

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 21.5.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the morning session of the resumed meeting :

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

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

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

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

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

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/16

(TPB Paper No. 10425)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was to continue the hearing of representations and comments in respect of the draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/16 (the draft OZP). Members' declaration of interests had been made in the morning session of the hearing held on 17.5.2018 and was recorded in the minutes of the respective meeting accordingly. In addition, Dr C.H. Hau declared that Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund (R2030) was his colleague and Mr Peter K.T. Yuen declared that Ms Leung Man Ling (R4334) was his ex-colleague.

4. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr Franklin Yu, Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong, Mr Raymond K.W. Lee and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan had tendered apologies for not attending this session of the meeting. The meeting agreed that the interests of Professor S.C. Wong, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Professor T.S. Liu and Mr Peter K.T. Yuen were indirect and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

6. The following government's 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)

Mr Joe B.M. Leung - Senior Civil Engineer

Mr Antony K.C. Chung - Senior Architect

Mr Raymond C.P. Law - Planning Officer

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr James W.C. Yip - Senior Engineer

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South

Ms Chole C.U. Ng - Nature Conservation Officer/Hong Kong

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup)

Professor S.Y. Chan - Associate Director

Dr Lo Kin - Associate Director

Mr Fanco Tsang - Engineer

Asia Ecological Consultants Limited (AEC)

Mr Tommy Hui - Senior Ecologist

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R775 – Chan Sun Man

Mr Chan Sun Man - Representer

R1396 – 程學麒

R4084 – Wong Sau Kam

Ms Elan Lee - Representers' representative

R1397 – 程維揚

R1465 – 李金齡

R3778 – Yau Siu Kwong Paul

Mr Yau Siu Kwong Paul - Representer and Representers' representative

R1790 – Alexa Cheung

Ms Lee Suk Wan - Representer's representative

R1794 – 張鄧雪芬

Ms Lee Wai Kuen - Representer's representative

R1801 – Island South Property Management Limited

R1802 – Bel-Air Owner's Committee

R1953 – Sharon Geok Lian Lim

R2020 – Chan Kenneth Kar Ching

R2028 – Kwok Ying Lok

R2039 – Lui Yau Shing

R2102 – Tony Lai

R2137/C121 – Ngai Tze Bun

R2156 – Wong Fung Mei Jacky

R2179 – Xiao Ran

R2186 – 麥海活

R2216 – Wilson Lo

R2348 – Linda Kwan Chow

<u>R2369 – Carina Healy</u>	<u>R2378 – Wong Ching Kong Clifford</u>
<u>R2436 – Pong Lai Fong</u>	<u>R2467 – Cheung Kit Ling</u>
<u>R2477 – Hong Ying Jiang</u>	<u>R2504 – Sung Kit Man</u>
Mr Mak Siu Lun Alan]
Ms Wong Ka Yan] Representers’ representatives
Mr Jeff Bau]
Ms Wan Ka Hing]
<u>R2023 – Fok Ming Fuk</u>	<u>R2030 – Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund</u>
<u>R2052 – Li Wing Fai Doris</u>	<u>R2055 – Michelle Li</u>
<u>R2557 – Daisy Chan</u>	
Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund	- Representer and Representers’ representative
<u>R2025 – Chung Napoleon King</u>	
<u>R2302 – Carmen Chung</u>	
Mr Chung Napoleon King	- Representer and Representer’s representative
<u>R2081 – Lo Wai Cheung</u>	
Mr Lo Wai Cheung	- Representer
<u>R2441 – Sun Yan Xi</u>	
Ms Kathy Lau	- Representer’s representative
<u>R2524 – Ronald Taylor</u>	
Mr Ronald Taylor	- Representer
<u>R2568 – Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents’ Association</u>	
<u>R2858 – Steve Sau</u>	<u>R3211 – 馮年興</u>
<u>R3212 – Ki Mui Kuen Annie</u>	<u>R3810 – Liu Chi Ngai</u>
<u>R3811 – Liu Kam Hay</u>	<u>R3812 – Tsang Mei Yee</u>

<u>R3951 – Winnie Wong</u>		<u>R3987 – 盧金鳳</u>	
<u>R4168 – 陳宜志</u>		<u>R4179 – 莊潤端</u>	
Mr Steve Sau] Representers and Representers'	
Ms Ki Mui Kuen Annie] representatives	
<u>R2627 – Yuen Yin Han</u>			
Mrs Leung Kan Kwan Sin Sylvia	-	Representer's representative	
<u>R2859 – So Sau Yu</u>			
Mr So Sau Yu Samuel	-	Representer	
<u>R2882 – Elan Lee</u>			
Ms Leung Man Ling	-	Representer's representative	
<u>R3013 – Lo Suet Kwan</u>			
Mr Kwok Kam Lam	-	Representer's representative	
<u>R3726 – 楊楠強</u>			
Mr Leung Hong Wah	-	Representer's representative	
<u>R3808 – Liu Wai Man</u>			
<u>R4034 – 梁麗貞</u>			
Ms Lee Kuen Kuen	-	Representers' representative	
<u>R3826 – 梁開龍</u>			
<u>R4273 – Kwok Kam Lam</u>			
Mr Kwok Kam Lam	-	Representer and Representer's representative	
<u>R3885 – Cheuk Wai Chuen</u>			
Mr Cheuk Chi Pong	-	Representer's representative	

R4070 – 林友光

Ms Poon Wai Ling - Representers' representative

R4142 – Yvonne Yu

Ms Yvonne Yu - Representer

R4198 – Chan Chi Chai

Mr Chan Chi Chai - Representer

R4229 – Leung Shu Wing

Mr Leung Shu Wing - Representer

R4239 – Lee Kam Fong

Mr Kwok Kam Lam - Representers' representative

R4334 – Leung Man Ling

Ms Leung Man Ling - Representer

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and answer (Q&A) sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in their absence, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

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

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK5, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's views on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10425 (the Paper).

10. The Chairperson then invite the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

R1396 – 程學麒

R4084 – Wong Sau Kam

11. Ms Elan Lee made the following main points :

- (a) she opposed the rezoning of representation sites D and E for public housing development as the ecological value of that area was high and the proposed public housing developments at those sites would involve massive tree felling. The supply for only several thousand housing units was not worth the damage to the environment caused by destroying those trees;
- (b) the Government was trying to enhance the public awareness of climatic change, protection of wild animal, preventing bush fire, promoting green living/green burial and preserving the natural environment to reduce the impact of urban development and to improve air quality. This notwithstanding, the Government was doing exactly the opposite by proposing public housing development in "Green Belt" ("GB") sites that necessitate the felling of vast number of trees;
- (c) there were rare and near endangered plant and animal species in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen. Clearing the vegetation for development would

adversely affect the ecological value of the area. The habitat for wild animals in the valley would be destroyed and it might not be possible to relocate those animals. Those animals would be forced to forage and roost closer to human settlements, creating conflicts between animals and residents;

- (d) many trees to be felled were mature trees but the compensatory trees might not be of comparable size; and
- (e) minor changes in the environment would kick-start a chain reaction and affect the habitat of wild animals. The impact of felling 5,300 trees for development at representation sites D and E would be great as it would adversely affect the habitats of animal species in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, as well as the sites of archaeological interest associated with the Old Dairy Farm.

R775 – Chan Sun Man

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

- (a) the Food Safety Laboratory of the Government Laboratory at Victoria Road near Wah Fu Estate (WFE) should be relocated as the nearby residents would be affected by the odour and fumes generated from the laboratory. Alternatively, the site of the laboratory should be extended for plantation of *Ginko biloba* (銀杏樹) along the site periphery to absorb the harmful substance released;
- (b) pavilions should be constructed near stream courses in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen and hiking trails to provide resting places for hikers. The existing pavilions were too small and could not accommodate large hiking groups;

- (c) seasonal or festive flowering plants should be planted near stream courses and hiking trails to enhance the environment;
- (d) the refuse collection point (RCP) at Aberdeen Centre I was sharing the same ingress/egress with the car park and another RCP at Shek Pai Wan Estate was located near a care home for the disabled. This arrangement was unsatisfactory as the odour would pose health hazard to the residents; and
- (e) the Government should examine the feasibility of providing ferry service from Waterfall Bay to various places and a market of one to two storeys in height should be provided at the Waterfall Bay Park for hawkers at low rents.

R1397 – 程維揚

R1465 – 李金齡

R3778 – Yau Siu Kwong Paul

13. Mr Yau Siu Kwong Paul made the following main points :

- (a) the “GB” sites at Kai Lung Wan (KLW) were located at the bottom of the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, where the cattle fields of the Old Dairy Farm once existed. Dairy Farm was established in 1886 and more than 1,000 dairy cattle were kept, producing milk for the whole territory. The farm once occupied a vast area from Sassoon Road to Tin Wan. However, the scale of the farm was gradually reduced since 1972. The farm at the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen was finally closed in 1983 and local residents had fond memories of the farm;

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

- (b) Dairy Farm had shaped the development of Pok Fu Lam and nowhere else in Hong Kong would have the same environment as the valley near Chi Fu Fa

Yuen. There were relics of the Old Dairy Farm including cowsheds, stables, storage and stone fences on walkways, which provided a place for historian to learn about the industrialization of the farm;

- (c) there were also graves near the Hong Kong Island Archery Club in KLV for burying those who had died in the storm in 1874 and occupation during World War II. In view of the historical background, the sites at KLV should be preserved;
- (d) the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen was densely vegetated and the trees provided cooling effect and fresh air for the area. It was the habitat of some near endangered amphibian species, which would die if their habitats were disturbed. The stream course also provided a good environment for migrating birds to stop over. The Government should preserve the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, which had historical, cultural, architectural and ecological value, as a showcase to the world;
- (e) a total of six buildings with a building height of 200mPD and 230mPD was proposed for the two sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, which would absorb a lot of heat and cause heat island effect; and
- (f) residents of Chuen Lung in Tsuen Wan had a pleasant green environment and residents there had an average lifespan of over 90. Similarly, residents in Pok Fu Lam enjoyed a nice view and green environment of the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen which should be left undisturbed for their well-being. The rezoning of representation sites A to C would be adequate in providing reception resources for Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment (WFER). The rezoning of the representation sites D and E should be aborted.

