

1. The meeting was resumed at 2:30 p.m. on 25.5.2018.
2. 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 Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

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

Mr Tony W.H. Cheung

Assistant Director/Regional 1, Lands Department

Mr Simon S.W. Wang

Chief Transport Engineer/Kowloon, Transport Department

Mr C.S. Lee

### **Hong Kong District**

#### **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 meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

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 (the draft OZP). Members' declaration of interests had been made in the hearing sessions held on 17.5.2018 and 21.5.2018, and was recorded in the minutes of the respective meeting accordingly.

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

5. The Secretary reported that Representer No. R4336 submitted a letter on 18.5.2018 to withdraw its representation. According to the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), comments on Representation No. 4336 were treated as not having been made. Hence, Commenters No. C135 to C146, all supporting Representation No. R4336, were not invited to the meeting.

#### Presentation and Question Sessions

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

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

#### **Government representatives**

#### Planning Department (PlanD)

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

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

Housing Department (HD)

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

Mr Theron K.K. Chan - Senior Planning Officer

Mr Joe B.M. Leung - Senior Civil Engineer

Mr Antony K.C. Chung - Architect

Miss Stephanie C.Y. Lai - Landscape Architect

Civil Engineering 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 (SNC/S)

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

Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited (Arup)

Prof S.Y. Chan - Associate Director

Ms Kristin Lai - Associate Director

Mr Brad Fong - Senior Engineer

AEC Limited (AEC)

Mr Tommy Hui - Senior Ecologist

**Representers, Commenters and their Representatives**

R2081 – Lo Wai Cheung

Mr Lo Wai Cheung - Representer

R2612 – Ho Loy

Mr Ho Loy - Representer

R4250 – Mandy Sue

R4252 – Gary Cheung

R4256 – 李美麗

R4257 – 張孝榮

R4255 – Cheung Wan Kee Nancy

Ms Cheung Wan Kee Nancy - Representer and  
Representers' representative

R4281 – Leung Kit Ying Kitty

Ms Leung Kit Ying Kitty - Representer

Mr Nelson Luk - Representer's representative

R4316 – Mak King Ho

R4317 – Tang Ho Fung

R4318 – Leung Mei Lin

R4319 – Tang Wai Leung

R4329 – Tang Kit Ying

Ms Tang Kit Ying - Representer and  
Representers' representative

R4328 – Jenny Deh

Ms Jenny Deh - Representer

R4331 – Ann McDonald

Ms Ann McDonald - Representer

Mr Robert Irvine ] Representer's  
Ms Ho Yuk Ming Sylvia ] representatives

R4332 – World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong

Mr Andrew Chan - Representer's  
representative

R4335 – Dai Yee Assets Limited

C133 – Fan Chi Sun

C134 – Henry Lee

*Masterplan Limited –*

Mr Ian Brownlee ] Representer's and  
Ms Cynthia Chan ] Commenters'  
representatives

C77 – To Wai Wah

Mr To Wai Wah - Commenter

C129 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Commenter

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

it was the last day of hearing, and invited DPO/HK, PlanD to brief Members on the representations/comments, and provide information requested by Members during the previous day of hearing.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Derek P.K. Tse, STP/HK, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the amendments, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in the Paper. Mr Louis K.H. Kau supplemented that during the previous day of hearing, Members had requested further information on (i) the implications on Wah Fu Estate redevelopment (WFER) if only representation sites A to C were available as reception sites (in terms of flat supply, redevelopment programme and provision of government, institution or community (G/IC) facilities, etc.); and (ii) traffic impact assessment (TIA) findings as compared to the existing traffic conditions at major junctions. HD's and CEDD's representatives would provide the information.

10. In response to question (i), Ms Portia K.H. Yiu, CPO, HD, advised that if only representation sites A to C were available for development, it was roughly estimated that WFER would likely require one more phase to complete, thereby lengthening the redevelopment programme by about ten years based on the experience of the So Uk Estate redevelopment Phase 1, which in turn would prolong the nuisance and inconvenience caused to the residents in WFE. The first batch of decanting of residents would also be delayed by about one year due to the need to re-visit the development parameters and the technical assessments of the three remaining reception sites. The public housing flat supply in the next ten years up to 2027/28 would be reduced by 7,560 units, which would exacerbate the short and medium-term shortage of public housing flat supply. To make up for the loss of the 5,310 units at representation sites D and E, the plot ratio (PR) of WFER site would have to be intensified from 7.0 to 9.0. While the technical feasibility needed to be revisited, it would be highly undesirable from the urban design point of view as the original building height profile for WFER (125mPD to 190mPD) would have to be substantially increased and the stepped height profile would not be achievable. If site E was excluded, it would also affect the provision of G/IC facilities planned within that site. There would also be consequential delay to the programme of the South Island Line (West)

(SIL(W)) of the Mass Transit Railway (MTR) because its implementation hinged on the actual redevelopment programme of WFE and the build-up of transport demand in the Wah Fu area.

