

**Minutes of 1216<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 10.1.2020**

**Present**

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-Chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Mr Franklin Yu

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (Kowloon)

Transport Department

Mr David C.V. Ngu

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Paul Y.K. Au

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (1)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Elvis W.K. Au

Director of Lands

Mr Thomas C.C. Chan

Director of Planning

Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Permanent Secretary for Development

(Planning and Lands)

Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Ms Lily Y.M. Yam

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms April K.Y. Kun

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr Eric C.Y. Chiu

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1215<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 20.12.2019

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of 1215<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 20.12.2019 were confirmed without amendment.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

- (i) Proposed Amendments to the Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/17 Arising from Consideration of Representations

2. The Secretary reported that the representation site (the Site) was located in Central and the following Members had declared interests on the item, for having property in the area or affiliation/business dealings with Ms Mary Mulvihill (R29 and C4), the Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong (FCCHK) (R3), and Townland Consultants Limited (Townland), Philip Liao & Partners Limited (PLP) and Mr Yeung To Lai Omar (representers' representative):

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li	-	his property having direct view of the Site
Mr K.K. Cheung	]	their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a
	]	contract basis from time to time, and having
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	current business dealings with FCCHK and
		past business dealings with Townland and
		PLP
Professor John C.Y. Ng	-	personally knowing Mr Yeung To Lai Omar
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	-	his firm having past business dealings with
		Townland

3. Members noted that Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Professor John C.Y. Ng had yet to arrive to join the meeting. Members also noted that as the property of Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had direct view of the Site, he should be invited to leave the meeting temporarily for the item, and as Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had no involvement in the matters related to the Site, they could stay in the meeting.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

4. The Secretary briefly introduced the Matters Arising paper. On 6.12.2019, after giving consideration to the representations and comments on the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to propose amendments to the OZP to partially meet Representations No. R1 to R30 by amending the building height restriction (BHR) of the northern portion of the Hong Kong Sheng Kung Hui (HKSKH) Compound from 135mPD to 80mPD, and amending the Notes of the “Government, Institution or Community (1)” (“G/IC(1)”) zone to require planning permission for any new development or redevelopment of existing buildings.

5. The proposed amendment regarding the BHR of the northern portion of the HKSKH Compound was shown in Annex II of the Paper. The revision to the Remarks of the Notes for “G/IC(1)” zone was set out in Annex III of the Paper. Relevant sections of the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the OZP were also revised accordingly as set out in Annex IV of the Paper.

6. Members agreed that the proposed amendments to the draft Central District OZP No. S/H4/17 as shown at Annexes II and III of the Paper were suitable for publication for further representation under section 6(C)2 of the Ordinance, and the revised ES at Annex IV of the Paper was suitable for publication together with the proposed amendments.

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li returned to join the meeting at this point.]

(ii) Reference Back of Approved Outline Zoning Plans

7. The Secretary reported that on 17.12.2019, the Chief Executive in Council referred the approved Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCTC/22 and the approved Tseung Kwan O OZP No. S/TKO/26 to the Town Planning Board for amendment

under section 12(1)(b)(ii) of the Town Planning Ordinance. The reference back of the two OZPs were notified in the Gazette on 27.12.2019.

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Professor John C.Y. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

**Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District**

**Agenda Items 3 and 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/TP/665

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 187 S.B in D.D. 21, San Uk Ka Village, Tai Po

Review of Application No. A/TP/666

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Green Belt” and “Village Type Development” Zones, Lot 187 S.C in D.D. 21, San Uk Ka Village, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 10614)

---

[The items were conducted in Cantonese.]

8. Members noted that the two applications were represented by the same representative for the same use with similar nature and the application sites were located in close proximity to each other, and agreed that they could be considered together.

9. The Secretary reported that the application sites were located in Tai Po and the following Members had declared interests in the item:

- |                       |   |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Mr H.W. Cheung        | - | owning a flat in Tai Po                |
| Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung | - | company owning a flat in Tai Po        |
| Mr Daniel K.S. Lau    | - | co-owning with spouse a flat in Tai Po |

10. Members noted that Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting and agreed that as the properties of Mr H.W. Cheung and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had no direct view of the sites, they could stay in the meeting.

### Presentation and Question Sessions

11. The representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicants' representative were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Sha Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), PlanD

Ms Kathy C.L. Chan - Senior Town Planner/Tai Po (STP/TP), PlanD

Ms Tseng Ka Man - Applicants' Representative

12. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review applications.