R1790 – Alexa Cheung

14. Ms Lee Suk Wan made the following main points :

- (a) the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen was a ‘green lung’ for the district, providing fresh air for the residents. Sites D and E in the valley should be retained to provide fresh air;
- (b) planning was not just about development, nature conservation and greening should also be considered in the development process. Different development intensities should be applied to different areas and it was not appropriate to copy a standard development model from other districts to Pok Fu Lam;
- (c) the housing shortage problem should be addressed at source by suppressing demand. While there was a need to provide housing for the general public, other basic needs, such as fresh air and green environment, should not be ignored;
- (d) WFE should be redeveloped in phases so that existing Wah Fu residents could be rehoused in-situ. The rezoning of those “GB” sites under the current OZP amendments was aimed to meet the housing target, but the quality of living of the general public was not taken care of; and
- (e) as a world-class city, Hong Kong should have diversified developments and green space in different districts. Retaining the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen for eco-tourism development would have more benefit than housing development. Hong Kong needed to maintain bio-diversity and conserve its natural environment for sustainability in the long-term, and a balance between development and nature conservation should be struck. The rezoning of those sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen should not proceed.

R1794 – 張鄧雪芬

15. Ms Lee Wai Kuen made the following main points :

- (a) she objected to the rezoning of “GB” sites for public housing developments at representation sites D and E as the green environment was important to the health and well-being of residents, both physically and mentally;
- (b) according to studies carried out in Hong Kong and overseas, green natural environment would reduce pollution and provide a place for recreation. The provision of a green environment would encourage outdoor activities, which in turn would promote inter-personal interaction, relieve mental pressure/fatigue, calm our mind, prevent diseases including high blood pressure, heart disease and obesity. It would even help recovery from surgery and lower crime rate;
- (c) about 20% of people in Hong Kong suffered a different degree of mental problem. The money and resources spent on curing mental disorder had risen sharply since 2009. Green space was a free remedy and should be widely used. “GB” was effective in absorbing noise and cleaning the air. Studies had shown that people living in or near “GB” were healthier in general;
- (d) there was no sizeable public park in Pok Fu Lam. Residents hoped that the easily accessible KLW could be developed into a public green park for their enjoyment. Apart from its landscape values, KLW also formed part of a ‘Fung Shui’ vein extending from Waterfall Bay to Mount Kellett and should not be rezoned for development hastily;
- (e) upon the completion of WFER, there would be about 12,000 flats. Taking into account about 3,600 flats to be provided in representation sites A to C, there would be almost 16,000 flats, which was significantly more than that in the existing WFE. Rezoning representation sites D and E in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen was not necessary; and

- (f) it was reported in the newspaper yesterday that Hong Kong ranked fourth in the world for its biodiversity and had surpassed New York, London and Tokyo in the level of biodiversity within the metropolitan area. KLW should be protected to maintain the unique character of Hong Kong, without which, Hong Kong would lose its attractiveness.

R1801 – Island South Property Management Limited

R1802 – Bel-Air Owner’s Committee

R1953 – Sharon Geok Lian Lim

R2020 – Chan Kenneth Kar Ching

R2028 – Kwok Ying Lok

R2039 – Lui Yau Shing

R2102 – Tony Lai

R2137/C121 – Ngai Tze Bun

R2156 – Wong Fung Mei Jacky

R2179 – Xiao Ran

R2186 – 麥海活

R2216 – Wilson Lo

R2348 – Linda Kwan Chow

R2369 – Carina Healy

R2378 – Wong Ching Kong Clifford

R2436 – Pong Lai Fong

R2467 – Cheung Kit Ling

R2477 – Hong Ying Jiang

R2504 – Sung Kit Man

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Mak Siu Lun Alan, Ms Wong Ka Yan and Mr Jeff Bau made the following main points :

- (a) they represented Bel-Air Owners’ Committee and residents in objecting to the rezoning of representation sites A and B and requested that those rezoning proposals be deleted. Public housing developments should be sited near KLW and Aberdeen for more cost efficiency and to minimise the impacts on Bel-Air and developments along Victoria Road. The rezoning proposals were ad hoc and the existing residents in particular those in Bel-Air were made to bear the consequence;
- (b) the need to increase housing supply and for WFER was acknowledged. However, the environment of Pok Fu Lam and the quality of living enjoyed by residents of Bel-Air and the nearby developments should not be adversely affected;

- (c) Bel-Air was located about 150m away from the existing WFE and was a major stakeholder in the WFER process, but the residents there had not been consulted. The map attached to the various issues of Information Leaflets for consultation only showed the location of the proposed public housing developments, but did not cover a wider area to show developments in the surrounding areas that might be affected, including Bel-Air. Residents of Bel-Air were misled into believing that they would not be affected by those developments;
- (d) Bel-Air Service Centre had been requesting for a meeting with the relevant department since July 2017 but such a meeting could only be held in October 2017 and the public housing development proposals were already in an advanced stage. Bel-Air residents felt that they were not respected and their views had been ignored;
- (e) there was doubt on how the traffic and environmental impacts of the proposed public housing developments on the surrounding areas, including Bel-Air, Baguio Villa, the University of Hong Kong (HKU) were assessed;
- (f) the junctions of Victoria Road/Cyberport Road and Victoria Road/Pok Fu Lam Road were already operating at full capacity and traffic would block the ingress/egress of Bel-Air. The proposed public housing developments at representation sites A and B would result in an increase of about 3,250 flats for more than 10,000 people, which would aggravate the traffic congestion problem, blocking fire engines and ambulances services to the area. Those future residents would also suffer from the traffic problem;
- (g) the traffic impact assessment (TIA) was piecemeal and had not taken into account all of the possible development in the area. It was subjective in reaching a conclusion that with traffic improvement measures, the increase in traffic would not be unacceptable. As the traffic would probably be concentrated in the rush hours, the impact from the additional traffic would

actually be worse than that in the anticipated scenario, which might be based on an average figure. The so-called traffic improvement measures to provide an additional eastbound traffic lane in Victoria Road at various road junctions could not solve the traffic congestion problem.

- (h) traffic congestion would also result in air quality and road safety problems. Although there would be mitigation measures to tackle the noise and dust problem during the long construction period, specifications on those measures were not available and their effectiveness was in doubt;
- (i) as illustrated by the photomontage in Issue No. 4 of the Information Leaflet, the view of Chi Fu Fa Yuen would be blocked by the proposed developments at representation sites A and B. The high-rise, high-intensity developments would have wall effect and adversely affect the breathing space. They were not compatible with the tranquil environment of Pok Fu Lam and would have adverse impact on its environment, visual openness and green space;
- (j) the proposed developments involved extensive tree felling, which was not in line with the advocacy of preserving the natural environment. Although some trees were proposed to be transplanted, there was doubt on whether transplanting could be carried out successfully. As most of the trees to be felled were over 30 years old, it would take a very long time for the compensatory trees to reach the same level of maturity;
- (k) the proposed public housing developments would also have adverse impact on Waterfall Bay and the stream course in the area. There was no information on how the construction impact on the ecology and the environment in the area could be mitigated;
- (l) the development concept of Bel-Air was modelled on the developments in Silicon Valley in California, comprising office, retail/entertainment, hotel and residents. The proposed high-rise, high-density public housing

developments in the area would contravene the development concept of Bel-Air; and

- (m) the rezoning was not based on a 'people-oriented' approach from the perspective of local residents.

R2023 – Fok Ming Fuk

R2030 – Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund

R2052 – Li Wing Fai Doris

R2055 – Michelle Li

R2557 – Daisy Chan

16. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund made the following main points :

- (a) he lived in Bel-Air and supported public housing development. However, the sites identified for proposed public housing development had not considered the impact on Cyberport and Bel-Air and was unfair to the residents;
- (b) as pointed out by other representers, Bel-Air was not included in the map in the Information Leaflet for consultation. Residents of Bel-Air had mistakenly believed that they would not be affected. The local communities in Pok Fu Lam spreading across Consort Rise, Sassoon Road and Bel-Air were all of low-density developments. The proposed developments would increase the population in the area by 45% and the capacity of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road could not cope with such a significant population increase;
- (c) there were more than 7,000 private cars in Bel-Air and 3,000 in Baguio Villa. Traffic was already very heavy and congestion occurred throughout the day. The addition of a traffic lane at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road for turning traffic could not solve the traffic congestion problem;

- (d) there was no information in the TIA on the existing condition of various road junctions or how performance of road junctions was calculated. It was indicated in the TIA that there would be over 50% reserve capacity at the junctions of Victoria Road/Cyberport Road and Cyberport Road/Information Crescent, and a negative reserve capacity at the junction at Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road in 2027 and 2032, with or without the MTR South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)). As illustrated by some recent photographs taken on a weekday and on Sunday, there was a long queue of traffic at the junctions of Victoria Road/Cyberport Road and Sha Wan Drive/Victoria Road. In view of the congestion condition at these junctions, the 50% junction reserve capacity was questionable. It was also not possible that the reserve capacity for 2027 and 2032 could remain the same, taking into account the additional public housing developments and WFER;
- (e) according to the TIA, the ingress/egress of the public housing developments at sites A and B were at Victoria Road. As Victoria Road was a single-lane dual carriageway, it could not accommodate the additional traffic generated from the developments with 3,250 flats and the future community/commercial centre, as well as the traffic after the completion of WFER. The proposed public housing development at representation sites A and B would aggravate the traffic problem. Traffic congestion black spots would be created and the exhaust from vehicles would in turn affect the air quality, which had the same effect of felling thousands of trees;
- (f) despite the possible implementation of the MTR SIL(W), there might not be any improvement in the traffic condition as residents of Bel-Air and Baguio Villa would still choose to drive instead of taking the MTR. As the mitigation measures recommended in the TIA could not solve the traffic congestion at the major road junctions, the construction of the MTR SIL(W) would not help in any way;

- (g) a number of trees at sites A and B would need to be felled. Preserving those trees would contribute to ‘greening’ the environment. Moreover, the implementation of public housing developments at the five reception sites, WFER as well as the construction of the MTR SIL(W) would take more than a decade to complete. The construction traffic would significantly affect Pok Fu Lam and St Paul’s College Primary School nearby; and

- (h) in view of the heritage impact at representation sites D and E and the adverse traffic impact at representation sites A and B, the Government should reconsider the rezoning of those sites. Alternative sites such as the Hong Kong Police College in Wong Chuk Hang, which occupied a large area near the MTR Ocean Park Station, should be considered.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break.]