11. In response to question (ii), Mr James W.C. Yip, SE, CEDD, advised that CEDD had reconfirmed the existing traffic conditions at several major junctions/road sections within the study area of the TIA with the Transport Department (TD). According to TD, traffic sensors were installed at the junction of Victoria Road/Cyberport Road in August 2017 to adjust the signal timing according to the traffic flow. Since then, TD had not received any congestion complaint at the junction. The TIA estimated that there would be ample reserve capacity (RC) at the junction up to 2032 even without the SIL(W) taking into account the proposed developments at representation sites A to E. Regarding the junction of Pok Fu Lam Road/Victoria Road, the major traffic flow was along Pok Fu Lam Road which traffic queue could usually be cleared in one to two signal cycles (i.e. no congestion) according to TD's traffic survey in 2017. If the housing developments at representation sites A to E proceeded without any traffic improvement measure, the TIA predicted that there would be minor congestion during the morning peak hour. With the provision of traffic improvement measures recommended in the TIA, the traffic conditions would be significantly improved and no congestion was envisaged. As for the junction of Cyberport Road/Information Crescent, TD's observation was that there was about 15 minutes' congestion during the morning peak hour due to the presence of a school in the vicinity. The TIA estimated that there would not be any traffic congestion up to 2032. Some representers expressed concern on the link capacity of a section of Cyberport Road between Sha Wan Drive and Information Crescent. Both TD's traffic data and the TIA revealed that there was/would be sufficient link capacity up to 2032. In terms of parking, a total of 209 private car parking spaces would be provided in the subject five housing sites in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). This would only generate a very small amount of car trips along Victoria Road.

12. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments on their written submissions.



R2081 – Lo Wai Cheung

13. Mr Lo Wai Cheung made the following points :
- (a) he lived in Bel-Air and he was mainly concerned about the traffic impacts; and
  - (b) CEDD's briefing had addressed his concerns and he had no further comment/query.

R4250 – Mandy Sue

R4252 – Gary Cheung

R4256 – 李美麗

R4257 – 張孝榮

R4255 – Cheung Wan Kee Nancy

14. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Cheung Wan Kee Nancy made the following main points :
- (a) she lived in Yar Chee Villas, which comprised of seven 5-storey blocks with 70 units. She persuaded her mother to move to Yar Chee Villas many years ago for the better environment there. Now she regretted that advice;
  - (b) while 230m high housing blocks were proposed to be erected in front of Yar Chee Villas, the villa was not even shown in Drawing H-5. There would be intolerable air, noise and other impacts on Yar Chee Villas;
  - (c) the proposed new access road to representation site E was only 40m away from Yar Chee Villas as measured on Drawing H-6. The 'Project Site Boundary' on Drawing H-7 even extended up to the fence of Yar Chee Villas. This was clearly not people-oriented as emphasized in the Paper;

- (d) CEDD's TIA did not reflect the serious congestion caused by various utility excavations every now and then, not to mention the construction-related excavations of a mega housing project as shown on the draft OZP;
- (e) there were many schools in the district, and the massive construction works would seriously affect the students over a period of 10 years;
- (f) the Paper mentioned very little about the development at the vacated WFE site. Citing a press release by the Permanent Secretary for Housing in 2014 regarding public-private partnership housing development, she suspected that the vacated WFE site would wholly or partly be handed over to the MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) for private housing development to finance the SIL(W);
- (g) it was unfair to tie the WFER together with the task of increasing housing land supply, as doing so would put the Chi Fu Fa Yuen and WFE residents in unnecessary direct confrontation. In-situ redevelopment of WFE would be a win-win situation;
- (h) she was given to understand by a Southern District Council (SDC) member that a site in Wong Chuk Hang was originally being considered as a reception site for the WFER, but subsequently dropped as it was allocated to the University of Hong Kong for hostel development. She queried the urgency for hostel development as compared to WFER;
- (i) she had families living in Chi Fu Fa Yuen and WFE. They all loved the beautiful valley to the southeast (representation site E), which was about to be destroyed by the housing project. Numerous animals and valuable trees would be lost together with this district breathing space which had the size of Victoria Park in terms of land area. She was upset that despite studies conducted by the locals which had confirmed the presence of valuable trees and animals, and numerous guided eco-tours to the valley, the site was still

considered by the Government to be a “Green Belt” (“GB”) of low ecological value and proposed for public housing development; and

- (j) she was disappointed to learn from the Paper that a few thousand objecting representations were all responded by PlanD with a series of ‘model’ reasons. She attended the hearing to voice out her concerns even though she considered it futile.

