the estate;
- (g) Wah Fu Centre, which was the icon of the estate currently providing shopping, open space and community facilities to the residents, should be retained upon redevelopment of WFE. However, markets and shopping facilities to be operated by commercial enterprise such as The Link was opposed;
- (h) the unit size in the WFER should not be too small and should accord with the current government standards; and
- (i) the planning and design of WFER should be conducive to the physical setting of the area. Waterfront promenade and recreational facilities should be provided for the enjoyment of the residents.

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

16. With the aid of the visualizer, Mr Poon Ping Hong made the following main points:

- (a) WFE and Wah Kwai Estate were two closely knitted communities. They were currently connected by a footbridge namely Fu Kwai Bridge. Opportunities should be taken to further enhance the connection between them upon redevelopment of WFE; and
- (b) provision of additional pedestrian and barrier free facilities to connect the two estates and the future MTR Station of the SIL(W) should be considered.

17. Mr Yim Chun Ho made the following main points:

- (a) the OZP amendments were supported as they would benefit the society by enhancing the supply of public housing;

- (b) the OZP amendments would foster the implementation of SIL(W), which could link up with MTR West Island Line and SIL(E) thus enabling a comprehensive improvement to the mass transit network. It might also help alleviate the current congestion problem at MTR Admiralty station;
- (c) conditions should be imposed in the future land grant of the reception site requiring that the public housing developments and ancillary facilities be taken up and managed by government departments. Selling off of any public facilities or properties to the commercial sector similar to what The Link had previously done would adversely affect the interests of the residents and should not be allowed; and
- (d) it was apparent that not all supportive views had been submitted to the Board for consideration during the representation process. According to the results of a survey conducted by the DP, it was clear that majority of the residents at about 80% supported the redevelopment of WFE and about 85% was satisfied with the current redevelopment proposal, while 76% were willing to be included in the first batch of residents to be rehoused and about 78% were dissatisfied with the slow progress of redevelopment.

R79 - 陳烈

R1053 - 王麗芳

R1216 - Sinn Sook Fong

18. Mr Chai Man Hon made the following main points:

- (a) two surveys in respect of the redevelopment of WFE were conducted by the DP in 2014 and 2017 respectively. It was revealed that in 2014, over 80% of the surveyed residents supported the redevelopment. According to the results of the 2017 survey, it was apparent that only about 10% of the surveyed residents had raised objection to redevelopment;
- (b) although the number of adverse representations on the OZP amendments was

more than the supportive ones, the mainstream views of the WFE residents were in support of redevelopment and that the redevelopment process should be taken forward at a faster pace;

- (c) while according to the Railway Development Strategy, the SIL(W) would commence operation in 2026, a recent reply of the Transport and Housing Bureau in respect of a question raised in the Legislative Council Special Finance Committee revealed that the Government would invite MTRC to submit a preliminary proposal for the construction of SIL(W) in end 2018. To provide further assurance on the implementation of SIL(W), in approving the OZP amendments, the Board should consider imposing a condition requiring the construction of SIL(W) to be undertaken in tandem with the redevelopment of WFE;
- (d) the allegation of some representers that public consultation regarding the WFER was inadequate appeared to be ungrounded. The public consultation process for WFER had lasted for over four years and the current representation hearing was also part of the statutory public consultation procedure;
- (e) identification of alternative reception sites such as brownfield sites for WFER would further delay the redevelopment process as well as the implementation of SIL(W). While the current proposal was not entirely satisfactory, the OZP amendments should be approved to enable the redevelopment process to move forward. The detailed planning and design of the proposed public housing developments could be subject to further study at the subsequent stages, and the views of the Southern District Council should be sought before seeking any public funding required for the proposed works;
- (f) adequate transport and retail facilities should be provided in the proposed public housing developments. The existing GIC facilities operated by NGOs should also be reprovisioned in WFER;

- (g) the existing Wai Fu Centre was serving as a linkage between WFE and Wah Kwai Estate. It was the icon of WFE which should be preserved. The Antiquities and Monuments Office should be consulted, where appropriate;
- (h) adequate vehicle parking spaces should be provided during the redevelopment of WFE and in the proposed public housing developments so as to address the illegal parking problem in the area;
- (i) he then read out the views collected from some residents of WFE, who all supported the expedition of the redevelopment on grounds that the existing buildings including the external walls, common areas and housing units were in dilapidated condition; the layout and design of WFE was outdated; the maintenance and stabilisation works of the buildings were expensive and had created nuisance to the residents; there was inadequate escalator facilities and the conservation value of the proposed reception sites were low; and
- (j) in conclusion, the redevelopment of WFE should commence as soon as possible in order to ease the concerns of the residents and to enhance the supply of public housing units.

R227 - 張啟明

19. Mr Cheung Kai Ming made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of WFE;
- (b) while the redevelopment of WFE had been discussed for a long time, he was disappointed that there was no concrete programme for implementation;
- (c) his rented housing unit was in run-down state. Regular maintenance and repair works were required to remedy the problems of water leakage and falling concrete finishes;

- (d) SIL(W) should be implemented to solve the traffic congestion problem of the Southern District; and
- (e) the OZP amendments should be approved to facilitate the redevelopment of WFE.

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

R244 - 文靜媚

20. Ms Man Ching Mei made the following main points:

- (a) she was a long-time resident of WFE living in Wah Ming House;
- (b) the progress of WFER was too slow and should be expedited;
- (c) as most of the walkways within the existing WFE were not weather proof, the residents, especially those living in lower WFE, had to suffer under bad weather conditions; and
- (d) adequate facilities for the elderly should be provided in the proposed public housing developments.

R270 - 許文進

21. Mr Hui Man Chun made the following main points:

- (a) he had lived in WFE for over 40 years;
- (b) all the OZP amendments were supported;
- (c) WFE was in dilapidated condition. The road layout was outdated and market facilities were inadequate. The redevelopment of WFE should commence

immediately. The residents wished to be rehoused in WFER which would be supported by better transport and open space facilities; and

- (d) the discussion and consultation on WFER had lasted over four years without any positive result. The Board should act proactively in enabling the redevelopment of WFE.

R281 – 黃秋影

22. Ms Wong Chau Ying made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of WFE;
- (b) her rented housing unit was in dilapidated state. Concrete patches had been falling off from the ceiling of the kitchen and bathroom. There had been also several incidents of blockage of sewers. The redevelopment of WFE should be implemented as soon as possible; and
- (c) the residents wished to be rehoused in the WFER with similar size of units and better provision of open space and transport facilities.

R282 - Choi Ngar Shan, Junny

23. Ms Choi Ngar Shan, Junny, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of WFE;
- (b) the redevelopment of WFE was supported; and
- (c) sufficient transport facilities should be planned in WFER, and consideration should be given to providing a government clinic in WFER to serve the residents of both WFE and Wah Kwai Estate.