R2025 – Chung Napoleon King

R2302 – Carmen Chung

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Chung Napoleon King made the following main points :

- (a) the need for public housing development and WFER was acknowledged;

- (b) Cyberport and Bel-Air were intended for the development of a high-technology community in a tranquil environment to promote and develop cyber industries in Hong Kong. The proposed high-rise, high-density public housing developments in their surrounding areas were not in line with that intention, or that of Pok Fu Lam area. The well-being of those residents in Bel-Air, Wah Kwai Estate and the surrounding areas would be adversely affected;

- (c) Cyberport and Bel-Air were not included on the plan attached to the various Information Leaflets for public consultation. As reflected from the plans in various issues of the Information Leaflets, the total land area proposed for the public housing developments had been reduced as a result of public consultation. However, as residents of Bel-Air were not consulted, no revision was made to the proposed developments at representation sites A and B, which would have the most impact on them;
- (d) residents in Bel-Air opposed to the rezoning as the quality of their living would be adversely affected. The Government chose to take the easy way out in rezoning those sites for public housing developments but failed to consider utilizing other readily available sites;
- (e) public housing developments at those rezoning sites would involve extensive and costly site formation works, which was a waste of public resources. While attempting to solve the housing problem by developing those sites, the Government created other problems related to traffic and transport, environment and air ventilation, infrastructure, ecology, living quality and well-being of the residents. There was no holistic assessment on the impacts of the significant population increase in the area;
- (f) WFER could be carried out by phases in order to rehouse its existing residents in-situ, hence representation sites A to E would not be required as reception sites. The proposed developments at those sites to provide additional public housing units should be planned elsewhere so as to minimize the adverse impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (g) those representations sites were scattered and the development proposals were piecemeal. In particular, some sites were small in size and not suitable for high-density public housing development. The green backdrop at those sites should be preserved. Instead, the Government should consolidate those sites into a single development for more comprehensive planning;

- (h) the TIA was not comprehensive and did not truly reflect the traffic condition. The existing traffic condition was already unbearable. The adverse traffic impact resulted from the additional population at representation sites A and B would be irreversible and could not be predicted;
- (i) there would be environmental pollution in terms of dust, noise and glare during construction. The preliminary environmental review did not reflect the actual condition of the area;
- (j) the proposed public housing developments involved extensive tree felling, which would have far-reaching adverse impact on the district in terms of air quality, and affected the physical, mental and psychological well-being of local residents; and
- (k) in view of the un-resolved traffic problems, rezoning of representation sites A and B should be aborted. Alternative sites should be considered for public housing development.

R2524 – Ronald Taylor

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ronald Taylor made the following main points :

- (a) he was an engineer and was involved in designing various highway projects in Hong Kong since 1975. He had been living in Pok Fu Lam since 1976 and hence had good local knowledge to provide useful comment on the traffic aspect;
- (b) PlanD's responses relied heavily on the TIA carried out by CEDD, which did not reflect the real traffic condition. Many findings in the TIA should

not be accepted as it had not taken into consideration many site specific factors which would reduce the road/junction capacity;

KLW North site (site E)

- (c) there was no objection to the proposed public housing development at the site. However, the proposed access road to the site, which was in the form of a cul-de-sac leading from Pok Fu Lam Road, was not acceptable for the following reasons and should be deleted :
- (i) the access road would pass through a “GB” zone, which was primarily intended for conservation of the existing natural environment and there was a general presumption against development within the “GB” zone;
 - (ii) the proposed access road would pass over the Hong Kong Electric Wah Fu-Cyberport Cable Tunnel underneath and have adverse impact on the cable tunnel;
 - (iii) the proposed access was inadequate to serve the proposed public housing development and the associated parking, retail and community facilities. As there was inadequate provision for visitors’ parking and drop-off/pick-up area, illegal parking would likely be attracted;
 - (iv) the existing bus routes and Green Minibus (GMB) routes serving the area would need to be diverted to serve the site, which would involve lengthy detours. The additional traffic through the Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road junction would aggravate the traffic congestion there;

- (v) vehicles turning left from Wah Fu Road to northbound Pok Fu Lam Road had to weave across two traffic lanes to turn right to the site, which was not satisfactory;
- (vi) Pok Fu Lam Road had been upgraded to Primary Distributor status on the presumption that this road should not carry any additional local traffic. The proposed access road would add additional local traffic and contravene that presumption;
- (vii) there was already congestion at the Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road junction, which was caused by the three-stage signal control for the junction, slow-moving uphill traffic and weaving traffic on northbound Pok Fu Lam Road. The proposed access road would require a four-stage signal control for that junction and the situation would be worse;
- (d) a more direct access from the southeastern corner of the site onto the intersection between Wah Fu Road, Shek Pai Wan Road and Pok Fu Lam Road should be provided instead;
- (e) a flyover for the right-turning traffic from southbound Pok Fu Lam Road to Victoria Road and a pedestrian footbridge should be provided. The signal control at the Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road junction could thus be revised to enable main movements on same traffic signal stage to reduce the cycle time and delays;
- (f) with workable access arrangement for the site, public housing development would be possible;

KLW South site (site D)

- (g) the site was not practical for public housing development in view of the steep slope and site topography, which necessitate extensive site formation and retaining walls. There would be geological problem;
- (h) ingress/egress to the site would be from Shek Pai Wan Road, which could only be based on a left-in/left-out arrangement. In-coming traffic from Aberdeen and out-going traffic towards Po Fu Lam would need to take long detours to Wah Fu and Tin Wan respectively;
- (i) additional bus bays would be required on Shek Pai Wan Road to serve the site, which were not appropriate for a primary distributor road;
- (j) footpath widening on Shek Pai Wan Road between sites D and E would be required. However, this would involve significant slope works and retaining structures. The footpath widening as well as the provision of drainage, sewerage, water and other utilities to the site would cause significant disruption to traffic on Shek Pai Wan Road; and
- (k) the significant site formation works was environmentally unfriendly and the rezoning of the site for public housing development should be aborted.

R2568 – Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents’ Association

R2858 – Steve Sau

R3211 – 馮年興

R3212 – Ki Mui Kuen Annie

R3810 – Liu Chi Ngai

R3811 – Liu Kam Hay

R3812 – Tsang Mei Yee

R3951 – Winnie Wong

R3987 – 盧金鳳

R4168 – 陳宜志

R4179 – 莊潤端

19. Ms Ki Mui Kuen Annie made the following main points :

- (a) she had been living in Chi Fu Fa Yuen for almost 38 years and was currently the Chairperson of Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents’ Association (the

Association). She clarified that residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen did not oppose WFER, but they objected to the rezoning of “GB” sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, which was of high ecological value. The residents requested for in-situ redevelopment of WFE;

- (b) the Association had collected views from 1,500 households and a further 1,810 objections to the OZP amendments, all objecting to rezoning various sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen for development. There were many trees of over 100 year-old as well as rare species of plants and animals. The rezoning would destroy the ecology and the natural environment, affecting air quality and creating a crowded living environment. There was no information on how the trees and animals could be transplanted/relocated, and how they would be affected after being transplanted or relocated;
- (c) there was no information in the Information Leaflets to address residents’ concerns, nor any concept/layout plans on the redevelopment of WFE. Residents had the perception that WFER was not thoroughly planned and the project was premature. In-situ redevelopment of WFE by phases should be considered;
- (d) apart from meeting the housing demand, the Government should also strike a balance between development and maintaining the ecology, environment and well-being of the residents. Preserving those “GB” sites could be achieved if priority was given to developing brownfield sites;
- (e) the capacity of road networks in Pok Fu Lam could not cope with the traffic generated from the additional 11,900 flats/26,880 residents. Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road were blocked for several hours a couple of weeks ago due to a ruptured water pipe. With the additional population in the district, the situation would not be manageable in case of accident;

- (f) there was no information on whether there would be any increase in bus/GBM services as most residents relied on public transport for commuting;
- (g) the additional population in the area would generate demand for medical, educational services as well as other community services. The average waiting time for treatment in the emergency ward in Queen Mary Hospital was about 5 hours and the situation would become worse. There was no demographic information on the additional population to plan for various facilities;
- (h) Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Yar Chee Villas were about 100m away from the future public housing development at representation site E and 40m away from the proposed access road. The residents would be facing a row of tall buildings in representation site E. The proximity of tall buildings would affect air ventilation and create stress;
- (i) as it was common to have private residential developments above MTR stations, residents had doubt on whether there would be any public housing above the future MTR Wah Fu Station. It would be unfair that the existing WFE residents was relocated to the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen while the original WFE site with a nice sea view would be taken up by private residential development. Although the total area of the development sites had been reduced, the existing residents' concerns had not been fully addressed; and
- (j) the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen were attracted by the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen when they moved there many years ago. They would like to retain the "GB" in the valley. In-situ redevelopment of WFE by phases would address the concerns raised by residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen, Pok Fu Lam Garden, Cyberport and Bel-Air, meeting the housing need as well as providing a better living environment for the existing WFE residents.