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the review applications including the consideration of the applications by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10614 (the Paper).

14. The Vice-Chairperson then invited the applicants' representative to elaborate on the review applications. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Tseng Ka Man, the applicants' representative, made the following main points in support of the review applications:

- (a) the applicants were indigenous villagers of San Uk Ka. It was unreasonable for PlanD to include the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone of Sheung Wun Yiu, Ha Wun Yiu and Cheung Uk Tei when assessing land availability as it was not practical for the applicants to develop the proposed Small Houses on land within Sheug Wun Yiu, Ha Wun Yiu and Cheung Uk Tei ;
- (b) land not suitable for Small House development, such as those reserved for



emergency vehicular access, existing local tracks, sites with Small House grant approved by the Lands Department (LandsD), as well as government land occupied by fire hydrant, lamp posts, sewage pipe, electricity and phone pipelines and mini-bus station, had not been excluded by PlanD in estimating the amount of land available for Small House development within the “V” zone;

- (c) according to the High Court Judgment of the Judicial Review on Small House Policy, applications for Small House grant on government land would not be processed by LandsD. Therefore, government land within “V” zone should not be counted as potential site for Small House development;
- (d) more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprints were within the “V” zone and the proposed developments complied with criterion (b) of the Interim Criteria for Consideration of Application for New Territories Exempted House/Small House in New Territories (Interim Criteria); and
- (e) most of the relevant government departments, including the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape of PlanD, and Head of the Geotechnical Engineering Office, Civil Engineering and Development Department, had no adverse comment on the applications. There were only some common vegetation within the sites and the proposed Small House developments would not cause any significant adverse landscape or geotechnical impact. It was the right of the applicants to use their sites for Small House developments to meet their own housing need.

15. As the presentations from PlanD and the applicants’ representative had been completed, the Vice-Chairperson invited questions from Members.

16. Some Members raised the following questions:

- (a) the amount of land available within the “V” zone for Small House development, if government land was excluded from calculation;
- (b) whether the application sites fell within the “V” zone and village ‘environs’ (‘VE’) and what the basis was to include land in Sheung Wun Yiu, Ha

Wun Yiu and Cheung Uk Tei in the estimation of land availability;

- (c) whether land considered not suitable for Small House development had been excluded in PlanD's estimation of land availability;
- (d) whether the assessment against the Interim Criteria was based on the proportion of the sites or the footprints of the Small House falling within the "V" zone;
- (e) noting that Tai Po River was located to the east of the sites, what the background was for zoning the area adjacent to the sites as "Green Belt" ("GB"); and whether the development of Small Houses in the vicinity would cause environmental concerns and whether there were any restrictions in that regard;
- (f) whether similar applications previously approved by the Board had similar planning circumstances with the current applications; and
- (g) whether an applicant could submit application for Small House grant to LandsD covering only part of a private lot, and whether LandsD would make reference to the development scheme approved by the Board in the processing of application for Small House grants.

17. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, with the aid of some PowerPoint slides, made the following responses:

- (a) if government land was excluded, the land available within the concerned "V" zone was equivalent to about 67 Small House sites, which was still sufficient to meet the 41 outstanding Small House applications;
- (b) the zoning boundaries of the "V" zone and the boundary of 'VE' of San Uk Ka, Sheung Wun Yiu, Ha Wun Yiu and Cheung Uk Tei were demarcated by solid lines and broken line respectively on the plan. While the sites fell entirely outside the 'VE' of San Uk Ka, more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprints fell within the "V" zone. As San Uk

Ka, Sheung Wun Yiu, Ha Wun Yiu and Cheung Uk Tei were covered by one single “V” zone and thus, the entire “V” zone was taken into account when estimating the land available for Small House development;

- (c) in estimating the land available for Small House development in “V” zone, PlanD had adopted a consistent approach and made use of the latest available information. In general, the land occupied by road, existing and approved village houses, steep slope, major tree clusters and stream buffer would be deducted from the area available for Small House development. Sites with irregular configuration that could not reasonably accommodate the footprint of a Small House would also be discounted. Moreover, a uniform rate of 40 houses per hectare was assumed in the assessment, representing a site coverage of only about 26% on a site with an area of 250m<sup>2</sup> considering the typical footprint of a Small House was 65.03m<sup>2</sup>. This would allow sufficient buffer to cater for the need of access road/EVA, local open space, circulation and other necessary supporting facilities. The current land available within the subject “V” zone was sufficient to meet the outstanding Small House applications;
- (d) the assessment criteria in the Interim Criteria focused on the proposed footprint of the Small Houses. It should be noted that while more than 50% of the proposed Small House footprints in the current applications fell within the “V” zone, the applications were rejected by RNTPC mainly on the ground that land was still available within the “V” zone for Small House development;
- (e) the area of land to the west of Tai Po River was zoned “GB” since the first Tai Po OZP was gazetted in 1980. Regarding the concerns on environmental impact on Tai Po River, the Director of Environmental Protection had no adverse comment on the proposed use of septic tanks for sewage treatment arising from the Small House developments and the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation had no adverse comment on the applications. The septic tanks would be required to be located at least 30m away from the river;