R4316 – Mak King Ho

R4317 – Tang Ho Fung

R4318 – Leung Mei Lin

R4319 – Tang Wai Leung

R4329 – Tang Kit Ying

15. Ms Tang Kit Ying made the following main points :

- (a) she lived in Pok Fu Lam Terrace on Wah Lok Path (near representation site C), and represented some of the residents there;
- (b) she was concerned about the traffic impacts associated with the proposed public housing development at representation site C as Wah Lok Path was very narrow and there was serious daily congestion during the morning peak hour when students went to the Kellett School. The development of a 200m high housing block at the site would bring about a substantial increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic. The footbridge link between representation sites C and E might increase the pedestrian flow along Wah Lok Path further, creating pedestrian congestion; and
- (c) she was also concerned about the air ventilation impact on Pok Fu Lam Terrace, and requested the site be used for the originally planned low-rise sports centre instead.

R4331 – Ann McDonald

16. Ms Ho Yuk Ming Sylvia made the following main points :
- (a) Kellett School was located at Wah Lok Path and currently had about 400 students aged four to ten, and 100 staff, some of which were WFE residents;
  - (b) while the school was supportive of the WFER, the school management, the parents and the staff were concerned about the continuous construction noise and serious air quality impacts of the proposed housing development at representation site C on students/staff. If the proposed housing development was not substantially revised, the school might not be able to operate;
  - (c) environmental impact assessment (EIA), drainage impact assessment (DIA), TIA and tree survey undertaken by CEDD were incomprehensive and selective. There was insufficient assurance to the school that the air and noise impacts on the surrounding environment arising from the construction works of the proposed housing development were within acceptable limits;
  - (d) despite the Government's drainage improvement works along Wah Lok Path over the past 20 years, the flooding problem in the areas around the school remained unsolved as the surface runoff towards Kellett School from Pok Fu Lam Road could not be effectively discharged;
  - (e) representation site C was small in area and located at a higher level right next to the school. The large amount of surface runoff towards Wah Lok Path during heavy rain would pose a serious flooding risk. The construction works would aggravate the flooding problem, which might lead to flooding at the school playground with mud during inclement weather, endangering the students;

- (f) Wah Lok Path was a single-lane road, and locating the site ingress/egress within 10m of the school's busy main entrance could result in fatal accident. According to CEDD, there would be three excavators/rock breakers operating at the site, and the debris would require 40 trucks/day to remove. Apparently, there was no thorough consideration of the impacts and risks to small children studying at the school;
- (g) Wah Lok Path also served as the emergency evacuation route of the school, and the construction traffic would jeopardize this important function;
- (h) the existing temporary carpark at representation site C would be relocated over one mile away to Wah Kwai Estate and Tin Wan Praya Road, without any reprovisioning carparking space for the school. This would force drivers into parking illegally along roads and result in higher traffic risks;
- (i) Kellett School also objected to Amendment Item D on the grounds of air and noise impacts. As the site was located on a slope prone to landslide, housing development thereat could pose slope safety threat to the school which was located downhill. Vegetation removal at the site would result in deterioration of the air quality and increasing surface runoff which would cause flooding. CEDD had not taken into account the cumulative impacts of the construction works at representation sites C and D on the students;
- (j) CEDD had not specified the piling method, and if traditional percussive piling was carried out at representation sites C and D, the noise pollution would be unbearable;
- (k) while Kellett School welcomed the Government's guarantee that a noise-free environment would be provided to the school during the examination period, the school operated on the basis of continuous assessment rather than relying on examination alone, and each grade would have a different examination timetable. It would be next to impossible to continuously assess students' performance under a noisy and dusty environment; and

- (l) Kellett School requested the Board to duly consider the school's circumstances.

[Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung left the meeting during the presentation.]

R4332 – World Wide Fund For Nature Hong Kong (WWF)

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

- (a) WWF did not object to public housing development per se, but was concerned about the site selection from the ecological point of view;
- (b) apart from the man-made cut slopes along Shek Pai Wan Road, representation site D was covered with natural vegetation which was contiguous to its surroundings. WWF noticed that CEDD's ecological survey transect for the site was along Shek Pai Wan Road only. Without any assessment of the core of the "GB", WWF casted doubt on the accuracy of the ecological survey, and the ecological condition of the site remained uncertain to justify the zoning amendment; and
- (c) a rare species of Tree Gecko, *Hemiphyllodactylus* (半葉趾虎), was found along a stream near representation site E. WWF was concerned that there might be suitable habitat for *Hemiphyllodactylus* within the site, and hence a habitat loss due to the housing development.