20. Ms Ki Mui Kuen Annie then read out a letter from a resident from Chi Fu Fa Yuen.

The main points were :

- (a) WFE Phase I and II were completed in 1967 and 1970 respectively, accommodating a population of about 50,000. As maintenance was costly, redevelopment was the only choice;
- (b) the rezoning of various sites for public housing developments as reception resources for WFER had attracted different views. In particular, the rezoning of “GB” sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen would destroy a vast vegetated area with high heritage and ecological values. The wooded valley accommodated many old and valuable trees, rare animal and plant species and purified the air for the district;
- (c) in view of the topography and its north-facing orientation, the proposed high-rise buildings at the sites in the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen would trap the hot and humid air and would cause discomfort to the residents there. Apart from having a flat to live in, the future residents living there would not enjoy the living environment. The Housing Policy should adopt a ‘people-oriented’ approach; and
- (d) the scale of WFER should be determined with respect to a comprehensively planned and phased redevelopment programme. Several blocks of interim housing with standard flat sizes should be built first for decanting existing WFE residents which would be affected in the first phase to trigger the in-situ redevelopment. Upon the completion of WFER, those interim housing blocks could be used to accommodate applicants on the waiting list for public rental housing.

[The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 12:37 p.m.]

21. The meeting was resumed at 1:50 p.m. on 21.5.2018.

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

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

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Chief Traffic Engineer/Hong Kong, Transport Department
Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

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

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

[Dr F.C. Chan arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 1 (continued)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/16

(TPB Paper No. 10425)

[The item was conducted in English and Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Sessions (continued)

23. The following government representatives and consultants, representers/commenter as well as 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

Housing Department (HD)

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

Mr Joe B.M. Leung - Senior Civil Engineer

Mr Antony K.C. Chung - Architect (A)

Mr Raymond C.P. Law - Planning Officer

Ms Stephanie C.Y. Lai - Landscape Architect

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

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

Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)

Ms C.Y. Ho - Senior Nature Conservation Officer/South

Ms Chole C.U. Ng - Nature Conservation Officer/Hong Kong

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup)

Professor S.Y. Chan - Associate Director

Dr Lo Kin - Associate Director

Mr Fanco Tsang - Engineer

Asia Ecological Consultants Limited (AEC)

Mr Tommy Hui - Senior Ecologist

Representers/Commenter and their Representatives

R775 – Chan Sun Man

Mr Chan Sun Man - Representer

R1396 – 程學麒

R4084 – Wong Sau Kam

Ms Elan Lee - Representers' representative

R1790 – Alexa Cheung

Ms Lee Suk Wan - Representer's representative

R1794 – 張鄧雪芬

Ms Lee Wai Kuen - Representer's representative

R1801 – Island South Property Management Limited

R1802 – Bel-Air Owner’s Committee

R2020 – Chan Kenneth Kar Ching

R2039 – Lui Yau Shing

R2137/C121 – Ngai Tze Bun

R2179 – Xiao Ran

R2216 – Wilson Lo

R2369 – Carina Healy

R2436 – Pong Lai Fong

R2477 – Hong Ying Jiang

Mr Alan Mak

Ms Wong Ka Yan

Mr Jeff Bau

Ms Wan Ka Hing

]

]

]

]

R1953 – Sharon Geok Lian Lim

R2028 – Kwok Ying Lok

R2102 – Tony Lai

R2156 – Wong Fung Mei Jacky

R2186 – 麥海活

R2348 – Linda Kwan Chow

R2378 – Wong Ching Kong Clifford

R2467 – Cheung Kit Ling

R2504 – Sung Kit Man

Representers’ and Commenter’s

representatives

R2023–Fok Ming Fuk

R2052 – Li Wing Fai Doris

R2557 – Daisy Chan

Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund

-

R2030 –Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund

R2055 – Michelle Li

Representer and Representers’
representative

R2025 – Chung Napoleon King

R2302–Carmen Chung

Mr Chung Napoleon King

-

Representer and Representers’
representative

R2568– Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents’ Association

R2858 – Steve Sau

R3212 – Ki Mui Kuen Annie

R3811 – Liu Kam Hay

R3951 – Winnie Wong

R4168 – 陳宜志

R3211 – 馮年興

R3810 – Liu Chi Ngai

R3812 – Tsang Mei Yee

R3987 – 盧金鳳

R4179 – 莊潤端

Mr Steve Sau] Representers and Representers'
Ms Ki Mui Kuen Annie] representatives

R2604 – Katty Law

Mr Charlton Cheung - Representer's representative

R2627 – Yuen Yin Han

Mrs Leung Kan Kwan Sin Sylvia - Representer's representative

R2882 – Elan Lee

Ms Leung Man Ling - Representer's representative

R3013 – Lo Suet Kwan

Mr Kwok Kam Lam - Representer's representative

R3808 – Liu Wai Man

R4034 – 梁麗貞

Ms Lee Kuen Kuen - Representers' representative

R3826 – 梁開龍

R4273 – Kwok Kam Lam

Mr Kwok Kam Lam - Representer and Representer's
representative

R4070 – 林友光

Ms Poon Wai Ling - Representer's representative

R4142 – Yvonne Yu

Ms Yvonne Yu - Representer

R4198 – Chan Chi Chai

Mr Chan Chi Chai - Representer

R4229 – Leung Shu Wing

Mr Leung Shu Wing - Representer

R4239 – Lee Kam Fong

Mr Kwok Kam Lam - Representer's representative

R4334 – Leung Man Ling

Ms Leung Man Ling - Representer

24. The Chairperson reminded the representers/commenter or their representatives to be concise in their oral submission and not to repeat points which had already been mentioned by the other representers so as to allow more time for the Question and Answer (Q&A) session. She then invited the representers, commenter and their representatives to continue their oral submissions.

R2568 – Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents' Association

R2858 – Steve Sau

R3211 – 馮年興

R3212 – Ki Mui Kuen Annie

R3810 – Liu Chi Ngai

R3811 – Liu Kam Hay

R3812 – Tsang Mei Yee

R3951 – Winnie Wong

R3987 – 盧金鳳

R4168 – 陳宜志

R4179 – 莊潤端

25. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Steve Sau made the following main points:

(a) he represented the Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents' Association. A total of 4,337 representations were received on the draft Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) which involved rezoning sites for public housing development in Pok Fu Lam South and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment (WFER). About 1,810 (42%) of the representations, including those from the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen, raised the following objections and concerns :

(i) preservation of the "Green Belt" ("GB") zone at Kai Lung Wan;

- (ii) in-situ redevelopment of WFE for public housing;
- (iii) opposed Items D and E for rezoning the “GB” at Kai Lung Wan which would involve felling of 2,400 trees; and
- (iv) opposed the proposed new access road near Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Yar Chee Villas which was only about 40m away from the two developments;

Environmental Aspects

- (b) according to a survey conducted by the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, Chinese University of Hong Kong in 2014, nearly 60% of the respondents found it unacceptable to the impacts on natural environment posed by boosting housing land supply, while more than half of the respondents considered increasing development density was unacceptable;
- (c) they concurred with the Civic Exchange that rezoning of “GB” sites without taking into account their ecological values, or increasing development density at the expense of air ventilation, would have far-reaching adverse impacts on the quality of life. They supported development of brownfield sites and revitalisation of industrial buildings;
- (d) while there was a need for WFER, in-situ redevelopment would be appropriate and the need for development of the five reception sites was not justified. The representation sites A and B could be used to build the first batch of 3,610 flats to rehouse about 40% of the residents in WFE. Yue Kwong Chuen and Pak Tin Estate were successful examples of in-situ redevelopment by phases with a large increase in flat production. WFER should adopt the same approach and thus the five sites would not be required and the number of public housing flats would still be increased;
- (e) the felling of 2,400 trees in the Kai Lung Wan sites would result in a great loss in greenery in the area which had the functions of purifying the polluted air and protecting nearby wildlife habitat. The reduction in “GB”

sites would affect the health of the residents and further aggravate the heat island effect;