- (f) it would be up to the applicant to decide on whether to include the entire lot or portion of it in applying for Small House grant from LandsD. In considering applications for Small House grants, if a site was covered by planning permission, LandsD would duly consider the development scheme approved by the Board, including the approved footprint of the proposed Small House, as appropriate; and
- (g) the seven similar applications previously approved by the Board in close proximity to the sites within the same “GB” zone were approved between 2000 and 2014, before the Board adopted a more cautious approach in considering Small House applications. Since then, only one application (No. A/TP/641) had been approved by the RNTPC in 2018. The site for application No. A/TP/641 was bounded by an existing cluster of village houses, with approved applications for Small House developments to the north and west. The implementation of the approved Small House applications would form a new village cluster in the locality and coupled with the vegetated slope to the immediate south, the site had become a residual lot and therefore warranted sympathetic consideration. The current application did not share the similar planning circumstances with application No. A/TP/641.

18. As Members had no further question, the Vice-Chairperson informed the applicants’ representative that the hearing procedure for the review applications had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the review applications and inform the applicants of the Board’s decision in due course. The Vice-Chairperson thanked the applicants’ representative and PlanD’s representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join the meeting during the Q&A session.]

#### Deliberation Session

19. A Member said that the Board had adopted a cautious approach in recent years in considering Small House applications and whether there was sufficient land in the “V” zone

to meet the outstanding Small House grant applications should be the crucial point for consideration of the subject review applications. While the applicants' argument that government land should be excluded from PlanD's estimation of land availability was not completely ungrounded, the Board should adhere to the established practice and assess the applications based on the Interim Criteria in a consistent manner. Since the subject "V" zone still had sufficient land to meet the outstanding Small House applications, there was no strong planning ground to warrant sympathetic consideration of the applications.

20. In response to the Vice-Chairperson's request, Mr Thomas C.C. Chan, Director of Lands, elaborated that land within 'VE' and "V" zone, other than for Small House development, might also be used to provide important supporting facilities for the villages. Regarding the High Court Judgment of the Judicial Review on Small House Policy, LandsD had withheld processing of Small House grants involving government land pending the outcome of the ongoing legal proceedings. At this juncture, it was premature to say that in the future all government land could not be used for Small House development.

21. A Member noted that a similar application No. A/TP/641 was approved in 2018 by the RNTPC on sympathetic consideration and asked what the major criteria were for such consideration. The Secretary explained that in general, sympathetic consideration would be given if there were specific circumstances to justify the cases, such as the site was an infill site among existing Small Houses and forming a cluster, the processing of the Small House grant was already at an advance stage, or the site was the subject of previous approvals for Small House development. Members generally considered that the current applications did not meet the criteria above and there was no strong planning justifications to warrant approval of the applications.

22. After deliberation, the Board decided to reject the two applications on review for the following reasons:

- “(a) the proposed development is not in line with the planning intention of “Green Belt” zone, which is primarily for defining the limits of urban and sub-urban development areas by natural features and to contain urban sprawl as well as to provide passive recreational outlets. There is a general presumption against development within this zone. There is no strong planning

justification in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention; and

- (b) land is still available within the “Village Type Development” zone of San Uk Ka, Cheung Uk Tei, Sheung Wun Yiu and Ha Wun Yiu which is primarily intended for Small House development. It is considered more appropriate to concentrate the proposed Small House development within the “V” zone for more orderly development pattern, efficient use of land and provision of infrastructure and services.”

### **Agenda Item 5**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Review of Application No. A/NE-KLH/573

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in “Agriculture” Zone, Lot 310 S.C in D.D. 9, Kau Lung Hang Village, Kau Lung Hang, Tai Po  
(TPB Paper No. 10616)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

### **Presentation and Question Sessions**

23. The representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant and his representatives were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), PlanD

Mr Tony Y.C. Wu - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE), PlanD

Mr Lee Ka Wai - Applicant

Mr Fung Ho Kee            ]  
  ] Applicants' Representatives  
Mr Lee Yau Wai            ]

24.         The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the review hearing. He then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the review application.