R4335 – Dai Yee Assets Limited

C133 – Fan Chi Sun

C134 – Henry Lee

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee and Ms Cynthia Chan made the following main points :

- (a) there was no systematic review of “G/IC” zones in the area. The “G/IC” site at the junction of Victoria Road/Cyberport Road owned by the representer (the Site) was vacant but not included in the current round of OZP amendment exercise purely because it was under private ownership;
- (b) the Site was approved for elderly housing development in 2000. Land exchange had been applied for in 2000 but not yet completed. The representer was currently appealing against the premium assessment by the Lands Department. The Site should be allowed to be developed into some other suitable use, like private housing, if the approved elderly housing could not proceed;
- (c) representation sites A, C and E were found suitable for housing development and rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)”. The Site was close to these sites, and should also be rezoned to “R(A)” under the same principle. Doing so was in tandem with the 2014 Policy Address of reviewing “G/IC” zones for residential use;
- (d) the approved elderly housing had a domestic PR of 5.0 producing some 300 flats for seniors aged 60 and above, and a non-domestic PR of 1.64 for ancillary recreational, health, care and communal facilities. As the applicant could abandon the approval any time, paragraph 6.3.44 of the Paper, which suggested a necessity to maintain the current “G/IC” zone to ensure the approval conditions of the planning application would be fulfilled, was irrelevant. There was also no mechanism under the Ordinance to ensure the implementation of approved s.16 applications, or prevent the rezoning of sites with s.16 approval; and
- (e) the representer’s proposal would enable early delivery of land and flats to meet the need of the society without significant social or environmental impact as demonstrated by the technical assessments of the approved s.16 application. The proposed rezoning of the Site to “R(A)2” would allow flexibility for the market to decide on the type of housing development. This was in tandem

with the 2017 Policy Address to optimize the use of existing housing land to meet the housing needs of families.

C129 – Mary Mulvihill

19. With the aid of the visualizer, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points :
- (a) existing WFE residents would be relocated to five different reception sites, some of which had no supporting facility. Representation site D, in particular, was so far away from the rest of the community that residents could hardly access the supporting facilities not to mention participating in community matters;
  - (b) representation site D was an intact “GB” zone which was contiguous to the adjoining Aberdeen Country Park, rather than on the fringe of built-up areas. Its ecological and traffic impacts had been downplayed and the rezoning was unjustified;
  - (c) representation site C would adversely impact the school and the whole G/IC belt thereat, but would only generate about 360 units that were detached from the rest of the housing development. It could be put into elderly housing development instead, which would be more in line with the Policy Address;
  - (d) traffic of the East Lantau Metropolis was not taken into account in the TIA;
  - (e) there was no comprehensive plan to show the integration of SIL(W) with the community;
  - (f) while the Government emphasized public consultation, the Wah Fu Swatow Christian Church within WFE was not consulted;
  - (g) the Government had not given any convincing reason why WFE could not be redeveloped in phases like the Pak Tin Estate;



- (h) the draft OZP was not substantiated by facts. According to the recent Court judgment, the Board had to examine each plan with regard to actual facts by making sufficient enquiries;
- (i) she suspected that the vacated WFE site would eventually be used for property development by MTRCL; and
- (j) she also shared the sentiment of representer No. R4255 that attendance at the hearing was futile, but she would keep attending hearings to stimulate others to participate in community issues and foster changes to the system.

[Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong left the meeting during the presentation.]

20. As all the presentations from the government's representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. 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.

#### *Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment*

21. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :
- (a) whether it was possible to redevelop WFE entirely without any reception site;
  - (b) elaboration on the programme of WFER, including the time required to relocate all WFE residents and to complete the redevelopment of WFE site if (i) representation sites A to E were all available to the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA); and (ii) only representation sites A to C were available to HKHA as reception sites;

- (c) whether partial redevelopment of WFE was possible/desirable and if it could shorten the redevelopment programme. If not, why;
- (d) whether the schools and the commercial centre of WFE could serve as reception site for decanting;
- (e) the design and building height of the vacated WFE site, and whether it would be redeveloped entirely for public housing;
- (f) the Wah Fu community would be broken up into five/six smaller communities upon redevelopment. Would there be planning/design measures to re-unite these communities; and
- (g) if there was no need to produce more flats to meet the housing target, whether it could shorten the redevelopment programme.