R628 - 羅鳳仙

24. Ms Lo Fung Sin made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of WFE;
- (b) her rented housing unit was in poor condition. She and her daughter were hurt by the concrete patches fell off from the ceiling, and both the main door and metal gate had broken. The HD had been slow in responding to the requests for repair and maintenance; and
- (c) she was tired with the current situation. Redevelopment of WFE was required immediately and the process should be expedited.

R676 - 曾榮富

25. Mr Tsang Wing Fu made the following main points:

- (a) he had lived in WFE for nearly 50 years;
- (b) the redevelopment of WFE was supported;
- (c) given the hilly topography of the Pok Fu Lam area and that the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site, which was originally earmarked as a rehousing site for WFE, had been granted to the MTR Corporation (MTRC) for depot and property development, the identification of reception sites had taken a long time thus hindering the progress of redevelopment;
- (d) although the proposed reception sites were scattered around the existing WFE which might not be ideal, the residents had accepted them with a view to taking forward the redevelopment without further delay;

- (e) social welfare and community facilities should be concentrated in a low-rise complex at representation site C in the WFER, which was conveniently located to serve the residents;
- (f) the existing community hall in WFE as well as the parks and recreational facilities at Waterfall Bay should be retained as they were important assets of the residents of WFE;
- (g) WFE and Wah Kwai Estate were closely tied communities. The existing Fu Kwai Bridge linking up the two estates was congested especially during peak hours, and the escalators facilities were inadequate. Additional footbridge or subway connections should be provided upon redevelopment of WFE; and
- (h) SIL(W) should be implemented to tie in with the programme of WFER.

R775 - 陳新民

26. Mr Chan Sun Man made the following main points:

- (a) it was proposed to convert the Wah Fu Service Reservoir and surrounding areas near representation site E into two forest parks to provide a recreation outlet for the enjoyment of Hong Kong people;
- (b) by referring to the experience of the Wilderness Park in Zurich, tall trees and streams should be provided within the forest parks to serve as a pleasant setting for the proposed housing developments. The proposed forest parks could also be developed as a tourist spot and a venue for festive activities;
- (c) the retention of the green areas between representation sites D and E was supported;
- (d) a GIC and open space complex should be provided within WFER to house facilities for the elderly and the youth, and a library; and

- (e) consideration should be given to improving the quality of building materials used in WFER.

R1258 – The Wah Fu Swatow Christian Church

27. Rev Ng Kar Wai made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chief Reverend of the Wah Fu Swatow Christian Church (WFSCC) and the convener of a concern group on WFER formed by 14 local NGOs (Concern Group) comprising social welfare, education and religious organisations;
- (b) WFSCC was set up in WFE in 1970. In 2010, the WFSCC changed its mode of operation to a community church providing a range of services to women, the youth and children, and organising training courses in collaboration with the residents' groups in WFE;
- (c) while WFSCC objected to Amendment Item D in the written submission as the site was located too far away from WFE, the redevelopment of WFE was generally supported by WFSCC and the Concern Group;
- (d) in 2017, about 200 letters were submitted to HD by church users and local residents expressing their aspirations for redevelopment. In the same year, a survey on the usage of social welfare and religious services in WFE was also conducted by WFSCC. According to the survey results, about 95% of the surveyed people supported the existing social services operated by NGOs in WFE be continued in WFER;
- (e) the community culture of WFE should be preserved upon redevelopment so as to enhance social harmony and stability. To this end, a series of programmes would be organised to identify those subjects which were to be preserved. Moreover, recruitment exercise on voluntary workers would be carried out with a view to helping residents to move into their new homes and adapting to the new environment in the future;

- (f) during the redevelopment and rehousing process, WFSCC would stay in WFE to offer assistance to local residents during the redevelopment and rehousing process. To facilitate the above work, the Government should disseminate detailed information regarding redevelopment programme and the rehousing arrangement to the stakeholders at the early stage;
- (g) as the residents of WFE would be rehoused on several reception sites, the existing social welfare and community facilities operated by NGOs should be reprovisioned on each of those sites so as to enable convenient service to the residents;
- (h) the views and proposals of the Concern Group were as follows:
 - (i) the NGOs should serve as a bridge to facilitate communication between the residents and the Government during the redevelopment and rehousing process so as to enhance the transparency of communication;
 - (ii) the NGOs had built up a long-term relationship with the local community and were willing to provide services to the residents throughout the redevelopment and rehousing process. As such, appropriate arrangement for reprovisioning of the NGOs in WFER should be made;
 - (iii) according to paragraph 4.3.9 of the Paper, the population of Pok Fu Lam South upon WFER was 115,900 while the planned population adopted for assessing the provision of major community facilities and open space in the Pok Fu Lam area was 103,500 in Appendix VI of the Paper. Given the inconsistency, there were doubts on whether the requirement for GIC facilities had been under-estimated. Moreover, facilities for the elderly people were not included in the assessment. In that regard, he had prepared some written information for submission to the Board for reference; and

- (iv) a comprehensive walkway system should be provided to enhance pedestrian circulation and connectivity between WFE, Wah Kwai Estate and Chi Fu Fa Yuen. In particular, consideration should be given to constructing additional footbridges linking up representation site D and Wah Kwai Estate, and representation site A and Chi Fu Fa Yuen; and
- (v) overall, the redevelopment process should not be further delayed, or otherwise dissatisfaction amongst the residents would escalate.

28. The Chairperson remarked that upon expiry of the statutory publication periods, the Board would not accept any further information from representers or commenters in written form. That said, Members would direct questions on the concerned issues to the relevant government departments during the Q&A session should they consider appropriate.

R1262 - Paul Zimmerman

R1886 – John Budge

29. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Paul Zimmerman made the following main points:

- (a) the redevelopment of WFE was supported. However, while the reception sites were prudent in moving the redevelopment project forward, there were issues regarding the design and implementation which were of concerns to the residents of Pok Fu Lam. It was on the basis of the concerns below that objection was raised against the OZP amendments;
- (b) there was no demonstration that the disposition and colour scheme of the buildings on the sites would blend in with the mountain backdrop. The disposition of the buildings, especially those on representation sites A and B, should be planned to reduce wall effect while allowing view corridors for the future residents. The height of the proposed buildings on those two sites should also be reviewed with a view to minimising visual impact;
- (c) any tall podium development at representation sites A and B would create a canyon effect along Victoria Road and on the adjoining St. Paul's College

Primary School. Imposition of building set-back requirements from Victoria Road would not only help address the canyon effect but also enable a better access arrangement to the representation sites hence reducing the traffic impact on Victoria Road;