25.         With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, briefed Members on the background of the review application including the consideration of the application by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Town Planning Board (the Board), departmental and public comments, and planning considerations and assessments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10616 (the Paper).

26.         The Vice-Chairperson then invited the applicant and his representatives to elaborate on the review application. With the aid of a visualiser, Mr Fung Ho Kee and Mr Lee Yau Wai, the applicant's representatives, made the following main points in support of the review application:

- (a) similar application (No. A/NE-KLH/572) located to the immediate north of the current application site and further away from the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone was approved by RNTPC on 6.9.2019 on sympathetic consideration as that site was the subject of a planning application (No. A/NE-KLH/426) previously approved by the RNTPC in 2011. The applicant of the current application had submitted an application for Small House grant to the Lands Department (LandsD) earlier than that by the above-mentioned applicant and sympathetic consideration should also be given to the application;
- (b) the applicant had applied to LandsD for Small House grant in 2006 and obtained planning permission from the Board for Small House development at another site in 2008 under application No. A/NE-KLH/372. However, since the public sewerage system in the Yuen Leng area had been degazetted, the approved development which was within water gathering grounds (WGG)

would no longer be able to be connected to a public sewerage system and therefore the development could not commence. That planning permission subsequently lapsed and the applicant would like to apply for Small House development at the current site; and

- (c) while the site was zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”), there was no active agricultural activity in the area surrounding the site. Since Kau Lung Hang fell within WGG, water supply for irrigation was severely insufficient. Although the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation considered that the site had potential for agricultural rehabilitation, there was practical difficulty in using the land in the area for farming and most of the farmland had been abandoned for a long time. Also, the area of site was small and it was not viable to be used as farmland.

27. As the presentations from PlanD and the applicant’s representatives had been completed, the Vice-Chairperson invited questions from Members.

28. In response to two Members’ enquiry, Mr Fung Ho Kee, the applicant’s representative, clarified that the applicant had applied to LandsD for Small House grant in 2006 and obtained planning permission under application No A/NE-KLH/372 for Small House development at a different site in 2008. However, the construction of the approved Small House could not commence as the implementation of the planned public sewerage system for the Yuen Leng area was delayed and subsequently degazetted.

29. A Member made reference to Plan R-2a of the Paper and enquired about the history of planning application concerning the surrounding sites and the major consideration of RNTPC in rejecting the subject application. Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, replied that applications No. A/NE-KLH/563, 564 and 572 located immediately adjacent to the site were approved by RNTPC in 2019 on sympathetic grounds as those sites were covered by previous planning permissions for Small House development. On the contrary, the site in the current application had never been approved for Small House development. In response to a follow-up question from Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning, Ms Chu said that according to the minutes of the RNPTC meeting of 6.9.2019, while PlanD considered the Small House under the current application (No. A/NE-KLH/573) an infill development, Members of the



RNTPC did not agree and considered that the site, which was not fully surrounded by existing/approved Small House development on all sides, should not be treated as an infill site. Furthermore, since the site had never been approved for Small House development, it should not warrant sympathetic consideration like the similar applications adjacent to the site.

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

#### Deliberation Session

31. Two Members made reference to the aerial photo in Plan R-3 of the Paper and said that the subject "AGR" zone still maintained a mostly rural character and most of the approved Small House development scattered in the "AGR" zone had yet to be implemented. If the current application was approved on sympathetic grounds, it would set an undesirable precedent for similar Small House developments to proliferate in the "AGR" zone and alter the character of the area.

32. A Member said that since the site was sandwiched between three sites on the north and south with approved Small House developments, there might be grounds for sympathetic consideration of the application as the proposed development could be considered as an infill. Two other Members, however, were of the view that most of the approved Small House developments in the area had not been implemented and it was uncertain whether they would be implemented at all. Since the approved Small House developments near the site had yet to be implemented, it might not be suitable to conclude that the proposed Small House at the current site could be considered as infill development at this juncture.

33. In response to a Member's enquiry, the Secretary said that in general, in consideration of whether a development could be regarded as an infill development, the approved developments though yet to be implemented, could be taken into account. A Member said that RNTPC had duly considered the application and was of the view that the

site should not be considered as infill since it was not fully surrounded by the existing/approved development. There was no overriding justification to warrant departure from the RNTPC's viewpoint.