22. In response, Ms Portia K.H. Yiu made the following points :

- (a) public housing redevelopment had always been difficult in that a piece of vacant land had to be identified to kick start the redevelopment process by building the first reception block(s). The more reception resources, the less phases of the redevelopment and the less nuisance to the residents. Site utilization and overall layout planning would also be enhanced;
- (b) WFER was only one of the many projects contributing to the additional public housing units to meet the Government's public housing flat supply target. The impact on flat supply target was derived based on the development programme and quantum of the reception sites having regard to that of the WFER;
- (c) redevelopment of large-scale public housing estates was a lengthy process which involved various stages of work, including decanting of residents, demolition/site formation, infrastructure and road works, as well as the piling

and construction works for new housing units. Making reference to the recent So Uk Estate Redevelopment Phase 1, it took about 9 years from decanting of residents to new flat completion;

- (d) the five reception sites themselves were marginally inadequate to rehouse all WFE residents. WFER Phase 1, i.e. development of the reception sites, was roughly estimated to take about 9 years to complete. If representation sites A to E were all available as reception sites, there should be enough reception resources to decant all the WFE residents upon completion of WFER Phase 1. Phase 2, i.e. redevelopment of the vacated WFE site, would take another 9 years or so. All in all, it would take about 9 years to completely decant the WFE residents, and about 18 years to complete the WFER;
- (e) if only representation sites A to C were available as reception sites, an extra year or so to re-visit the development parameters of representation sites A to C and relevant technical studies would be required. Hence, completion of WFER Phase 1 would need about 10 years. WFER Phase 2 would also be required to decant the remaining residents and it would take another 9 years to complete. Redevelopment of the remaining WFE site, i.e. Phase 3, would also take about 9 years to complete. All in all, it would take about 19 years to completely decant the WFE residents, and another 9 years for the extra phase, i.e., a total of about 28 years to complete the WFER;
- (f) in-situ redevelopment approach had indeed been considered. However, WFE was fully developed with internal roads and structurally interlocked blocks that could not be demolished individually. The cleared land parcels would either be linear or irregular in shape, which would undermine the efficient layout and optimal utilization of the land. In view of these constraints, the overall layout of the estate would need to be replanned with facilities including road layouts upgraded in a comprehensive manner;
- (g) there was no existing school within the boundary of WFE. While there were requests from the public to use the schools around WFE as reception sites for

redevelopment, the proposal was found infeasible as the Education Bureau (EDB) had indicated that the schools were actively in operation;

- (h) while the detailed planning for the WFE site had yet to be formulated, one of the planning principles was to maintain sufficient supporting facilities, including retail, throughout the redevelopment process;
- (i) the Secretary for Transport and Housing had publicly committed that the vacated WFE site would be redeveloped solely for public housing;
- (j) not all five reception sites would be available to HD at the same time, particularly representation sites D and E which required extensive site formation. HD would commence construction works as soon as a site became available. The current target completion date of the first batch reception units was 2025;
- (k) noting the reception sites were in five locations, one of the major planning objectives of the five sites was to strengthen the connectivity between the five reception sites in the preliminary design stage. The design of the reception sites would be further refined at the detailed design stage taking account of views expressed where appropriate; and
- (l) Pak Tin Estate, cited by a commenter, had its unique background that it had been partially redeveloped in the 90s, and hence had a mixture of old and new housing blocks. The old housing blocks could only be redeveloped on small land parcels in-situ.

[The Chairperson left the meeting at 5:10 p.m. The Vice-Chairperson took up to chair the meeting.]

*Ecological value of representation sites D and E*

23. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions :
- (a) whether representation site D was part of the Aberdeen Country Park;
  - (b) noting that the ecological survey at representation site D covered only the peripheral areas along Shek Pai Wan Road, whether the findings of the survey could accurately reflect the ecological value of the site;
  - (c) whether there was any *Lagerstroemia fordii* (廣東紫薇) in representation site D;
  - (d) whether the specimen of *Hemiphyllodactylus* found near representation site E was the new species, *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis* (香港半葉趾虎), identified by the Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU);
  - (e) whether *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis* was a species unique to Hong Kong, and whether the Government had any information on the population of the species;
  - (f) whether *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis* was found in downstream areas only;
  - (g) whether it was certain that housing development at representation sites D and E would not adversely affect the habitat of *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis*;
  - (h) whether any mitigation measures could be implemented to conserve *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis* during the construction works at representation site E; and
  - (i) whether a baseline ecological survey would be carried at representation site D before the commencement of construction works thereat.

24. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau advised that representation site D was not part of any Country Park. It was about 400m away from the Pok Fu Lam Country Park and 1,100m away from the Aberdeen Country Park. The southern part of the site was excised from the coverage of the Aberdeen OZP and incorporated into the Pok Fu Lam OZP to allow Members to have a comprehensive picture of the zoning amendments for the proposed public housing development.

25. Mr James W.C. Yip advised that CEDD had carried out an ecological survey at the five housing sites in the feasibility study. Whilst the core areas of representation sites A, B, C and E could be accessed to carry out the survey, CEDD's consultants were unable to access the core area of representation site D due to the dense vegetation. Observation from the periphery of the site was undertaken instead. AFCD considered the survey methodology and findings acceptable. CEDD would carry out a baseline ecological survey for the Tree Gecko at the sites before the commencement of construction works thereat.