- (d) as many residents in WFE and Wah Kwai Estate had jobs as coach and truck drivers, the proposed development should include high headroom parking facilities for coaches and trucks so as to provide convenience for the residents and minimise illegal parking problem in the area. The relevant standards adopted in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines should be applied flexibly where appropriate;
- (e) a commitment was required from the Government on the planning and implementation of SIL(W) and North Island Line prior to any increase in development in the Pok Fu Lam area;
- (f) there was a lack of comprehensive plan for walkways through the area to and from the nature trails. The trails leading to the mountain areas in the surrounding should be maintained and possibly integrated into the future WFER. Opportunities should also be taken to provide sports and recreational facilities at the Wah Fu Service Reservoir which could be incorporated into the design of the proposed development on representation site E;
- (g) due to the high speed traffic on the roads, the pedestrian crossing at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road was dangerous especially for elderly people and young children. The safety issue of the crossing should be addressed; and
- (h) the whole Pok Fu Lam community was highly concerned over the efficiency and capacity of the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road. While the proposed upgrading might merely be adequate to serve the future WFER which would bring about an additional 11,900 units or 35,000 residents to the area, taking into account the anticipated new development/redevelopment projects upon lifting of the Moratorium including the Queen Mary Hospital

redevelopment, the Cyberport expansion, developments at Kong Sin Wan and Route 4, a major upgrade to that junction by grade separation was considered necessary. However, despite repeated requests and enquiries on the proposed upgrading were sent to the concerned government departments including HD, and CEDD, no positive responses had been received. It was suspected that such upgrading had become infeasible after part of St Paul College Primary School had encroached onto the area shown as 'Road' on the OZP originally reserved for a grade separated junction. Opportunities should be taken by the Board to address the potential long-term traffic problem at that junction.

R1274 - 馮錦霞

30. Ms Fung Kam Har made the following main points:

- (a) the redevelopment of WFE was supported. However, under the current proposal, Chi Fu Fa Yuen would become surrounded by the reception sites and would be subject to adverse visual and air ventilation impacts from the proposed developments;
- (b) many residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen had used all their life-time savings to buy a flat there. Their rights should be duly respected;
- (c) the suggestion of a representer to construct a 50-storey tall car park building in the area might cause insurmountable traffic impact. The feasibility of such suggestion should be examined with care; and
- (d) the proposed building height and development density for representation sites A and E should be reduced so as to minimise the potential impacts on Chi Fu Fa Yuen.

R1278 - 譚美寶

R1282 - 朱慶虹

R1283 - 楊燕芳

R1300 - 曾錦仁

R1327 - 曾守賢

R1435 - Kwan Oi Ying

R1436 - Kwan Shiu Kee

R1440 - 鄺榮傑

R1466 - Li Kam Kwong

R1475 - 梁瑞芬

R1492 - 萬玉如

R1498 - 潘玉屏

R1559 - 陳瑞榮

R1573 - Cheung Sing Cheong

R1574 - Cheung Wai Ting

R1588 - Fung Sau Chun

R1592 - Fung Suet Yee

R1612 - Kwan Kam Ki

R1613 - Kwan King Hei

R1616 - Kwan Mi Yu

R1618 - Kwan Oi Ki

R1620 - Kwan Wai Yu

R1621 - Kwan Yin Yu

R1639 - Lee Chi Yee

R1642 - Lee Ming Wai

R1644 - Lee Ting Yee

R1648 - Leung Kwok Kwong, Dominic

R1653 - Leung Yuk Mei, Magdalena

R1658 - Louze Wai Gee

R1661 - Lung Mandy

R1662 - Man Yuk Pui

R1701 - Wong Wan Hung

R1707 - Yen Yik Chong, Stephanie

R1708 - Yen Yik Ming, Ernest

R1709 - Yen Yuen Ho, Tony

R1765 - Ho Yuk Ngan

R1766 - Chan Shiu Mo

R2561 - Fong Chung Yu

R2565 - Kwok Hoi Yee

R2566 - Kwok Hoi Kit

R2585 - Lawrence Hon

R3125 - 方知行

R4333 - Kwok Tak Shing

31. Mr Chu Ching Hong made the following main points:

- (a) the need to redevelop WFE was imminent and supported by majority of the representations. The adverse representations were mainly against the selection process of the reception sites and the potential adverse impacts of the proposed development thereon;
- (b) the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site was originally reserved as the rehousing site for WFE. However, that site was subsequently granted to MTRC under the SIL(E) project and hence the redevelopment process of WFE had been hindered;
- (c) the process for identifying and selecting the reception sites for WFER was working within a 'black box'. As there was no public consultation, views of the stakeholders had not been taken into account by government departments during site identification and selection. A comprehensive public consultation exercise should have been carried out in the Southern District so that a general consensus could be reached on the suitable sites for increasing housing supply;
- (d) while the 2014 Policy Address announced that the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium would be partially lifted, the Government did not propose any corresponding new transport infrastructure or traffic improvement measures to support the policy. Without a firm commitment on the implementation of SIL(W), any proposed population increase in the Pok Fu Lam South area would be impracticable in traffic terms. To gather more public support, the WFER should be planned in tandem with the alignment, station location and design of SIL(W);

- (e) the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road was already very busy especially during peak hours and when festive activities were held in Cyberport during public holidays. The capacity of that junction was limited and the heavy traffic could cause long traffic queues tailing back to Aberdeen. The proposed junction improvement to a cross-road design was unacceptable as it would not be adequate to absorb the future increase in population and the associated traffic flows in the area. The traffic condition along Pok Fu Lam Road, the major road corridor serving the Southern District, would be significantly aggravated;
- (f) there were alternative sites near WFE available for the proposed developments. One such example was the agricultural area adjacent to the ex-dog kennel site at Victoria Road. The area comprised private land zoned "G/IC" on the OZP but had been left under-used for some time. The Government should make better use of the site to increase housing land supply before resorting to the current proposal;
- (g) according to the general planning intention stated in the Explanatory Statement of the OZP, it was the intention to allow high-rise development on the landward side of Pok Fu Lam Road while keeping developments below the level of the road on the seaward side. It was doubtful whether the proposed high-rise development at representation site A was in line with the intended urban design concept. Such bad planning would hamper the image of the Southern District as a popular tourist destination in Hong Kong; and
- (h) representation site E was too close to Yar Chee Villas and the construction of the proposed access road leading to the site would require substantial tree felling and adversely affect the ecology of the area. Consideration should be given to merging the proposed developments on representation sites D and E onto one larger site so as to enable a more comprehensive development.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau left this session of the meeting at this point.]