- (f) according to an analysis by National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the surface temperatures of the Earth were the warmest in 2016 and 2017 and it was the second hottest year since 1880. The number of days of intense heat in Hong Kong had increased, while cold days had decreased. As reported in the press in 2015, academic pointed out that adding hundreds of thousands units to the concrete jungle of Hong Kong could intensify the heat island effect, leading to more hot days and even death. Hong Kong had already fell out of top 30 in liveability rankings;
- (g) with reference to the “Hong Kong Urban Climatic Analysis Map” published in 2009 which was derived from the data on wind information, building height, and thermal load, etc. The ‘High Thermal Load and Low Dynamic Potential’ areas shown in red were usually of high building volumes in main urban areas in Kowloon and north shore of Hong Kong Island. However, some areas near WFE and Chi Fu Fa Yuen were also shown in red. The main factors affecting the thermal comfort were air temperature, humidity and air ventilation of which air ventilation was planning related. The proposed six 49-storey buildings in the “GB” zone under Items D and E would create wall effect and affect air ventilation. Rezoning of the “GB” sites at Kai Lung Wan would intensify the “heat island” effect and high-rise buildings had great heat capacity and slower release in absorbed heat;
- (h) the major sources of air pollutants in the Pok Fu Lam area came from vessels passing by the East Lamma Channel, the power plant at Lamma Island, and vehicles emission along Pok Fu Lam Road, Chi Fu Road and Victoria Road;
- (i) a video from the School of Public Health, the University of Hong Kong was played to show the impacts of air pollution. In terms of health, the major effects were found on respiratory and cardiovascular systems. Gaseous pollutants, not only irritating the eyes and the respiratory tract, but would provoke health problems. Particulate matters (PM) could cause

injury beyond our respiratory system and increased the risk of cardiovascular diseases. Economically, society paid a huge price in the burden on the healthcare system and loss of productivity. Regarding environmental degradation, acid rain would damage buildings and smog would affect road traffic and navigation. Air pollution was not only affecting the physical health but also mental health;

- (j) WFER would add a population of 36,000 which was equivalent to an increase of 45% of the population in Pok Fu Lam South. Such a large increase would bring problems to the road capacity, provision of government, institution and community (GIC) facilities, employment and public safety;
- (k) the planning intention of “GB” zone was for the conservation of the existing natural environment at the urban fringe, to safeguard it from encroachment by urban type development, and to provide additional outlets for passive recreational activities. There was also a general presumption against development within the zone. The “GB” zone of the Kai Lung Wan representation sites D and E should be retained as they would not only protect the water resources of the nearby Aberdeen Reservoirs, country parks and nearby ecological areas, but could also ease the heat island effect in the area. Trees were essential elements in the ecosystem, asset of nature, and support to healthy life;

Ecological Aspects

- (l) according to their own tree survey, there were 54 significant trees comprising Old Valuable Trees (OVTs) in Chi Fu Valley and Kai Lung Wan including *Aquilaria sinensis*, *Lagerstroemia fordii* and *Ficus elastica*;
- (m) a large number of birds and wildlife species were also observed in Chi Fu Valley, including rare and protected species like the Masked Palm Civet, White-bellied Sea Eagle and Crested Serpent Eagle, of which at least five of those observed species were listed as “Rare” or “Vulnerable” in the China Red Data Book of Endangered animals and

even up to 10 species were protected under the Protection of Endangered Species of Animals and Plants Ordinance (Cap.586). A total of 72 species of birds, 13% of the total species found in Hong Kong was recorded in Chi Fu Valley and Kai Lung Wan during 2010 to 2018. He had seen about 50 to 60 Black Kite flying in the sky of the area. According to the assessment of Dr Sung Yik Hei of the Hong Kong Baptist University, Chi Fu Valley was of high ecological value. He had pointed out that the sighting of a number of animal species of conservation concern, including Tree Gecko, White-bellied Sea Eagle and Crested Serpent Eagle, had highlighted the high ecological value of the area. Their record was far more different from the result of the assessment done by the Government, in which only five bird species of conservation importance were observed;

- (n) a baseline survey in the Chi Fu Stream was conducted by the Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents' Association. Out of the fish, reptiles, frogs and dragonflies discovered, many were listed in the Red List of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), including Short-legged Toad which was an endangered species and Lesser Spiny Frog which was a vulnerable species, demonstrating high scientific importance of the stream. Development boundary of less than 10m away from the stream was not acceptable;

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

- (o) according to a well-known climatologist, “not only climate influences the living plant but the opposite effect of the interaction of plants on their environment could also take place, and was known as plant climate”. The “GB” zones in the Kai Lung Wan had provided ‘eco-system services’ such as absorbing gas produced from greenhouse effect, purifying the air, lowering the temperature, and providing habitat for wild animals;
- (p) neither the fauna relocation nor the tree transplanting issues had been resolved. The proposed transplanting areas were all well-covered with vegetation and there were no space for additional trees to be planted. The

proposed re-diversion of streams was ecologically infeasible, it was thus misleading and illogical to state that the affected Lesser Spiny Frog could be translocated to a newly made channel 500m away from its original habitat;

- (q) the proposed new access road at the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road would have adverse impact on the sites of archaeological interest and important trees including the *Lagerstroemia fordii* along the proposed road alignment;

[Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Information on Development

- (r) the assumptions for flat production and the housing types for the WFER were not mentioned in any of the information leaflets issued jointly by the Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) and Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). Based on the Census data, the population of Hong Kong would only be increased to 8.2 million and would be declining afterwards. Although it was mentioned in the ‘Message from the Secretary’ attached to the information leaflet issued in February 2017 that WFE would be retained for public housing after redevelopment, there was no guarantee that there would be a 100% public housing development at the site. The redevelopment plan including the proposed layout and major development parameters had not been released for public information;
- (s) there were other sites in the area and alternative land resources in Hong Kong available for public housing development to replace some of the representation sites. The proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone and would degrade the environment of the Kai Lung Wan area;

The Representatives' Proposals

- (t) to take forward WFER without sacrificing the ecological value of the “GB” zones at Kai Lung Wan with a view to benefiting the next generation in respect of lessening global warming and heat island effects, they had the following proposals on WFER:
 - (i) to develop representation sites A to C which would accommodate almost 40% of the existing WFE residents and then redevelop WFE by phases;
 - (ii) to retain WFE as a public housing estate to meet the demand for public housing, and to provide a comprehensive redevelopment plan;
 - (iii) to preserve the ecological functions of and maintain the “GB” zoning for representation sites D and E in Kai Lung Wan;
 - (iv) to give priority in development of brownfield sites;
 - (v) to extend the development site boundary of WFE towards the breakwater at Tin Wan as illustrated on the proposed drawing; and
- (u) the Board should consider seriously their grounds, concerns and proposals as Pok Fu Lam was an area of unique character, and such garden neighbourhood should be preserved. Urban and building designs were as important as meeting housing target.

R2627–Yuen Yin Han

26. Ms Leung Kan Kwan Sin, Sylvia made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed Items D and E but would not repeat the grounds already covered by other representers. She would like to express her feelings on the OZP amendments as a resident in the area;

- (b) the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen did not oppose WFER but supported in-situ redevelopment. The residents also queried whether the whole site of WFE would be redeveloped into public housing or it would be just prepared for land sale as private luxury flats; and
- (c) she was also disappointed with the Southern District Council (SDC) as the representatives of Chi Fu Fa Yuen had written to SDC to express their concerns and objections to the zoning amendments but the SDC did not help to relay their views. She thus requested the Board to listen to their voice and consider in detail their submissions.

R2882 – Elan Lee

R4334 – Leung Man Ling

27. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Leung Man Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she opposed rezoning of the site in Kai Lung Wan from “GB” to “Residential (Group A)1” (“R(A)1”) (Item E) and proposed in-situ redevelopment of WFE;

Ecological Impact

- (b) as mentioned earlier by other representers, the proposed development would cause adverse ecological impact on fauna species, such as Short Legged Toad and Lesser Spiny Frog, which were either endangered or vulnerable species. However, there was no information about Short Legged Toad in the TPB Paper No. 10425 (the Paper);
- (c) according to the drawing provided by the Government during the zoning amendments (Drawing 11 of MPC Paper No. 5/17), Stream course 5 which was a 214m long natural watercourse within the Kai Lung Wan North site (Item E), was proposed to be diverted to a new ‘green channel’ near Kai Lung Wan South (Item D) to translocate the protected species. Short Legged Toad, an endangered species, was not only found in Stream course

5, it was observed in nearby watercourses by them. Since the proposed stream diversion would involve an area of more than 3 ha with tree felling, the endangered species would be affected;

- (d) Drawing H-8 of the Paper showed that *Aquilaria sinensis*, which was a native tree in southern China and endemic in China, was found in Chi Fu Valley. However, this type of tree was actually found all over the Pok Fu Lam area. As the tree was threatened by habitat loss, the proposed zoning amendments were considered ecologically unacceptable;
- (e) as regards the woodland compensation proposal, an area of about 6.44 ha was identified as potential woodland compensation areas to compensate the loss of about 5 ha of secondary woodland of the relatively higher ecological value found at the representation sites D and E. However, as seen from a photo taken by her, the proposed compensatory woodland area was already largely covered with trees and vegetation. The two areas suggested for transplanting (Drawing H-9b of the Paper) were considered not satisfactory;

Traffic Impact

- (f) the proposed new access road would create a junction in proximity to the existing vehicular access of Chi Fu Fa Yuen, and there were also three existing schools nearby. It was thus anticipated that the traffic impact with such an increase of population in the area would be significant. According to Table A of the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) conducted by CEDD, the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road (J6) with a -7% in design year of 2027 would be operating without spare capacity, it was questionable why it could suddenly be increased to 19% with just the proposed junction improvement scheme (Drawing H-5 of the Paper);
- (g) the additional traffic flow would aggravate the congestion problems and would also affect the emergency traffic to the nearby Queen Mary Hospital;

Visual Impact

- (h) although it was claimed that a stepped building height (BH) profile would be adopted, as noted in the photomontage (Drawing H-5 of the Paper), the Kai Lung Wan North site would comprise four huge monotonous building blocks of 49-storey at the site. According to Drawing H-4 of the Paper, while the proposed BH for Wah Lok Path site was 170mPD, the BH of the remaining sites was 200 mPD except the Kai Lung Wan North site which was 230mPD. The proposed stepped BH profile was even less than the profile within the existing Chi Fu Fa Yuen. Besides, Yar Chee Villas, the residential development behind the Kai Lung Wan North site was only 5-storey high and would inevitably be blocked by the proposed development. As shown in the photomontage prepared by the Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents' Association, the proposed development in Kai Lung Wan North site would block the whole sky when viewing along Chi Fu Road, and Yar Chee Villas would be totally out of sight. The existing view of the site from Pok Fu Lam Road was all green area, it would then be filled up with high-rise building blocks;

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

- (i) it was unreasonable that the project site boundary had unnecessarily extended to the boundary of Yar Chee Villas (Drawing H-7 of the Paper). Besides, it was also doubted how the remaining area of 5.8 ha would be affected when the gross site area of the 5 sites was only 7.2 ha but the total development area of the housing project was 13 ha; and
- (j) she requested the Board to consider the proposed amendments seriously for the benefits of the future generations.