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

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

**Energizing Kowloon East Office**

**Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip  
(TPB Paper No. 10617)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

35. The Secretary reported that AECOM Asia Company Limited (AECOM) was the consultant of the Planning and Urban Design Review for Developments at Kai Tak Runway Tip - Feasibility Study (the Study) and the following Members had declared interests on the item:

Prof. S.C. Wong (Vice-Chairperson)	-	personally having current business dealings with AECOM and being the traffic consultant/ engineering consultant of AECOM
Mr Ivan C.S. Fu	]	
	]	
Dr Billy C.H. Hau	]	having current business dealings with AECOM
	]	
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	]	
Mr Franklin Yu	-	having past business dealings with AECOM
Mr K.K. Cheung	]	their firm having past business dealings with
	]	AECOM
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	

36. Members noted that Mr Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. Since the item was only a briefing on the key recommendations of the Study, all other Members above who had declared interests could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

37. The following representatives from the Energizing Kowloon East Office (EKEO) and the Consultant of the Study (the Consultant) were invited to the meeting at this point:

Ms Brenda K.Y. Au	-	Head/EKEO
Mr Edwin K.Y. Wong	-	Deputy Head/EKEO
Ms Margaret H.Y. Chan	-	Senior Place Making Manager (Planning), EKEO
Ms Carol Hui	-	Director, Urban Planning, AECOM
Ms Yoko Cheung	-	Associate Director, Urban Planning, AECOM

38. The Vice-Chairperson extended a welcome and invited the representatives from EKEO and the Consultant to brief Members on the Study. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Carol Hui from the Consultant briefed Members on the background to the Study, the planning objectives and design principles for the Kai Tak Runway Tip (KTRT) area, the key study recommendations including the planning and design framework, Master Layout Plan and Landscape Master Plan for KTRT, the Tourism Node (TN) development, and implementation arrangements as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10617 (the Paper).

39. As the presentation by the consultant of EKEO was completed, the Vice-Chairperson invited comments and questions from Members.

40. Some Members had the following comments and questions:

*Connectivity*

- (a) whether an environmentally friendly linkage system (EFLS) would be provided to link up KTRT and Kwun Tong;

- (b) whether there were plans to enhance accessibility to the area for visitors coming from Kwun Tong and other parts of Kowloon East or even Hong Kong Island;
- (c) it might be worthwhile to explore enhancing both the physical connectivity as well as symbolic linkages with the Kwun Tong area. A holistic plan to have the design of the Kwun Tong Promenade integrated with the future design at KTRT should be pursued;

*Reclamation*

- (d) whether reclamation would be required; and if reclamation was not a viable option, whether the design features of the winning scheme of the Kai Tak Fantasy International Ideas Competition on Urban Planning and Design (the KTF Competition) would be lost;

*Facilities in KTRT*

- (e) noting that there were various themed open spaces proposed, whether there would be separate areas in KTRT designed specifically to meet the different needs of tourists and local residents;
- (f) whether some form of shuttle service was required within KTRT to facilitate easy movement of visitors, especially for the elderly;
- (g) whether sufficient supporting facilities such as toilets and shelters would be provided in KTRT. Those supporting facilities were essential to create a place that was friendly for families and the elderly, but those facilities were often neglected in large-scale developments;
- (h) whether there was scope to hold large-scale sports events such as cycling, running or dragon boat competition at KTRT;

*Synergy with the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal*

- (i) noting that there was insufficient patronage to the commercial facilities at the Cruise Terminal, whether the development of additional commercial facilities at the TN would worsen the situation;
- (j) the insufficient public transportation services to the Cruise Terminal had been a problem and whether there were plans to improve the transport services in the area;

*Development of the TN Site*

- (k) judging from the current indicative scheme, the design of the TN was similar to a typical commercial development. As such, whether there was scope to improve the design; and whether it was possible to require the prospective developer for the TN site to submit a preliminary design together with the tender so that the Government could have better control on the design and mode of operation of the future development at the TN site;
- (l) besides the district cooling system (DCS) currently being operated in the Kai Tak area, the Government should strive to promote reducing the environmental footprint of the future development by using renewable energy and working towards a carbon-neutral objective for KTRT. The Government should consider requiring the future development at the TN site to be carbon-neutral apart from meeting at least the BEAM Plus Gold accreditation;
- (m) besides developing buildings that had lower carbon emission, whether there were plans to promote a low-carbon lifestyle;
- (n) there might be an over-provision of office space at KTRT. It appeared that more floor space should be allocated to retail or hotel use rather than office;
- (o) whether it was possible to suspend the commercial development in the TN

site so that the entire KTRT could be used for recreational purpose for public enjoyment;