R1273 - Cheng Kwan Wah

R1390 - 張希豪

R1470 - 梁莉年

R1472 - 梁英年

R1507 - 鄧志鵬

R1566 - Chen Chi Te

R1567 – Chen Chih Ming

R1568 - Chen Shuk Guey

R1602 – Hsu Hui Chu

R1617 - Chen Hui Feng

32. Ms Hsu Hui Chu made the following main points:

- (a) she had been living in Chi Fu Fa Yuen for over 10 years;
- (b) the granting of the ex-Wing Chuk Hang Estate site to MTRC had deprived the residents of WFE of the right to be rehoused;
- (c) similar to WFE, the population of Chi FU Fa Yuen also comprised a large proportion of elderly people. They and their families had spent their life-time saving to establish their homes at Chi Fu Fa Yuen. Their rights and interests should be given due respect;
- (d) the existing road networks in Pok Fu Lam and Aberdeen were already heavily loaded. A mini-bus journey from Aberdeen to the Central District could take over 45 minutes. The proposed population increase in Pok Fu Lam South to over 100,000 would certainly aggravate the traffic conditions especially along Pok Fu Lam Road and Aberdeen Tunnel;
- (e) there were alternative sites along Pok Fu Lam Road suitable for the proposed developments. There was scope to provide more housing units by redeveloping WFE in-situ or relaxing the plot ratio of the developments along Mount Davis Road. Given the availability of MTR West Island Line, consideration should also be given to decanting the residents of WFE to the

Western District rather concentrating the proposed developments around WFE and Chi Fu Fa Yuen to minimise the potential traffic impact; and

- (f) apart from traffic, the proposed development would also create adverse visual and environmental impacts on Chi Fu Fa Yuen. Residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen chose to live there for its pleasant environment. Their views against the proposed developments should be taken seriously.

R1517 - 黃金淑

33. Ms Wong Kam Shuk made the following main points:

- (a) she had resided in Chi Fu Fa Yuen for 30 years. She and her family had chosen to live there for its pleasing environment. In fact, many existing residents in the area were aged people who had positive contribution to the society and used their hard-earned money to settle in Chi Fu Fa Yuen. To decant the whole population of WFE to sites surrounding Chi Fu Fa Yuen was unfair to those residents; and
- (b) while she had no objection to the redevelopment of WFE, there should be other alternative sites suitable for receiving the population of WFE. Concentrating the reception sites around Chi Fu Fa Yuen would result in serious traffic problems.

R1570 – Cheng Yee Wah

34. Ms Cheng Yee Wah made the following main points:

- (a) while the redevelopment of WFE was supported in principle, it should be undertaken in-situ on the seaward side of Pok Fu Lam Road, but not the landward side close to Chi Fu Fa Yuen;

- (b) according to the information provided in the Paper, there was a discrepancy in the planned population of about 3,000 people in Pok Fu Lam South. It was doubtful if all the five proposed reception sites were required;
- (c) as the building heights of the proposed developments were not in line with the intended planning control and were incompatible with the surrounding, the current proposal might be subject to judicial review; and
- (d) representation site E was endowed with abundant natural resources and was a popular spot for field trips conducted by teachers and students alike. The site was a midway stop for a variety of seasonal migratory birds, some of which were not covered in government's environmental assessment. Moreover, the site was rich in plants and insects, including species which were of medical use. It should be retained to support medical researches and to facilitate the development of medical technologies.

R1696 – Wong Shu Ho

35. Mr Wong Shu Ho made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen;
- (b) as the reception sites were located far apart and representation sites D and E were physically isolated, the proposed developments would not create any benefits in terms of comprehensive development;
- (c) it was questionable whether the representation sites were the most suitable sites for receiving the population of WFE. Other alternative sites should be identified; and
- (d) consideration should also be given to redeveloping WFE in-situ. No plans and details regarding the future use of the existing WFE site were provided by the Government.

R1738 - 陳秀麗

36. Ms Chan Sau Lai, Sandy, made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen;
- (b) the redevelopment of WFE was supported as the buildings and facilities were in poor condition;
- (c) representation site A was located too close to Chi Fu Fa Yuen and should be retained as a green area;
- (d) representation sites D and E were physically isolated. The proposed developments should be planned comprehensively for the benefits of the future residents;
- (e) the implementation of SIL(W) should be considered in the planning of WFER; and
- (f) consideration should also be given to making use of the ex-dog kennel site at Victoria Road as a reception site for WFER.

R1743 – Ho Kit Fun, Polly

37. Ms Ho Kit Fun, Polly, made the following main points:

- (a) although there was an imminent need to redevelop WFE, the handling of the matter had been inhumane which would result in densely built developments and adverse ecological impacts;
- (b) while no detailed information regarding the future use of the existing WFE site was given by the Government, the best solution for WFER should be in-situ redevelopment. Such redevelopment could be implemented in phases with temporary rehousing arrangements so that the residents could move back to the redeveloped WFE. In effect, the development intensities and building

heights of the proposed developments at representation sites A, B, D and E could be reduced;

- (c) the proposed building heights for representation sites A, B, D and E were monotonous and not in line with the stepped height concept. The developments at representation sites A and B would also intrude upon the views of the mountain backdrop;
- (d) the proposed widening of Pok Fu Lam Road was not scientific and could not absorb the envisaged increase in traffic flows brought about by the proposed developments. Also, the congestion problem at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road had not been addressed. Even with the completion of SIL(E), the traffic problems in the Southern District had not been totally resolved. It would not be logical to approve the current proposal without a firm programme on the implementation of SIL(W); and
- (e) given the OZP amendments would affect the whole population of Pok Fu Lam, it would be unreasonable not to consider the views of the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen. A balanced decision taking into account the interests of both the WFE residents and other residents should be made.

[The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:30 p.m.]

38. The meeting was resumed at 1:51p.m. on 17.5.2018.

39. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the afternoon session of the resumed meeting :

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

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

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Assistant Director (Regional 3),
Lands Department

Ms Angela S.C. Chan

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong),
Transport Department

Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

Vice-Chairperson

[Mr Stephen H.B. Yau arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 1

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Housing Department (HD)

Ms Portia K. H. Yiu - Chief Planning Officer (CPO)

Mr Theron K.K. Chan - Senior Planning Officer (SPO)

Mr Joe B.M. Leung - Senior Civil Engineer (SCE)

Mr S.C. Lo - Senior Landscape Architect (SLA)

Mr Antony K.C. Chung - Senior Architect (SA)

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

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

Ms Chole C.U. Ng - Nature Conservation Officer/Hong Kong
(NC/HK)

CEDD

Mr James W.C. Yip - Senior Engineer (SE)

Consultants

Professor S.Y. Chan - Associate Director, Ove Arup & Partners
Hong Kong Limited (ARUP)