R3013 – Lo Suet Kwan

28. Mr Kwok Kam Lam made the following main points on behalf of Lo Suet Kwan :

- (a) the representer lived in Pok Fu Lam for its good air quality and nice environment. Her flat once had a sea view but was then blocked mostly by the Bel-Air development. The air ventilation had been worsened and dust particles were increasing. Should more trees be felled, more pollutants would be blown to her flat as the trees and vegetation in the area had help purify the emission from vessels and vehicles;
- (b) to meet the housing land supply target, the Government had been destroying the “GB” sites all over the Territory notwithstanding the strong public objection. While there were about 800 ha brownfield sites in 2013, it was now increased to 1,300 ha. She wondered why the Government did not develop brownfield sites but continue to rezone “GB” sites and it was afraid that the Country Parks would be developed after the “GB” sites; and
- (c) she opposed rezoning the “GB” at representation sites D and E in Kai Lung Wan and objected to felling of 2,000 to 3,000 trees instead of in-situ redevelopment at the existing WFE site. She would like to emphasise that she was not opposing WFER.

R3808 – Liu Wai Man

R4034 – 梁麗貞

29. Ms Lee Kuen Kuen made the following main points:

- (a) she did not oppose WFER but just requested the redevelopment in-situ;
- (b) as said by Mr Lam Chiu Ying, the former Director of the Hong Kong Observatory that the imbalance in ecology had brought about climatic changes and loss of food supply. It was so hot in May currently but it was still cool in the Pok Fu Lam area mainly because of the presence of trees which brought fresh air into the area. The in-filling of housing sites by the Government helped accelerate the climatic changes. “GB” zone acted as the urban lung to promote public health and was good for animals and birds. There were many hiking trails in Kai Lung Wan and the area should be

developed into an ecological park to alleviate the increasing ecological imbalance; and

- (c) she requested the Board to delete Amendment Items A to E and redevelop WFE in-situ.

R2604 – Katty Law

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

- (a) Chi Fu Valley was a V-shaped valley and mostly covered by vegetation with an access road. It was under a continuous ecological system. Although the area for the proposed housing sites had been reduced, it would still disturb the ecological balance of the remaining area. There were many important species with high ecological value found in the valley. It was rather hot at the bottom of the valley in summer time since there was no wind and there were many mosquitoes. The proposed public housing development on one side of the valley would not provide a good living environment for its residents. Chi Fu Fa Yuen was located at the shoulder of the valley and thus had good air ventilation;
- (b) according to the proposed development concept plan, the proposed public housing site at Kai Lung Wan North would be located at the eastern side of the Chi Fu Valley with natural stream courses and the ecology would be adversely affected. In-situ redevelopment of WFE was preferred and the sites in valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen should be released; and
- (c) in addition to the natural and ecological environment of the representation site E, historic remains were found in the site. There were many old tomb stones spotted in the former squatter area within the site. The tomb stones were probably remains of the former Kai Lung Wan Cemetery at the area which was relocated to Wo Hop Shek in the 1950s. The finding of old tomb stones warranted more researches and studies, as well as the need of

preservation since it was part of the history of Hong Kong recording events of typhoon and epidemic.

R4070 – 林友光

31. Ms Poon Wai Ling made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen and supported WFER;
- (b) she proposed to use the staff quarter buildings of the Old Dairy Farm as the reception site for first phase of WFER to allow in-situ redevelopment of the remaining phases; and
- (c) it would be more important for the Government to review the population policy to solve the housing land problem.

R4142 – Yvonne Yu

32. Ms Yvonne Yu made the following main points:

- (a) she was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen and supported WFER while opposing developing the “GB” sites;
- (b) she had moved three times for a green living environment as her child was subject to allergy. She considered good air quality was a basic need for residents;
- (c) the shortage of housing land was mostly due to inappropriate population and land use policies. Many of the brownfield sites had still not been developed, they were land resources for public housing development and could help improve environment at the same time; and
- (d) destroying the “GB” sites was not reversible. To maintain a good living environment for the existing residents, she requested the Government to adopt in-situ redevelopment for WFE.

R4229 – Leung Shu Wing

33. With the aid of a few PowerPoint slides, Mr Leung Shu Wing made the following main points:

- (a) he did not agree with the Government that the proposed housing development would have insignificant adverse visual and air ventilation impacts to the area. The five reception sites together with the redeveloped WFE would block the view of most Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Yar Chee Villas would be the most affected development;
- (b) he agreed that there was a need for WFER, however, the need for the five reception sites for WFER was not justified. Developing only some of the representation sites such as sites under Items A, B and C for reception of WFER would be sufficient to accommodate the existing residents of WFE;
- (c) as shown at photomontage in Drawing H-5 of the Paper, it appeared that the Government was twisting the fact. The existing WFE, instead of the proposed WFER, was shown in the photomontage. It would be questionable if Yar Chee Villas could still be seen from that vantage point if the WFER was in place. Yar Chee Villas was only 100m away from the proposed public housing at representation site E. With a BH from 100mPD to 150mPD, the new high rise residential towers at representation site E would also have visual and adverse air ventilation impacts on Chi Fu Fa Yuen. The proposed development at representation sites A and B would bring about additional traffic to the nearby roads and further worsen the air quality of the area. Developments at representation sites D and E and removal of the trees would also have adverse impact on air quality, local climate and air ventilation;
- (d) the need to free up space within WFE for later railway construction and area for the proposed railway station of the South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)) might only be an excuse of the Government and was not acceptable as there were successful examples, such as Wong Tai Sin, Lok

Fu, and Shek Kip Mei Estates, that the public housing estate had been redeveloped together with MTR construction. The Government might probably transfer benefit to MTRC for property development at the WFE site, just like the recent Wong Chuk Hang Estate case which was changed to private residential development. The Government's hidden agenda similar to the South-East Kowloon Reclamation for private residential development was obvious; and

- (e) the Board was a professional and independent body and thus should be impartial to give a fair judgement on the proposals.

R4239 – Lee Kam Fong

34. Mr Kwok Kam Lam made the following main points :

- (a) the presenter lived in Chi Fu Fa Yuen and opposed Amendment Items D and E in lieu of in-situ redevelopment at WFE by phase. Using the representation sites A to C as reception sites would be able to provide sufficient flats to accommodate the residents affected by WFER, and there would be no need for Amendment Items D and E;
- (b) the “GB” zone of Items D and E was a vegetated area beside Chi Fu Valley in which at least 50 OVTs had been identified as well as the historic structures of the Old Dairy Farm; and
- (c) the “GB” zone was intended for the conservation of the existing natural environment, to safeguard from urban encroachment, and to provide additional passive recreational outlets. Items D and E were not in line with the planning intention of “GB” zone in that there was a general presumption against development. Items D and E would destroy the ecology and heritage of the area and was not well-justified. It was thus proposed to retain the two “GB” sites and only use representation sites A to C for WFER by phase.

R3826 – 梁開龍

R4273 – Kwok Kam Lam

35. Mr Kwok Kam Lam made the following main points:

- (a) he was a resident of Chi Fu Fa Yuen. Having built almost 50 years before, there was a need for WFER. However, in-situ redevelopment would be the best solution for both the residents of WFE as well as the nearby residents;
- (b) in a recent s12A application submitted by Chi Fu Fa Yuen Residents' Association for a proposed Eco-Heritage Park in Chi Fu Valley, he noted that the Metro Planning Committee of the Board did not deny the ecological values of the area. Notwithstanding, the application was rejected and he found the rejection reasons not acceptable. Among others, the reason that the applicant failed to provide sufficient information to ascertain that implementation feasibility of the proposed Eco-Heritage Park was most unreasonable. However, there was no appeal mechanism for s12A application;
- (c) representation sites D and E were located to the southeast of the valley near Chi Fu Fa Yuen, development at such close proximity would cause adverse impacts to the natural vegetation and watercourses, as well as the historic remains. The proposed diversion of streams and tree transplanting were considered not effective nor feasible;
- (d) it was doubtful that representation sites D and E would be really necessary for WFE and why WFER could not be carried out by phases. The Hong Kong Housing Society had already planned to redevelop Yue Kwong Chuen and the Garden Estate in Ngau Tau Kok by phases. The HD had not provided any detailed information including layout and major parameters for WFER. The site would probably be reserved for private housing as property development of the railway station to benefit the MTRCL; and

- (e) in view of the topography of Chi Fu Valley and anticipated ecological impact, he requested that WFER be carried out by phases. Only representation sites A, B and C should be used as reception sites and representation sites D and E should be retained as “GB” zone.

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

[Mr H.W. Cheung left the meeting at this point.]