*Design of the Public Open Space (POS)*

- (p) the open space should be designed to encourage people to interact with Victoria Harbour and provide access to the water body for fun. In the current scheme, the River Valley and water features in KTRT were only visually connected to the harbour. It would be more desirable to actually 'bring-in' the water from the harbour and let it run through the POS in KTRT. Also, small cruise boats could be provided for recreational or sight-seeing activities;
- (q) regarding the land and water interface, whether people could get down to harbour if they so wished;
- (r) whether there was scope to develop the area into an open-air museum with a unique theme so that it would be more attractive to tourists; and whether there was scope to provide additional retired aircrafts for display in the open space to strengthen the aviation theme or even allow the public to board the aircrafts;
- (s) the design of the open space should be resilient to climate change and adverse weather conditions such as a tidal surge;

*Implementation Arrangements*

- (t) how the open space in KTRT would be implemented; and whether the 45m-wide set back area would be part of the private development at the TN site;
- (u) what the implementation and operation arrangement was for the public open space within private development (POSPD) at the River Valley;

*Others*

- (v) noting that the Kai Tak area was an indispensable part of Hong Kong's

aviation history and had great significance to many people in terms of collective memory, whether there would be plans to reflect the unique history of the site as the former base of the Hong Kong Auxiliary Air Force;

- (w) whether there was any special arrangement with the Kai Tak Children's Hospital to make use of KTRT for rehabilitation purposes;
- (x) whether supporting facilities such as luggage storage would be provided to facilitate cruise passengers to enjoy the facilities in KTRT;
- (y) iconic design could be adopted for the pumping station and electricity sub-station in KTRT so that they would blend in with the overall environment; and
- (z) to reveal the aviation history of the site, further consideration could be given in urban design to echo with the concept of "take-off" and "coming home".

41. In response, Ms Brenda K.Y. Au, Head/EKEO, and Ms Carol Hui from the Consultant, with the aid of the PowerPoint slides, made the following main points:

*Connectivity*

- (a) the ELFS alignment shown in the winning scheme of the KTF Competition was illustrative only. A preliminary alignment of the EFLS was also shown on the relevant Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for indicative purpose. A detailed feasibility study on the ELFS was being conducted by the Civil Engineering and Development Department to investigate the possible modes and alignments of the proposed EFLS and the implementation issues. While the outcome of the ELFS study was not yet available, sufficient flexibility was provided in the KTRT development to cater for such provision should the Government decide to proceed with the implementation of the ELFS;
- (b) connectivity to KTRT was one of the most important considerations in the Study. At the moment, the Kai Tak area was served by both road-based



public transport and ferry. As the area developed, it was anticipated that the demand for public transport services would increase and provision of such service could be enhanced correspondingly to cater for the demand. Recently, the Transport Department had invited tenders for operating the “Water Taxi” licensed ferry service, which was tentatively scheduled to commence operation later in 2020;

- (c) the Kwun Tong area facing KTRT and the water body in between were an integral part of KTF. EKEO had formulated proposals in a holistic manner, and the approach to enhance the connection between KTRT and Kwun Tong would be further explored under the EFLS study;

#### *Reclamation*

- (d) in order to create an interesting design for the shoreline and provide additional open space, reclamation was proposed in the conceptual winning design of the KTF Competition. However, pursuant to the Protection of the Harbour Ordinance, reclamation for development of more open space for recreational purposes would unlikely meet the overriding public need test laid down by the Court of Final Appeal. As such, no reclamation was proposed in the current scheme but the design had made reference to the winning design e.g. incorporating an internal water channel to create an interesting landscape for public enjoyment and enhance land-water interface;

#### *Facilities in KTRT*

- (e) one of the strategies adopted in design of the POS was to promote diversity. The goal was to create “A place for all” including locals, visitors and tourists to enjoy. The current design had adopted elements related to aviation as well as a water theme. Some commercial elements such as food and beverages (F&B) and alfresco dining would also be provided to enhance the vibrancy of the area;