Dr K. Lo - Associate Director, ARUP

Mr Chris Lee - Associate, ARUP

Mr Brad Fong - Senior Engineer, ARUP

Mr Tommy Hui - Senior Ecologist, AEC Limited

Representers/Commenters or their representatives

R3 – Cheng Kwok An

Mr Cheng Kwok An - Representer

R61 - Lai Hop Yee

R94 - 朱月妍

R425 - Keung Yee Ching

R465 - 陳靜

R475 - 陳蕙芳

R499 - 鄭玉鳳

R521 - 朱月妍

R532 - 傅榮森

R533 - 馮尉明

R545 - 高至雄

R546 - 高桂英

R547 - 高偉杰

R548 - 高俊杰

R554 - 鄧玉儀

R556 - 郭楚玲

R562 - 郭惠良

R589 - 黎松慶

R607 - 李健全

R611 - 梁梨妮

R627 - 羅伯全

R667 - 譚燕清

R669 - 譚群鳳

R741 - 姜書涵

R742 - 叢改滋

R1067 - 黃翠儀

R1232 - 黎熙琳

Ms Li Shee Lin - Representer and Representers' representative

Mr Poon Ping Hong - Representers' representative

R79 - 陳烈

R1053 - 王麗芳

R1216 - Sinn Sook Fong

Mr Chai Man Hon - Representers' representative

R775 - 陳新民

Mr Chan Sun Man - Representer

R1258 - The Wah Fu Swatow Christian Church

Rev Ng Kar Wai - Representers' representative

R1278 - 譚美寶

R1282 - 朱慶虹

R1283 - 楊燕芳
R1300 - 曾錦仁
R1327 - 曾守賢
R1435 - Kwan Oi Ying
R1436 - Kwan Shiu Kee
R1440 - 鄺榮傑
R1466 - Li Kam Kwong
R1475 - 梁瑞芬
R1492 - 萬玉如
R1498 - 潘玉屏
R1559 - 陳瑞榮
R1573 - Cheung Sing Cheong
R1574 - Cheung Wai Ting
R1588 - Fung Sau Chun
R1592 - Fung Suet Yee
R1612 - Kwan Kam Ki
R1613 - Kwan King Hei
R1616 - Kwan Mi Yu
R1618 - Kwan Oi Ki
R1620 - Kwan Wai Yu
R1621 - Kwan Yin Yu
R1639 - Lee Chi Yee
R1642 - Lee Ming Wai
R1644 - Lee Ting Yee
R1648 - Leung Kwok Kwong, Dominic
R1653 - Leung Yuk Mei, Magdalena
R1658 - Louie Wai Gee
R1661 - Lung Mandy
R1662 - Man Yuk Pui
R1701 - Wong Wan Hung
R1707 - Yen Yik Chong, Stephanie
R1708 - Yen Yik Ming, Ernest
R1709 - Yen Yuen Ho, Tony

R1765 - 何玉顏

R1766 - 陳紹武

R2561 - Fong Chung Yu

R2565 - 郭凱貽

R2566 - Kwok Hoi Kit

R2585 - Lawrence Hon

R3125 - 方知行

R4333 - Kwok Tak Shing

Mr Chu Ching Hong - Representers and Representatives' representative

Ms Lo Tsoi Yin - Representatives' representative

R1273 - Cheng Kwan Wah

R1390 - 張希豪

R1470 - 梁莉年

R1472 - 梁英年

R1507 - 鄧智鵬

R1566 - Chen Chi Te

R1567 - Chen Chih Ming

R1568 - Chen Shuk Guey

R1602 - Hsu Hui Chu

R1617 - Chen Hui Feng

Ms Hsu Hui Chu - Representers and Representatives' representative

R1464 - 李玉清

Ms Li Yuk Chung, Christina - Representers

R1743 - Ho Kit Fun, Polly

Ms Ho Kit Fun, Polly - Representers

R1762 - Lau Ho Fung

R4164 - 王淑華

Mr Lau Ho Fung - Representer and Representer's representative

R1787 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer

C83 – 黃澤芳

Ms Yeung Siu Pik - Commenter's representative

41. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R1762 – Lau Ho Fung

R4164 – 王淑華

42. Mr Lau Ho Fung made the following main points :

- (a) he was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen;
- (b) while the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate (WFE) was not objected to in view of its deteriorated building condition, there was concern on whether the planning and redevelopment process was comprehensive and fair. Without a detailed redevelopment scheme of WFE, he doubted how an estimation of flat production at WFE site was derived and whether the site would be redeveloped for public housing instead of private housing like the case of Wong Chuk Hang Estate;
- (c) the Pok Fu Lam Moratorium (PFLM) was imposed to prohibit intensive development in the Pok Fu Lam area on traffic grounds. In the absence of a new railway and traffic improvement measures, he doubted why the Moratorium could be partially lifted to facilitate public housing development and redevelopment in the area for the addition of over 10,000 units to accommodate about 50,000 population;

- (d) the five reception sites for the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment (WFER) were geographically separated. It would affect the social network of WFE residents and cause inconvenience for the elderly to use the future community facilities which were sparsely located in different sites;

[Mr L.T. Kwok and Mr Peter K.T. Yuen returned to the meeting at this point.]

- (e) the proposed public housing development would cause wall effect and impose adverse air and visual impacts on Chi Fu Fa Yuen;
- (f) the junction at Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road was a busy and critical junction for traffic between the Southern District and the Western District. Even though road widening of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road was proposed, the proposed new public access road connecting representation site E with the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road could not cater for the future traffic demand;
- (g) PlanD should not disregard the opposing representations which accounted for about 70% of the total representations. If PlanD considered that the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) should not be amended to meet the adverse representations, it was contradictory to its mission for making Hong Kong a better place to live and work in, encouraging the community to participate in the planning process and being accountable to the community. Besides, the hearing process was to provide an opportunity for the representers to voice out their views, rather than requesting them to provide technical data to rebut the information provided by the Government; and
- (h) to strike a balance between meeting the pressing need of the WFER and carrying out a comprehensive planning, he proposed that public housing development/redevelopment in the area should be implemented in three phases (i) short term: to take forward public housing development at the Wah King Street site as a reception resource for the phased

redevelopment of WFE, within which in-situ rehousing might be feasible by increasing the building height of the housing blocks; (ii) medium term: to take forward the planning of the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)); and (iii) long term: to take forward the planning of other sites with the engagement of stakeholders after the commissioning time of the SIL(W) was available.

R1787 - Mary Mulvihill

43. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:
- (a) with respect to the hearing procedure, she considered that there should be a consistent approach for handling the representations/comments and the technical assessments regarding the amendments of different OZPs. The full set of the representers' and commenters' submissions should be uploaded onto Town Planning Board (the Board)'s website for public inspection rather than deposited at the enquiry counters. Besides, the provision of extracts for the technical assessments in the Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam OZP No. S/H10/15 (MPC Paper No. 5/17) only included six pages for the traffic impact assessment (TIA), one page for air quality aspect and two pages for Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA), was unacceptable;
 - (b) the proposed public housing developments should be planned together with the railway. The redevelopment of WFE should be carried out block by block making reference to the redevelopment of Pak Tin Estate in Shek Kip Mei; and
 - (c) the rezoning of representation sites D and E, which were heavily vegetated, was not in line with the Policy Addresses 2013 to 2015 that only those "GB" areas which were devegetated, deserted or formed should be rezoned for residential use. There was no policy statement

indicating that the “GB” sites close to a road were suitable for development.