Environmental and Ecological Issues

37. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on environmental and ecological aspects:

- (a) whether the feasibility study of the five reception sites had included micro climate assessments on air quality, heat island effect, as well as air pollution caused by additional traffic;
- (b) noting that the proposed development at representation site E would involve relocation of the existing habitats and transplanting of mature trees identified in the area, in particular, the *Lagerstroemia fordii* which was a rare species, the feasibility of which was queried by some representers, whether the ecological impacts resulted from the proposed housing development and new access road had been assessed comprehensively;
- (c) whether the increase in traffic flow of the proposed developments would worsen the air quality problem;

- (d) as construction site runoff and sewage might pollute the watercourses in the area, in particular it was noted that there was a natural stream within representation site A running directly into the waterfall next to Waterfall Bay Park, whether there would be mitigation measures to prevent pollution to those watercourses; and
- (e) whether the small knoll shown on Plan H-12b within representation site D would be removed as a result of housing development at the site.

38. In response, Mr Theron K.K. Chan, SPO, HD, Mr Antony K.C. Chung, A, HD, and Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the suitability of the representation sites for public housing development had been demonstrated by the feasibility study carried out by CEDD. The findings of the study had been agreed by the relevant government departments. Upon approval of the zoning amendments, HD would proceed with building design and conduct assessment on the micro-climate of the proposed public housing development as early as possible, while CEDD would further examine traffic, ecological, environmental and other technical aspects. Additional mitigation measures would be considered at the detailed design stage to enhance the air ventilation performance and visual quality;
- (b) the adopted conservation strategy was to avoid, minimise and compensate for ecological impacts. The site boundaries of representation sites D and E involving “GB” zone had been revised and the affected “GB” area had been reduced to 7.6 ha. That was to avoid direct impact on the woodlands of relatively high ecological value and the natural watercourses in Kai Lung Wan as far as possible. As shown in Drawing H-8 of the Paper, the woodland area and watercourse between representation sites D and E had been avoided to retain the existing ecological condition;
- (c) to mitigate for the loss of a natural stream at representation site E, a ‘green channel’ of about 250m long was proposed to the northeast of

representation site D. As the proposed location of the 'green channel' was at the upper watercourse, it would provide similar habitats for stream inhabitants. In-situ preservation or transplantation of floral species of conservation importance including *Lagerstroemia fordii*, to the compensation woodland area was considered feasible. According to the tree survey record, most of the mature trees and *Lagerstroemia fordii* identified were not within the works boundary of the proposed new access road. Besides, the proposed access road at that portion where the *Lagerstroemia fordii* was located would be elevated, hence no adverse impacts on the tree from road works would be anticipated. If any of the important trees would be affected, transplanting would be considered according to the established practice;

- (d) the air ventilation assessment (AVA) conducted was a qualitative assessment in the form of expert evaluation. Based on the findings of the AVA, mitigation measures including six local air paths with minimum width of 20m to 30m were proposed. The proposed residential blocks would maintain at least 100m separation from Yar Chee Villas and Chi Fu Fa Yuen. HD would conduct quantitative AVA at the detailed stage and make reference to Buildings Department's PNAP APP-152 on Sustainable Building Design Guidelines in respect of building separation, permeability, and setback, etc.;
- (e) the natural stream within representation site A would be diverted to run along the site boundary, stormwater from the construction site would be collected and filtered to remove the suspended soil particles before discharging into the public stormwater system or entering the waterfall. Sewage from the construction site would be discharged to the nearby existing public sewerage; and
- (f) to minimize construction waste from the site formation works, they would try to reduce the required surface area and volume of excavation at the least necessary requirement, and the proposed site formation at representation site D would be in stepped platforms instead of removing the whole knoll.

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

- (a) with reference to Drawing H-10 of the Paper, Watercourses 1, 5 and 7 of 135m, 214m and 101m long respectively were running within representation sites A, B and C. While Watercourses 5 and 7 were far away from the waterfall and were not running towards that direction, Watercourse 1 might flow into the waterfall but preventative measures would be carried out to avoid polluting the watercourse during the construction stage; and
- (b) all the relevant air emission sources that would have air quality impacts on the proposed developments, including industrial sources, vehicular emission from existing and proposed roads, had been identified and assessed. The findings of the assessment were acceptable by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) and adverse impact on air quality was not anticipated.

Redevelopment WFE

40. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on redevelopment of WFE:

- (a) whether feasibility study had been conducted to examine WFER in-situ and whether the development parameters of the proposed WFER were available;
- (b) noting there were successful examples of in-situ redevelopment in other public housing projects, whether it was feasible to use only representation sites A, B and C as reception sites or consider in-situ redevelopment of WFE without reception site, and whether in-situ rehousing or rehousing within the same district could be allowed during the redevelopment process in case of in-situ redevelopment;

- (c) what relationship would the Kai Lung Wan sites have with the WFER and what the impact would be on the development programme of WFER if only representation sites A, B and C were used as reception sites instead of all the five sites; and
- (d) whether WFE would be redeveloped for 100% public housing.

41. In response, Mr Theron K.K. Chan, SPO, HD, and Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) there was currently no concrete redevelopment plan for WFER and HD would consult SDC and other stakeholders including the residents of WFE when the redevelopment plan was made available;
- (b) based on rough estimation, there would be serious delay in completing the whole redevelopment process of the WFE if not all the five reception sites would be available. According to HD's current conceptual layout and development parameters, the five reception sites would be developed comprehensively to provide about 8,900 public housing units which would still be less than rehousing demand of WFE. To expedite WFER, HD had targeted the reception resources to be available as soon as practicable with the first phase of the reception resources to be completed in 2025 the earliest while the last phase in 2027. Any reduction in the reception resources would prolong the rehousing and redevelopment process;
- (c) For other redevelopment projects such as Pak Tin Estate reception sites were also identified in the vicinity to facilitate redevelopment of the estate by phase;
- (d) if only representation sites A to C would be available as reception sites, the flat production would be reduced to about 3,000 units only, i.e. a reduction of 5,300 units for rehousing of WFER. While HD had not conducted any assessment on the development programme under the two scenarios, based on their previous experience in other public housing redevelopment projects, it was roughly estimated that one phase of the redevelopment

would require more than five years to complete. For the scenario without representation sites D and E, additional time of ten years or more would be required to complete the whole WFER. As per the request of the TPB, HD would attempt to work out a rough redevelopment programme of WFE including the number of flats affected in respect of the two scenario for Members' information in the next hearing session;

- (e) according to the message from the Secretary for Transport and Housing issued on 15.2.2017, WFE would be redeveloped for public housing so as to address the keen demand for public housing from the society; and
- (f) to implement the SIL(W), it was necessary to free up some space within WFE for subsequent railway construction, including the Wah Fu Station proposed in the preliminary conceptual scheme of SIL(W) in the Railway Development Strategy 2014 (RDS 2014). As the implementation of SIL(W) would be closely hinged on the build-up of transport demand in Pok Fu Lam South and WFER, the Government had to develop the five reception sites as soon as possible to expedite WFER as well as the implementation of SIL(W).

Heritage Aspect

42. Some Members raised the following questions on heritage aspect:

- (a) noting that there were historic structures/buildings of the Old Dairy Farm in the area, whether there was any heritage preservation strategy for the area and the proposed measures to preserve those historic structures/buildings; and
- (b) whether there was further information on the Kai Lung Wan Cemetery as mentioned by one representer.

43. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that Plan H-19 of the Paper indicated the location of the Grade 2 and Grade 3 historic buildings/structures in the area. According to the Antiquities and Monuments Office

(AMO), there was no site of archaeological interest or declared monument identified within or close to the five sites. Three graded structures of the Old Dairy Farm were located within the work limits of the proposed development at representation site E. As advised by AMO, a heritage impact assessment would be required only for the Grade 3 historic structures locating close to the proposed access road to representation site E. As the proposed road works and the historic structures would be at different levels, no direct encroachment of works to the structure was anticipated.

44. In response, Mr Steve Sau (R2858) said according to Dr Ting Sun Pao, the Cemetery at Kai Lung Wan North site was probably the extension of Kai Lung Wan Cemetery formerly located at the WFE site. The resident group had recently observed many tomb stones accidentally during their survey trip near the former squatter area in representation site E, the number would probably be around 1,000 to 2,000. It was believed that the tomb stones were left there when the tombs of the cemetery were relocated to Wo Hop Shek during late 1950s and were subsequently made use by squatters for building platforms and retaining walls

Visual and Air Ventilation Impacts

45. A Member noted there would be an overall 11,900 additional public housing units including 8,900 units to be provided at the five reception sites and 3,000 additional units upon WFER on top of the existing 9,100 units, and asked why the WFER was not shown in the photomontage of the visual assessment. The Member also asked whether the results of the visual and air ventilation impact assessments would be different if the WFER was taken into account.

46. In response, Mr Leung Shu Wing (R4229) said that the proposed WFER should be shown on the photomontage to present an overall image of the resultant developments. The visual and air ventilation impact assessments should also include WFER. As indicated on Plan H-17 in the Paper, the proposed building height of WFER would be 125 to 190 mPD, the potential visual and air ventilation impacts would be significant. Ms Elan Lee (representative R1396 and R4084) supplemented that the five reception sites together with WFER would enclose Chi Fu Fa Yuen completely. She considered that the adverse impacts of visual and air ventilation on Chi Fu Fa Yuen would be much less if representation sites D and E were not to be developed.

47. In response, Mr Theron K.K. Chan, SPO, HD, said that the existing building height of WFE ranged from 80mPD to 130mPD. As shown on Plan H-17 in the Paper, WFER would adopt a stepped building height profile from 125 to 190mPD as agreed with PlanD so as to maintain the urban design concept in Pok Fu Lam South area. He also advised that the existing building height of WFE was about 80 to 130mPD. Based on the recommendation of the AVA(EE), mitigation measures in the form of six local airpaths with minimum widths of 20m to 30m were proposed to ensure no adverse air ventilation impacts in Pok Fu Lam South area.