- (f) the KTRT area would be highly walkable and given that the facilities in KTRT would be within walking distance, there was no plan to provide internal shuttle service at the current stage. Furthermore, KTRT was mainly designed as a traffic-free area, except for emergency vehicles and bicycles, where visitors could easily stroll around;
- (g) sufficient supporting facilities including seatings, toilets and shelters would be provided at suitable locations in KTRT to ensure that the development was attractive and accessible to people from all walks of life, including the elderly. The details would be further examined at the detailed design stage;
- (h) the Kai Tak Runway Park (KTRP) was about 8 hectares and the TN site was about 6 hectares. A minimum overall greening ratio of 50% was proposed for KTRP to promote extensive greenery, echoing with the vision of creating KTRT as a green hub. The proposed cycle track in KTRT would integrate with the GreenWay network already planned for the Kai Tak Development Area with a total length of about 13km. There was scope for organising major sports events in KTRT in the future;

*Synergy with the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal*

- (i) at the moment, the scale of commercial facilities in the Cruise Terminal was too small to create a critical mass. The development at the TN site was anticipated to create a synergy effect and would complement the existing commercial facilities in the Cruise Terminal;
- (j) regarding the issue of insufficient public transport services, it was difficult to provide additional services when there were insufficient passengers for the time being. The situation was expected to improve with the completion of more developments along the former airport runway including KTRT. Moreover, different types of commercial uses such as retail, F&B and office would be provided in the TN development and there would be a continuous flow of visitors at different times of the day in KTRT to sustain the demand for public transport services in future;

*Development of the TN Site*

- (k) the scheme for the TN site prepared under the Study was indicative in nature for the purpose of demonstrating the technical feasibility of the proposed development based on the development restrictions stipulated under the OZP. The final design of the TN would largely be dependent on the design approach adopted by the future developer. Notwithstanding that, as planning permission from the Board would be required for the development at the TN site, the Board could have the opportunity to scrutinise the detailed design at the planning application stage. A Development Brief to provide guidance to the future TN development would be submitted to the Board for consideration and endorsement in due course;
- (l) in terms of environmental performance, the future development at the TN site would be required to achieve BEAM Plus Gold or Platinum accreditation, which was a standard requirement imposed on all other development sites in the Kai Tak Development. It was observed that developers generally strived to achieve the best rating as far as possible. The use of DCS and other forms of renewable energy would be required for the TN site;
- (m) it was the objective of the KTRT development to promote a healthy city concept and low-carbon lifestyle. Given that there was an extensive cycle track network in Kai Tak, i.e. the GreenWay network, it was anticipated that a large number of visitors would use bicycles to get around the area;
- (n) the study team had conducted business viability study for the TN site as well as the POSPD in recommending the current land use proposals, which would provide a diverse range of commercial facilities;
- (o) the TN site had been planned for tourism related and commercial uses in accordance with the specific zoning on the OZP. If the site was not to be developed as planned but used for other purposes, amendment to the OZP would be required;

*Design of the POS*

- (p) the study team had explored the possibility to bring-in water from the Kwun Tong Typhoon Shelter (KTTS) for water recreation activities in in the River Valley. However, the water quality in KTTS might not always meet the standard for secondary contact such as after a heavy downpour. To ensure that the River Valley could be used by the public for water recreational purposes throughout the year, the current design would not draw in water from the KTTS;
- (q) visitors would be able to have access to the water directly via a spot near the River Valley as well as the Kai Tak Runway Park Pier, and there would be water access points at the two proposed water sports facilities;
- (r) the scope to provide an additional retired aircrafts at KTRT for exhibition purpose would depend on the availability of such aircrafts. A balance would also need to be struck in the use of the POS as the installation of an additional aircraft large enough for the public to board would occupy much of the POS that could otherwise be used for other activities. Regarding the aviation theme, the play equipment features such as mock-up paper planes in the current proposal was only preliminary and the idea would be further developed at the detailed design stage;
- (s) in proposing the site formation level for the current scheme, the Consultant had duly considered the implications of climate change and adverse weather conditions as part of the technical assessments in the Study;

*Implementation Arrangements*

- (t) part of the POS, i.e. Phases 1, 2A and 2B, would be implemented as one public works project to be completed in phases so that the facilities could be made available for public use as soon as possible. For the POSPD including the River Valley, it would be implemented by the future developer. As F&B uses at the River Valley would require planning permission form the

Board, it was expected that the developer would submit a planning application covering both the TN site and the POSPD in the River Valley for consideration by the Board and the integration between the TN development and the POSPD could be considered holistically. The 45m set-back area demarcated within the TN site would form part of the private development in the future. The area would be used for a POSPD which would be open to the public at all times;