C83 – 黃澤芳

44. Ms Yeung Siu Pik made the following main points:

- (a) she was a member of the Democratic Party and represented a resident of Wah Kwai Estate to make oral submission;
- (b) she had lived in WFE for about 30 years and was concerned about the neighbourhood in the area. She supported the redevelopment of WFE due to its deteriorating condition and the lack of community facilities; and
- (c) she requested Members of the Board to consider imposing the following conditions for the rezoning proposals, including providing (i) a barrier-free environment and facilities to cater for the needs of the residents; (ii) a new footbridge linking WFE and Wah Kwai Estate in addition to the existing footbridge, which was heavily used; (iii) a railway station exit of SIL(W) at Wah Kwai Estate; and (iv) a cultural and heritage trail for the preservation of the Milestone of Kwan Tai Lo at Shek Pai Wan Road.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

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

Flat Production

46. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) how many public housing units would be provided in the area;
- (b) how the 8,900 units would be distributed in the five reception sites;
- (c) whether more units could be provided in addition to the proposed flat production;
- (d) why there was not much difference in the units to be provided in representation sites A and B while the site area of representation site A was much larger than that of representation site B; and
- (e) whether the estimated flat production was based on HD's latest spatial standard.

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

- (a) the five reception sites and the WFER would provide a total of 11,900 additional public housing units which included 8,900 units at the five representation sites and 3,000 additional units on top of the existing 9,100 units to be provided at the existing site of WFE upon redevelopment. As such, a total of 21,000 public housing units would be provided after the implementation of the five reception sites and the WFER;
- (b) as set out in Annex 3 of the TPB Paper No. 10425 (the Paper), about 1,890, 1,360, 360, 1,320 and 3,990 units would be provided at representation sites A to E respectively; and

- (c) the partial lifting of the PFLM as approved by the Executive Council (ExCo) was to facilitate the provision of an addition of 11,900 public housing units. Any increase of the flat production figure would need to seek further approval from the ExCo.

48. In response, Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides and the visualizer:

- (a) considerations such as air ventilation, visual impact and required supporting facilities were taken into account in the distribution of housing units in the five representation sites. Given the need for a view corridor and an air path at the Wah Fu North site (representation site A), the optimal layout was to construct two housing blocks with a low-rise block at the south-eastern part of the site; and
- (b) the estimated flat production was based on HD's latest assumption on average flat size.

WFER

49. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the WFER would be carried out by phases after rehousing the existing residents to the five reception sites and whether the existing WFE would be completely demolished for the construction of new public housing blocks;
- (b) whether in-situ redevelopment and rehousing approach of Pak Tin Estate could be adopted for the WFER;
- (c) the number of households being affected by the deteriorating structural condition in WFE; and

- (d) the number of residents aged 65 or above currently living in WFE and the projected population aged 65 or above in the coming 5 to 10 years.

50. In response, Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, made the following main points:

- (a) upon the completion of the rezoning procedures, Planning Brief (PB) for the five reception sites would be prepared and details of the proposed public housing developments including the number of units, types of flat and development programme would be formulated. The five reception sites would be developed in phases and the first phase was expected to be completed in 2025. The study for the WFER, including the number of phases to be involved and blocks to be demolished in each phase, would be carried out after the completion of the planning of the five reception sites for public housing developments;
- (b) the implementation time frame for the in-situ redevelopment and rehousing approach would be very lengthy. The five reception sites provided the much needed opportunity to redevelop WFE and provide additional public housing units to meet the pressing need from the community. It was considered appropriate to develop the five reception sites for the rehousing of the existing WFE residents so as to facilitate the WFER in a timely manner;
- (c) a comprehensive investigation of the structural condition of WFE was carried out in 2008 and the investigation was reviewed regularly. While the investigation demonstrated that the structures of WFE was safe, regular and daily maintenance services including the 'Total Maintenance Scheme', the 'Responsive In-flat Maintenance Services', etc. were provided to maintain and improve the condition of the buildings in WFE. To avoid prolonged nuisances to the existing residents due to the maintenance works, the WFER should commence as soon as possible. Regarding the number of

households affected by the deteriorating building conditions, there was no such information in hand at this juncture; and

- (d) regarding the elderly population, about 30% of the existing residents in WFE were aged 60 or above. While there was no projection data for population aged 65 or above in the coming 5 to 10 years, it was well noted that the proportion of the elderly living in the WFE was expected to be relatively large. To meet the needs from the elderly, barrier-free facilities had been proposed in the five reception sites in accordance with the existing planning and design practice in all new public housing developments.

51. In response to the Vice-Chairperson's question on the relationship between the five reception sites and the WFER project, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, said that the five reception sites were to facilitate the redevelopment of WFE. Without those sites, the redevelopment process of WFE would be prolonged and other reception sites might need to be identified. The WFER scheme would be worked out by HD at a later stage.

Traffic

52. The Chairperson, the Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the TIA conducted by CEDD had taken into account the WFER, and whether the results of the TIA were realistic if the WFER was not included in the TIA;
- (b) the traffic improvement measures to be implemented to address the traffic impact of the proposed developments and the implementation schedule;
- (c) whether SIL(W) would need to be in place to support the five reception sites and the WFER, and the progress of the SIL(W) and the location of the Wah Fu Station;

- (d) the latest status of the Route 4; and
- (e) in view of the aging population in WFE, how the accessibility of the five reception sites could be enhanced to meet the needs of the elderly.

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

- (a) a TIA for the development of the five reception sites was conducted by CEDD with two scenarios, namely with and without the SIL(W). While the TIA was conducted for the proposed developments in the five reception sites without taking into account the WFER, all the planned and committed developments in the area had been taken into account. The TIA concluded that with the proposed traffic improvement measures, the traffic condition in the area would be acceptable under both scenarios;
- (b) another TIA for the WFER would be conducted by HD at a later stage, which would take into account the committed developments including the five reception sites, the proposed development in the WFER site, and the planning and implementation of SIL(W) which would be more certain by that time;
- (c) according to the information previously provided for the Legislative Council (LegCo), the Government would invite the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) to submit a proposal of the SIL(W) in 2018. Consultation with stakeholders including the concerned district council (DC) would be conducted afterwards. With the approval from the ExCo, funding approval for the construction of the railway from the LegCo would be sought. It was expected that exits of the SIL(W) Wah Fu Station would be planned in the vicinity of residential developments subject to the proposal to be submitted by

the MTRCL;

- (d) the alignment of the Route 4 as indicated on the OZP would not be implemented. The related land uses would be reviewed and the OZP would be amended in due course; and
- (e) there would be a pedestrian green deck with lift towers between representation sites A and B, and a footbridge with lift towers between representation sites C and E respectively. CEDD also intended to widen the existing pedestrian walkway connecting representation sites D and E and enhance it to become a covered walkway. The connectivity between the five reception sites and Wah Fu/Wah Kwai Estate would be enhanced at the detailed design stage, taking into account the interface with the SIL(W).

54. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the TIA conducted by CEDD was mainly for the proposed developments in the five reception sites while another TIA for the WFER would be conducted by HD at a later stage. According to the advice of the Transport Department (TD), without a detailed scheme for the WFER such as the scale of development and the associated new transport infrastructure, it would be premature to take into account the WFER or otherwise the results of the TIA would be inaccurate. It would be more appropriate for HD to conduct another TIA for the WFER after a detailed redevelopment scheme was formulated with the up-to-date traffic data was available (e.g. after operation of the SIL (East) for a period of time) and the implementation details of the SIL(W) were provided;
- (b) according to the TIA, the road improvement works recommended to address the transport needs arising from the proposed developments included (i) widening of Pok Fu Lam Road southbound carriageway

at the upstream of the junction at Victoria Road/ Pok Fu Lam Road from existing two lanes to four lanes and widening of the downstream exit section of the junction from existing two lanes to three lanes; (ii) widening of Victoria Road eastbound carriageway from existing two lanes to three lanes. According to the traffic model of the TIA, the reserve capacity (RC) of the junction at Victoria Road/Pok Fu Lam Road in 2027 would be increased from 16% under the Reference Case (i.e. without the proposed development) to 19% under the Design Case (i.e. with the proposed developments) after the implementation of the proposed road improvement works. It was demonstrated that the junction capacity would be increased with the proposed improvement measures; and

- (c) the widening of Victoria Road eastbound carriageway from two lanes to three lanes would be carried out in the first phase to facilitate the implementation of representation sites A to C. The proposed new access road to connect representation site E site with the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road would also be implemented before the completion of representation sites D and E.

55. In response to a Member's question on the proposed measures for enhancing the accessibility among the five reception sites in addition to the barrier-free facilities, Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide said that podium, lift towers, covered walkways and footbridges would be provided to improve the accessibility of the five reception sites. In particular, two lift towers would be provided to enhance the connectivity between Kai Lung Wan South and North sites (representation sites Items D and E). Barrier-free facilities would also be provided at the five reception sites in accordance with relevant standards and guidelines. It was believed that the pedestrian connectivity would be much improved in the five reception sites as compared with the existing condition in WFE. As for the connectivity between the WFER site and the five reception sites, it would be examined in the WFER scheme and when the details of SIL(W) was available at a later stage.

56. In response to the Chairperson's question, Mr Chai Man Hon (representers'

representative) said that the Board should have a clear stance on the construction of the SIL(W) if the rezoning proposals were approved. The Board should impose a condition requesting that by the completion of the proposed public housing developments at the five reception sites, and commencement of the WFER upon decanting of residents in 2027, the SIL(W) should be either completed or largely completed.

57. In response to the Chairperson's question on the provision of car park in the proposed developments, Mr Louis H.K. Kau, DPO/HK, said that part from the ancillary parking facilities to be provided according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, about 230 public parking spaces of different vehicle types would be provided in the major activity hub at representation site E to address the community need as proposed by HD and TD. He added that there was no such a proposal to develop a 50-storey carpark building as claimed by a representer.

Visual and Air Ventilation Aspects

58. The Chairperson and some members raised the following questions:

- (a) regarding the representers' concern on the wall effect, whether there was any illustration to show the stepped height profile in the area as mentioned in the Paper;
- (b) whether there was any illustration to show the views from Chi Fu Fa Yuen after the development of representation sites A and B; and
- (c) the building separation between the existing and proposed developments and the air path within the five reception sites.

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

- (a) a stepped BH concept with height bands of 170mPD, 200mPD and 230mPD was proposed for the five reception sites. The proposed BH of 170mPD for representation site C was to minimize its visual

impact in view of the heights of its surrounding development (up to 150mPD). The proposed BHs with a difference of 30m between the height bands had taken into account the existing stepped height profile in the area with BHs increasing progressively from WFE and Wah Kwai Estate (up to 110mPD) near the waterfront to Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Pokfulam Garden (up to 230mPD) in the inland areas;

- (b) as set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 41 for Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Board (TPB-PG No. 41), in the highly developed context of Hong Kong, it was not practical to protect private views without stifling development opportunity and balancing other relevant considerations. In the interest of the public, it was far more important to protect public views, particularly those easily accessible and popular to the public or tourists. As such, a public viewpoint from the podium garden atop Chi Fu Fa Shopping Centre was chosen for the visual appraisal to demonstrate the visual impact of the proposed developments; and
- (c) there would be a minimum separating distance of about 100m between Chi Fu Fa Yuen and representation site A and between Yar Chee Villas and representation site E site. Based on the findings of the air ventilation assessment (Expert Evaluation), mitigation measures including six local air paths with minimum width of 20m to 30m would be incorporated into the proposed public housing developments to alleviate the potential air ventilation impacts on the surrounding areas.

60. Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, also supplemented that suitable measures such as setback, building gap and disposition of building block would be considered in the detailed design stage to address the 'canyon effect', enhance permeability and facilitate the penetration of prevailing winds.

61. The Chairperson and some members raised the following questions:

- (a) the community facilities to be provided in the proposed developments;
- (b) the mechanism of informing the locals including the DC about the types of the community facilities to be provided in the proposed public housing developments; and
- (c) the arrangement for the reprovisioning of the existing community facilities and whether the non-government organizations (NGOs) which had been providing social services and building up a long-term relationship with the local residents would be reprovisioned in the five reception sites with a higher priority.

62. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, made the following main points:

- (a) there was no shortfall in the major GIC facilities in the planning scheme area nor the Southern District. While there was no government clinic in the Pok Fu Lam area, there were 3 government clinics in the Southern District. HD would provide suitable social welfare facilities at the Wah Fu North, Wah King Street, Wah Lok Path and Kai Lung Wan North sites (representation sites A, B, C and E) in consultation with the Social Welfare Department (SWD); and
- (b) HD would prepare PB to set out the development parameters and the types of facilities to be provided in the proposed public housing developments. Relevant government departments would be consulted and their comments would be incorporated in the PBs where appropriate. The relevant DC would also be consulted on the major development parameters of the public housing developments.