26. Ms C. Y. Ho of AFCD supplemented the following points :

- (a) accessibility was a problem often encountered in ecological surveys. If part of a site under study was inaccessible, the ecological consultants could make use of the information obtained from literature review, aerial photos and site surveys to provide a reasonable assessment of the site's ecological value. This was a commonly adopted approach and AFCD considered such survey methodology acceptable;
- (b) according to the ecological survey report submitted by CEDD's consultants, representation site D was assessed to be of moderate ecological value with records of some species of conservation interest. AFCD concurred with the survey findings, and was of view that the consultants had not underestimated the ecological value of the site;
- (c) there was no *Lagerstroemia fordii* in representation site D;

- (d) CEDD's consultants first identified a Tree Gecko near representation site E in August 2016. The species was small in size and lived among tree bark, making it very difficult to be detected in the field. There was very little literature/knowledge on this rare species, the more recent one being an article published by HKBU about a new species of Tree Gecko identified in Hong Kong, *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis*. It was a species unique to Hong Kong, and there were only four locations where it had been recorded, including Aberdeen near the Nam Fung Road "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI"), Po Toi Island, Pok Fu Lam, and some historical records of its existence at Shek Kwu Chau;
- (e) AFCD had consulted the HKBU scholar studying this species, and confirmed that the specimen found near representation site E should be the new species, *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis*. Since its discovery at Kai Lung Wan, extensive ecological surveys had been carried out by CEDD's consultants as well as AFCD in the area, and findings (both adults and eggs) of *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis* were confined to areas around the original location where it was found. Recognizing the importance of *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis*, the original proposed housing site was substantially reduced in size and divided into the north and south sites, with the one in the south shifted further southwards (i.e. representation site D). These were considered the only effective mitigation measure to conserve the core habitat of *Hemiphyllodactylus hongkongensis*. The use of natural woodland areas for development was undesirable from the ecological perspective, but departments concerned had made substantial efforts to protect this rare species. AFCD acknowledged the efforts being made to preserve a substantial piece of "GB" to conserve this species; and
- (f) unlike the stream between representation sites D and E, the stream at representation site D was seasonal in nature, and without much water flow.

27. The Vice-Chairperson asked Mr Andrew Chan (R4332) whether conducting an additional ecological survey before the commencement of construction works would ease WWF's

concerns. Mr Andrew Chan responded that it would be too late since the zoning amendments had already been agreed, and irreversible ecological damage would be incurred. As the ecological value of representation site D could not be ascertained at this stage, a precautionary principle should be adopted and the site should not be rezoned for public housing development. Same for representation site E, which had the similar conditions for the *Hemiphyllocladactylus hongkongensis* habitat, the original “GB” zoning should be maintained.

28. In response, Ms C. Y. Ho re-iterated that representation site D was assessed by CEDD’s consultants to be of moderate ecological value, which had not undermined the site’s ecological value. Regarding representation site E, despite the intensive surveys for *Hemiphyllocladactylus hongkongensis* conducted in the area, findings were confined to the original location reported and there was no other record in the representation site. Although the site might provide suitable habitats, given the lack of findings, the presumption that *Hemiphyllocladactylus hongkongensis* would be present within the site was considered speculative.

#### *Impacts to Kellett School*

29. Some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) noting Kellett School’s flooding concerns, whether there was any preliminary assessment of the drainage conditions of the area;
- (b) the design capacity of the stormwater drainage facilities for the area; and
- (c) what mitigation measures would be implemented to address Kellett School’s noise and dust concerns during the construction stage.

30. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip made the following points :

- (a) runoff from representation sites D and E would not flow to Kellett School due to the presence of a central divider along Shek Pai Wan Road. Surface runoff along Shek Pai Wan Road would flow to the Aberdeen direction due to the steep gradient of the road. The kerb along roads was also usually 100-200mm



higher than the traffic lanes, and thus, only runoff along the pavement abutting Kellett School had a chance of reaching the school. This could easily be addressed during the construction stage by simply altering the gradient of the pavement, if required, to divert the runoff back to the traffic lanes;

- (b) Kellett School was presently at a level of 54.9mPD which was lower than that of representation site C. There was an existing boundary wall of unsatisfactory condition between the school and the site and, hence, the possibility of surface runoff flowing to the school during heavy rain could not be ruled out. That said, representation site C would be formed to a level of 53mPD which was lower than that of Kellett School. A new boundary wall and peripheral drains around the site would also be constructed for the proposed housing development;
- (c) stormwater drainage facilities for representation site C would be designed to cater for floods of 1 in 50 year return design period. DIA for the housing developments would be carried out at the detailed design stage and submitted to the Drainage Services Department (DSD) for agreement before commencement of the construction works; and
- (d) contractors would be required to use quieter machines, water the site often, and cover the materials/debris pending transportation to reduce noise and dust impacts. These mitigation measures were commonly adopted in construction sites in Hong Kong and acceptable to the Environmental Protection Department (EPD). Construction traffic in/out of representation site C would be avoided when kids went to school in the morning and left the school in the afternoon. In particular, excavators would usually need to enter and exit the construction site once during the entire construction period, rather than daily as suggested by the representer.