- (u) the POSPD including the River Valley would be operated by the developer of the TN for a specified period of time. Upon expiry of that period, the Government would review the management and operation performance of the POSPD and decide the way forward including possible renewal;

*Others*

- (v) given the unique history of the site, the facility building in KTRT that resembled the appearance of the former air traffic control tower could include the display of some remnants of the former airport, which might also form the elements of an aviation-themed restaurant. For the ex-airport fire station which would be used for water sports in the short term, given its total site area of about 3,200m<sup>2</sup> and a gross floor area of the structure of about 400m<sup>2</sup>, it could be developed into a decent-sized gallery in the long run;
- (w) the Kai Tak Children's Hospital had its own rehabilitation facilities and there was also a waterfront promenade immediately outside the hospital that would be more conveniently accessible to the patients;
- (x) regarding the arrangements to facilitate cruise passengers to visit KTRT, it would be up to the operators of the Cruise Terminal and the TN development to make appropriate arrangements as it was mainly a matter of business operations;
- (y) the sewage pumping station and electricity substation located near the end of the runway area were existing supporting facilities for the Cruise Terminal. Aesthetic screening by way of amenity planting would be provided in the

future to reduce visual intrusiveness;

- (z) the suggestion of incorporating the “take-off” and “coming home” theme was noted and it would be further explored at the detailed design stage of KTRP.

42. Members generally agreed that consideration should be given to strengthening the aviation theme in the KTRT development. It was crucial that the KTRT development could create a place that would duly reflect the aviation history of the site and be attractive to the public.

43. The Vice-Chairperson remarked that Members generally supported the TN development and hoped that EKEO could duly consider the views expressed by the Members regarding the future development at the KTRT.

44. As Members had no further question, the Vice-Chairperson thanked the representatives of EKEO for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Mr Sunny L.K. Ho, Mr David Y.T. Lui, Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Mr K.K. Cheung, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Philip S.L. Kan and Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng left during the Q&A session.]

## **Procedural Matters**

### **Agenda Item 7**

[Open Meeting]

Application to the Chief Executive under Section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance for Extension of Time Limit for Submission of the Draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H4/17 to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval

(TPB Paper No. 10615)

---

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

45. The Secretary reported that the representation site (the Site) was located in Central and the following Members had declared interests on the item, for having property in the area or affiliation/business dealings with Ms Mary Mulvihill (R29 and C4), the Foreign Correspondents' Club, Hong Kong (FCCHK) (R3), and Townland Consultants Limited (Townland), Philip Liao & Partners Limited (PLP) and Mr Yeung To Lai Omar (representers' representative):

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li	-	his property having direct view of the Site
Mr K.K. Cheung	]	their firm hiring Ms Mary Mulvihill on a
	]	contract basis from time to time, and having
Mr Alex T.H. Lai	]	current business dealings with FCCHK and
		past business dealings with Townland and
		PLP
Professor John C.Y. Ng	-	personally knowing Mr Yeung To Lai Omar
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho	-	his firm having past business dealings with
		Townland

46. Members noted that Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Mr Alex T.H. Lai, Mr K.K. Cheung and Mr Thomas O.S. Ho had left the meeting and agreed that as the item was procedural in nature, Professor John C.Y. Ng could stay in the meeting.

47. The Secretary briefly introduced the TPB Paper No. 10615. On 24.5.2019, the draft Central District Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H4/17 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the exhibition periods, a total of 33 representations and 22 comments were received. On 6.12.2019, the Town Planning Board (the Board) conducted hearing of the representations and comments and decided to propose amendment to the draft OZP to partially meet Representations No. R1 to R30 by revising the building height restriction for the northern portion of the “Government, Institution or Community (1)” zone and the relevant Notes. The exhibition of proposed amendments to the draft OZP and the consideration of further representation(s), if any, could only be arranged in the first quarter of 2020 at the earliest.

48. According to the statutory time limit, the draft OZP should be submitted to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval on or before 24.4.2020. There was a need to apply to the Chief Executive (CE) for an extension of the statutory time limit for six months (i.e. to 24.10.2020) to complete the plan-making process.

49. After deliberation, the Board agreed that the CE’s agreement should be sought under section 8(2) of the Ordinance to extend the time limit for submission of the draft OZP to the CE in C for a period of six months from 24.4.2020 to 24.10.2020.

### **Agenda Item 8**

[Open Meeting]

### **Any Other Business**

[The item was conducted in Cantonese.]

50. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 12:20 p.m.