Traffic Issues

48. The Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions on traffic aspect:

- (a) while it was indicated that there was no actual increase in the population due to the five reception sites before WFER and hence there would be no adverse traffic impact from the proposed development, whether the traffic volume would be increased due to construction vehicles during the construction stage and would cause traffic congestion;
- (b) whether the following road improvement proposals raised by Mr Ronald Taylor (R2524) were feasible or practical :
 - (i) a flyover for the right turn traffic from southbound Pok Fu Lam Road to Victoria Road be provided; and
 - (ii) a more direct access to representation site E from the south-eastern corner of the site onto the Wah Fu Road interchange should be provided instead of from Pok Fu Lam Road where the capacity would be affected by the gradient of the road;
- (c) whether traffic from Pok Fu Lam to Aberdeen would be greatly disrupted due to lane closure required during slope works, footpath widening and provision of services as pointed out by Mr Ronald Taylor (R2524);

- (d) whether a subway option for providing the access road to representation site E would be feasible;
- (e) as some representers pointed out that there were 10,000 vehicles in the Bel-Air and Baguio Villa developments, what the traffic impact would be as a result the development of the five reception sites; and
- (f) whether implementation of the SIL(W) would help alleviate the traffic problem in the area and its relationship with WFER, and whether the latest programme of the SIL(W) was available yet.

49. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD and Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) the construction vehicle traffic had been taken into account in the TIA. It was preliminary estimated there would be about 90 construction vehicle units/day and hence the hourly volume of trucks would be less than 20 trucks and the contractor would be requested to limit the traffic to non-peak hours. Since the existing peak hours traffic flow was over 1,000 vehicle units/hour at Pok Fu Lam Road, the additional traffic impact caused by construction vehicles would be insignificant;
- (b) an elevated road bridge option, i.e. a flyover from Pok Fu Lam Road into Victoria Road, had been considered in the technical assessments. To meet the technical requirements for an elevated road bridge, the proposed highway structures in the proposal would encroach into the Pok Fu Lam Fire Station and/or the St. Paul's College Primary School sites. Besides, the proposed elevated road bridge would also worsen the traffic noise impact to the primary school. According to the TIA conducted, the junction capacity problems could be solved by the proposed junction improvement works and an elevated road bridge was thus considered not appropriate in view of the above mentioned impacts and construction cost involved;

- (c) direct access to representation site E from Wah Fu Road would not be feasible due to the level difference of almost 20m between the existing road level and the proposed site formation level. A long ramp would be required to rise from Wah Fu Road at about 55mPD up to 65mPD to 75mPD of the site. In such case, the proposed road would cover a very large portion of the development site area and pose constraints to the development potential of the site. The subway option branching from the Wah Fu Road interchange was also not preferred in terms of road safety in view of the steep gradient, associated vehicle speed, as well as possible blockage of the drivers' sight line at the junction of Wah Fu Road, which was an existing circular exit, and the link road;
- (d) the proposed access road would be designed according to the Transport Planning and Design Manual standards (TPDM);
- (e) temporary road closure for about six months in the early construction stage might be required at representation site D, it was proposed to close one of the road lanes during non-peak hours to create an access road for construction vehicles;
- (f) the TIA did not take into account the gradient of the access road as allowed speed for the road was adopted in the assessment and that would not be affected by gradient of the road;
- (g) there would be scope to consider further road improvement proposals in the detailed design before finalising for road gazettal, and any authorised road works gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance would be deemed to be approved under the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (h) according to Table A of the TIA, scenarios for both SIL(W) not yet in place and with SIL(W) in design year 2032 had been assessed. According to the TIA's findings, the performance of the assessed junctions would be improved in general with the SIL(W) in place, though not in all concerned junctions and the changes were not significant;

- (i) as shown in Drawing H-3 of the Paper, the recommended alignment of SIL(W) in the RDS 2014 was to extend the railway coverage to Pok Fu Lam. There was active consideration of taking forward the SIL(W), however, the implementation of SIL(W) was subject to the actual development/ redevelopment programme of the public housing near Wah Fu area as well as the build-up of transport demand;
- (j) THB intended to issue invitations to the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) in 2018 to submit proposals for the SIL(W) project; and
- (k) the parking space provision at Bel Air and Baguio Villa was not available at the moment. As there would be no actual population increase before the completion of WFER, the traffic generation and transportation pattern would be similar to the existing situation and most residents would be expected to use public transport facilities or Pok Fu Lam Road for vehicular trips. Parking spaces would be provided in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and the residents of the five reception sites would be encouraged to use public transport. To meet the parking demand of the area, there would be a public vehicle park at representation site E for reprovisioning the affected temporary vehicle parks in the area.

Local Consultation

50. In response to a Member's question on local consultation, Mr Theron K.K. Chan, SPO, HD said that HA in conjunction with THB had published four issues of Information Leaflets since 2016, outlining the background, considerations and intention of WFER, as well as the proposed development concept plan for the five sites, for distribution to SDC members, residential developments in the vicinity including Bel-Air and other stakeholders. HD had also exchanged views with local communities, residents' representatives and stakeholders through meetings as well as attending 10 residents' forums, including one held in the Bel-Air. Among some 5,000 opinions received from the four issues of Information Leaflets, there were about 100 replies from Bel-Air residents.

Other Aspects

51. Some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether alternative sites such as the Hong Kong Police College in Wong Chuk Hang had been considered;
 - (b) whether the Hong Kong Electric (HKE) cable tunnel underneath the proposed access road to representation site E would be affected; and
 - (c) whether the GIC provision of WFE would be affected, whether reprovisioning of the existing GIC facilities or new facilities would be included in the five sites to alleviate the deficit in the Southern District, and whether the provision of GIC facilities was adequate in Pok Fu Lam and Southern District.
52. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD and Mr Theron K.K. Chan, SPO, HD made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:
- (a) the Police College at Wong Chuk Hang was an existing facility of the Hong Kong Police Force (HKPF). Any change of use would affect the operation of the HKPF. The HKPF currently did not have any plan to relocate the Police College. Besides, the Police College was not in proximity to WFE and therefore was not a suitable reception site;
 - (b) there were existing HKE cable tunnel near the boundary of representation site E and there was one cable tunnel lying under the proposed access road. CEDD had already liaised with HKE. The tunnel and proposed road were at different levels, and the cable tunnels near the site would not be affected;
 - (c) while the existing GIC facilities in WFE, such as that for the elderly, would be considered for reprovisioning as far as possible, additional GIC facilities may be required to meet the request from departments and the demand generated from the additional population. HD would liaise with the

Social Welfare Department on the need to provide other social welfare facilities ; and

- (d) there was in general no shortfall of the major GIC facilities in the OZP area except clinic, sports centre, police station and magistracy. The provision of the latter two was district based. As regards the deficit of general clinics/health centres and sports centre in Pok Fu Lam, there were three clinics in the Southern District, though they might not be located close to Pok Fu Lam. However, HD could examine the possibility of providing general clinic/health centre within the reception sites at the detailed design stage. In respect of sports centre, its site area requirement did not allow its provision in any of the five sites.

53. In response, Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund (R2030) made the following main points on the proposed alternative site at the Hong Kong Police College in Wong Chuk Hang:

- (a) he supported protecting the environment and public housing development but considered that the Government had chosen to take the easiest way out in site selection and neglected the living environment and safety of the residents;
- (b) the response from departments was focused on the traffic impact of Pok Fu Lam Road but had not addressed the problems on Victoria Road; and
- (c) the Government's response that the proposed alternative site at Police College at Wong Chuk Hang was too far away for WFE was not justified as residential development in proximity to MTR station would be always welcome. Nevertheless, local consultation on the proposal had not been carried out.

54. A Member noted that the survey of the Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies conducted in 2014 had indicated more than half of the respondents accepted the impacts on life style and community network in order to increase housing land supply. In response, Mr Steve Sau (R2858) said that there would be no impact on the existing life style and community network for the existing residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen. However, for those of

WFE, there might be certain impact, and the degree of acceptability varied with people and community.

55. In response to the Chairperson's question on the impact of the proposed public housing sites on Bel-Air, Mr Jeff Bau of Island South Property Management Limited (R1801) and Mr Chung Napoleon King (R2015) made the following points :

- (a) representation sites A and B were close to Bel-Air, the high-rise and high-intensity developments would have adverse visual, air ventilation, noise and traffic impacts on the area including traffic jam caused by boarding of public transport at Victoria Road instead of WFE. They were not compatible with the tranquil environment and development density of Bel-Air;
- (b) Bel-Air Service Centre had been requesting for a meeting with the relevant departments but only one meeting could be held prior to the OZP amendment;
- (c) as shown in their PowerPoint presentation earlier, the existing traffic condition was already unbearable. The photos showing the busy traffic presented by Dr Li Tsze Shing Edmund (R2030) were taken on a Sunday morning which was not the peak hour or school hours. Members were requested to take a site visit to Pok Fu Lam before a decision was made. There was also doubt on the estimation of construction vehicle trips to be generated.

56. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD said that the performance of the junctions J2 and J12 which were close to Bel-Air was indicated in Table A of the TIA. More information on the existing traffic conditions could be provided at the next sessions of the meeting.

57. In response to the Chairperson's question whether there was brownfield site in the area, Mr Louis K.H. Kau, DPO/HK, PlanD said that except the two temporary vehicle parks which had already been included for public housing development, there was no open storage and workshop uses identified in the area.

[Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong, Dr C.H. Hau, Mr Elvis W.K. Au, Mr Stanley T.S. Choi, Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Mr Sunny L.K. Ho left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

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

59. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 7:20 p.m.