63. In response, Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, made the following main points:

- (a) GIC facilities would be provided at representation sites A, B, C and E for reprovisioning of the existing facilities and providing new facilities. In particular, HD would liaise with SWD on the need of elderly facilities and work with the concerned government departments to ensure the continuous provision of adequate and suitable community facilities for the residents. For example, there were existing clinics operated by the private sector in WFE. Similar medical services would also be considered at the five reception sites through leasing of the future retail facilities. Taking into account the phasing arrangement, HD would aim at achieving a seamless transition in order to maintain the provision of necessary community facilities and services throughout the redevelopment process. Apart from reprovisioning of existing facilities in WFE where appropriate, suitable GIC facilities would also be planned at the build-back site of WFER in the future taking into account the demand from the new population generated from build-back development;
- (b) similar to other redevelopment projects such as So Uk Estate and Pak Tin Estate, HD would engage local residents on the need of community facilities, which would be incorporated in the PB, where appropriate; and
- (c) subject to the views of SWD and relevant Government departments, the existing NGOs at WFE would be considered for reprovisioning at the five reception sites subject to policy support to ensure a continuous provision of the facilities and services .

Connectivity Among the Public Housing Sites

64. Some members raised the following questions:

- (a) noting that a major activity hub would be provided at representation site E, how the connectivity between representation site D /Wah

Kwai Estate and representation site E could be enhanced so as to avoid the isolation of the representation site D;

- (b) the walking distance between representation sites D and E and the facility to be provided (e.g. travelators) to facilitate pedestrian movement (in particular for the elderly) between the sites; and
- (c) what the pedestrian linkage between representation sites D and E and Wah Kwai Estate would be provided, and whether lift tower could be provided to enhance the connectivity between representation site D and Wah Kwai Estate.

65. In response, Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) with the development of a major activity hub at representation site E, it was essential to enhance the connectivity between the representation sites D and E by a covered pedestrian walkway. The connectivity among the five reception sites as well as with WFE would be further enhanced when the detail of the SIL(W) was available at a later stage; and
- (b) footbridge/pedestrian walkway with lift towers would be provided at representation sites D and E linking with the existing major pedestrian connection. Representation site D and Wah Kwai Estate would be connected via the proposed pedestrian links including footbridge with lift towers across Shek Pai Wan Road with the existing pavement and pedestrian walkway at Wah Fu Road. There was technical difficulty to connect representation site D and Wah Kwai Estate by lift or escalator due to the great level difference of about 30m.

66. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD, made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint Slides:

- (a) there was no plan to provide a travelator between representation sites D and E;
- (b) the walking distance between representation sites D and E was only about 200m with a gradient of about 1% to 3% at maximum; and
- (c) the two lift towers proposed at representation sites D and E would connect the residential developments to the street level and the level with retail facilities respectively.

Ecological Aspect

67. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the criteria to identify representation sites D and E, which were originally zoned “GB”, for public housing development;
- (b) why the area between representation sites D and E was not proposed for housing development;
- (c) whether the site formation works including the retaining walls and artificial slopes at representation sites D and E would fall outside the site boundary;
- (d) taking into account the ecological value of the area between representation sites D and E, whether the concept of a ‘forest park’ as proposed by some representers could be incorporated into the proposed public housing development;
- (e) the location of the 6.44 ha potential woodland compensation areas;
- (f) as stream course 5 was passing through representation site E, whether there would be a buffer area for the stream;

- (g) given that the proposed developments at the five reception sites were not designated projects under the Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), how the implementation of the ecological mitigation measures could be monitored; and
- (h) whether there was any platform to make available the information regarding the implementation of the ecological mitigation measures for public inspection.

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

- (a) the Government had made effort to increase short to medium term housing supply by on-going land use reviews including a two-stage “GB” review. The first stage of “GB” review mainly covered “GB” areas which were formed, deserted or devegetated, but possessed potential for residential development. The second stage of “GB” review covered “GB” zones in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and new towns, and those vegetated areas with relatively less buffering effect and lower conservation value. Representation sites D and E, which were located in the fringe of built-up areas close to existing urban areas and comprising government land, had been identified for public housing development;
- (b) according to the findings of CEDD’s feasibility study, the area between representation sites D and E was of high ecological value, including a semi-natural stream course, some species of conservation importance and an existing hiking trail, and hence, was not suitable for housing development. Besides, the land to the further southeast of representation site D was subject to various site constraints, such as very steep slope and partly underneath or too close to the pylon/overhead transmission line. As such, combining

representation sites D and E or expanding representation site D to the southeast for housing development was not recommended;

- (c) there was an existing hiking trail in the area between representation sites D and E, HD would explore the feasibility of providing a linkage between the proposed developments and the trail at detailed design stage;
- (d) several sites with a total area of about 6.44 ha within 500m from the reception sites had been identified as potential woodland compensation areas;
- (e) an ecologically-friendly 'green channel' of about 250m long to the northeast of representation site D was proposed as mitigation measure for the affected natural stream in representation site E; and
- (f) the ecological mitigation measures and the required recreational facilities would be included in the PB to be prepared by HD.

69. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD also made the following points with the aid of some PowerPoint Slides:

- (a) while retaining wall would be adopted for representation sites D and E, only a small area close to the boundaries of those two sites would be required for the construction of retaining wall such that its impact on the slopes and trees would be minimized;
- (b) the loss of the natural stream in representation site E site due to site formation works would be mitigated by constructing an environmentally-friendly 'green channel' to the northeast of representation site D for re-creating the habitat;
- (c) although the proposed developments at the five reception sites were not designated projects under the EIAO, a Preliminary Environmental

Review had been conducted in accordance with requirements similar to those adopted in EIAO and approval from the Environmental Protection Department had been obtained. CEDD would oversee implementation of the mitigation measures as identified in the PER; and

- (d) for large scale project, CEDD would usually report to the relevant DC regarding the implementation details. For the subject public housing developments, the same reporting mechanism could be adopted and report on progress could be made available in website for public inspection, if required.

70. Ms Portia K. H. Yiu, CPO, HD, supplemented that the interface of the surrounding areas with the proposed developments could be considered in the detailed design stage.

Alternative Sites

71. Noting some representers' suggestion to use the nearby "G/IC" and "Open Space" ("O") sites as alternative housing sites, the Vice-Chairperson asked where the locations of those sites were. In response, Mr. Chu Ching Hong (R1282 and representers' representative) said that the alternative sites referred to a site zoned "O" near ex-Pok Fu Lam Kennel and a "G/IC" site at ex-Pok Fu Lam Kennel. The "O" site near ex-Pok Fu Lam Kennel was owned by a resident of Pok Fu Lam Tsuen. Another one at ex-Pok Fu Lam Kennel was owned by the Swire Properties Limited and had been proposed for elderly housing for years. Those two sites were located in the vicinity of WFE and should be used for residential development taking the opportunity of the partial lifting of the PFLM.

72. Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK said that the alternative proposal mentioned by the representer involved resumption of private lots. The site owned by the Swire Properties Limited was subject to a planning approval for proposed elderly housing but yet to be developed.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau returned to the meeting at the Q&A session.]

73. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing session on the day was completed. The Board would deliberate on the presentations and comments in closed meeting after all the hearing sessions were completed and would inform the presenters and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the Government representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

74. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 4:15p.m.