31. Ms Portia K.H. Yiu supplemented that noise mitigation measures would also be implemented during construction in view of the schools around. HD would liaise with schools and instruct contractors to avoid carrying out noisy works as far as possible during the examination

periods. Contractors would also be advised not to carry out noisy works concurrently at the same location.

32. Despite CEDD's and HD's explanation, Ms Ann McDonald (R4331) considered that there was a genuine risk of mud slide from representation site C to Kellett School during the construction works of the proposed housing development. She advised that the school was situated in a basin lower than both Shek Pai Wan Road and representation site C, and the school had been suffering from flooding during heavy rain. It was considered that existing drainage facilities in the area had insufficient capacity to cope with heavy rain situation.

*Impact to Yar Chee Villas*

33. Some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) the distance between representation site E and Yar Chee Villas, and how the completed housing development would impact on Yar Chee Villas in terms of building height (BH) and development intensity;
- (b) the Project Site Boundary shown on Drawing H-7 was abutting Yar Chee Villas, whether it implied that all the land within this boundary would be developed;
- (c) had consideration been given to providing access to representation site E further south at the junction of Shek Pai Wan Road/Wah Fu Road in the form of a tunnel to minimize impacts to Yar Chee Villas;
- (d) whether noise barriers would be provided along the access road for representation site E to mitigate any noise impact on Yar Chee Villas; and
- (e) any photomontage showing the visual impact on Yar Chee Villas.

34. In response, Portia K.H. Yiu advised that the overall urban design concept of the five reception sites and WFER was a stepped height profile rising from the waterfront towards the

mountain. The WFER was located at a lower platform and its preliminary maximum BH would be from 125mPD to 190mPD. Representation sites A, B, D and E, which were located at an upper platform, would have a maximum BH of 200mPD to 230mPD, while representation site C would have a lower maximum BH of 170mPD.

35. With the aid of Drawing H-11 of the Paper, Mr Louis K.H. Kau advised that Yar Chee Villas was over 100m to the west of the proposed housing blocks at representation site E. If viewed towards the direction of the sea (photomontage at Drawing 13d of MPC Paper No. 5/17), the closest housing development to Yar Chee Villas would be representation site C (some 200m away). There would be a number of ventilation corridors between the proposed housing blocks of representation site E, which served also as visual relief to Yar Chee Villas.

36. Mr James W.C. Yip supplemented the following points :

- (a) the area between the proposed access road for representation site E and Yar Chee Villas, though within the Project Site Boundary, would not be developed or entirely devegetated. This piece of land was a vegetated slope, and whether there was a need for any slope improvement works and, if so, its scope would need to be further assessed, and hence this area was included in the Project Site Boundary;
- (b) on plan, the proposed access road was about 40m away from Yar Chee Villas. However, the access road was actually some 30m below the level of Yar Chee Villas. In other words, the access road would be screened by trees on the existing slope and unlikely be visible to Yar Chee Villas. The slope and the trees on it would also screen the traffic noise;
- (c) the level difference within representation site E was substantial, but road design was limited to a maximum of 8% vertical gradient. Considering that there were cable tunnels within the site and another cable tunnel near the junction of Shek Pai Wan Road/Wah Fu Road, the proposed tunnel option was not feasible. Besides, the foundation of the housing blocks would be seriously constrained by the proposed tunnel; and

- (d) there might be three to four times more excavated materials if the tunnel option were adopted, adding much burden to road traffic.

*Site of Representation No. R4335*

37. A Member would like to know the background of the site of Representation No. R4335. Specifically, why the approved development was not yet materialized after 18 years, whether it was due to land premium or procedural issue, the rent to be charged if the approved elderly housing development went ahead, whether the representer was actually offering his land to the Government for public housing development, and whether it would be more appropriate to take forward the representer's proposed residential development by submitting a planning application.

38. In response, Mr Louis K.H. Kau made the following points :

- (a) the site of Representation No. R4335 was zoned "G/IC" on the draft OZP. The applicant's s.16 application for elderly housing development was approved by the MPC in 2000;
- (b) the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) agreed to partially lift the moratorium on Pok Fu Lam to facilitate the approved elderly housing development;
- (c) a fresh s.16 application with a revised development scheme for elderly housing development was approved by the MPC in 2004, and the validity of the planning permission was extended in 2008 by the Director of Planning under the delegation authority of the Board. Minor amendments to the approved scheme were subsequently approved in 2010 and 2011;
- (d) the approval conditions of the planning permission had yet to be fully discharged;
- (e) the representer's building plan submission was first approved in September 2011, and the development was considered to have commenced;

- (f) the representer had been applying to LandsD for a land exchange, which was eventually approved by the District Lands Conference in 2016; and
- (g) the representer appealed against the land premium in 2018.

39. Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points :

- (a) the representer was not offering the land back to the Government;
- (b) the rent of the elderly housing development to be charged would depend on the land premium and the market situation, and could not be ascertained at the moment;
- (c) it took over 10 years for LandsD to approve the land exchange application because it was the first of its kind;
- (d) the lease restricted the units to be rented to people aged 60+ but the premium was so high that the elderly housing development would not be viable; and
- (e) hence, the representer would like to take the opportunity to ask the Board for rezoning of the site to “R(A)2” to allow the flexibility for providing various types of housing.

#### *Heritage Conservation*

40. Some Members raised the following questions :

- (a) HD was asked to elaborate why there were quite a number of heritage sites within the Project Site Boundary, but very little had been mentioned about measures to conserve these heritage sites;

- (b) whether there was any arrangement to facilitate the public to visit these heritage sites; and
- (c) whether the access road for representation site E could be relocated away from heritage site No. N1.

41. In response, Ms Portia K.H. Yiu advised that there was no heritage building within the five housing sites.

42. Mr James W.C. Yip supplemented the following points :

- (a) the Antiquities and Monuments Office (AMO) had identified quite a number of the old Dairy Farm structures near the proposed access road for representation site E;
- (b) the proposed alignment of the access road was dictated by the cable tunnel underneath and the important trees on the slope, which resulted in an alignment close to the terrace of heritage site No. N1. That said, the old Dairy Farm structure thereat was located further northwest away from the access road and at different levels; and
- (c) CEDD would carry out a Heritage Impact Assessment on heritage site No. N1 at the detailed design stage of the access road, and the terrace of heritage site No. N1 would be stabilized before commencement of the roadworks.

43. Mr Louis K.H. Kau advised that although AMO had already graded these heritage structures, there was no particular future use of the heritage structures at the moment. He noted from the representers' presentation that there were privately run guided tours to these structures.

*Traffic*

44. Some Members raised the following questions :
- (a) why the representers' real life congestion experience was not reflected in the TIA, which predicted no congestion at all;
  - (b) whether the access road to representation sites D and E was structurally sound; and
  - (c) why the access road to representation site E, which was taking up a lot of space, was not shown on the draft OZP.
45. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip supplemented the following points :
- (a) the traffic data of the TIAs were collected on hourly basis, while representers might only be experiencing 5- to 10-minute congestion events during the peak hour;
  - (b) CEDD's consultants had proposed to widen Shek Pai Wan Road to allow access into representation site D, and TD had agreed to the access design; and
  - (c) CEDD had obtained the alignment of the cable underneath the proposed access road to representation site E from Hong Kong Electric Company Limited, and ascertained that there was sufficient clearance between the access road and the cable tunnel. Suitable decking over structures would be designed to support the access road.
46. Mr Louis K.H. Kau advised that the access road to representation site E formed an integral part of the housing development and, hence, its impacts had already been taken into account in the technical assessments undertaken by CEDD, even though the road was not shown on the draft OZP. The access road would need to be gazetted under the Roads (Works, Use and Compensation) Ordinance under which there would be statutory procedures to deal with objections

received. Upon authorization by CE in C, the access road would be deemed to be approved under the Ordinance (according to s.13A of the Ordinance).

*Sequencing of Works*

47. A Member considered that proper sequencing of works within the five sites and infrastructural works would minimize disturbance to the public, and would like the Government to elaborate on any such measures.

48. In response, Mr James W.C. Yip made the following points :

- (a) CEDD and HD would ensure optimal sequencing of site formation, building and infrastructural works under their purview;
- (b) surplus excavated soil requiring disposal would be transported out of the sites by batches during different hours of the day to minimize the burden to road traffic; and
- (c) contractors would be required to programme the infrastructural works in such a manner as to avoid simultaneous closure of multiple sections of roads in the area.

[Mr H.W. Cheung, Mr Sunny L.K. Ho, Dr C.H. Hau, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Ms Winnie W.M. Ng and Mr L.T. Kwok left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

49. As Members had no further question to raise, the Vice-Chairperson said that the Q&A session had been completed. The Vice-Chairperson thanked the representers, commenters, their representatives, and the government representatives/consultants for attending the hearing. The Vice-Chairperson informed them that the Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision. They all left the meeting at this point.



50. The Vice-Chairperson said that the deliberation session would be scheduled for another day.

51. The meeting was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.