

**Minutes of 947th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 13.11.2009**

Present

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr. Thomas Chow

Chairman

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. David W.M. Chan

Mr. Leslie H.C. Chen

Mr. Tony C.N. Kan

Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung

Professor N.K. Leung

Professor Bernard V.W.F. Lim

Dr. C.N. Ng

Dr. Daniel B.M. To

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau

Mr. B.W. Chan

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Starry W.K. Lee

Mr. Rock C.N. Chen

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Mr. Benny Wong

Deputy Director of Lands (Gen) (atg)
Mr. Simon Yu

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Andrew Tsang

Director of Planning
Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor David Dudgeon

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Mr. Fletch Chan

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board
Mr. Lau Sing

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse (am)
Miss H.Y. Chu (pm)

Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Ms. Johanna W.Y. Cheng (am)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss Vivian M.F. Lai (pm)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 946th Meeting held on 30.10.2009

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of 946th Meeting held on 30.10.2009 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[Open Meeting]

2. The Secretary reported that there were no matters arising.

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront – Revised Planning and Urban Design Proposals (the Study)

(TPB Paper No. 8448)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

3. The following Members had declared interest on the item :

Miss Ophelia Wong - being Chairman of the Study's Steering Group

Dr Greg Wong - being Chairman of the Task Group on the Urban Design Study for the New Central Harbourfront (TGUDS) under the Harbour Enhancement Committee (HEC) that had provided recommendations to the Study Team

- Prof. N.K. Leung - having business dealings with the Red Cross and Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts which might be affected by the Study proposals
- Prof. Bernard V.W.M. Lim - having business dealings with the consultants from the Polytechnic University of Hong Kong
- Prof. Paul K.S. Lam - being academic staff of the City University of Hong Kong (CityU)*
- Ms Maggie M.K. Chan - being member of the Council of the CityU*
- Mr. Rock C.N. Chen - being member of the Court of the CityU*
**(A company of the CityU - the CityU Professional Services Limited, was a member of the consultant team).*
- Professor Edwin H.W. Chan - being on the Consultant Team of the Study

4. Members noted that Prof. Paul Lam had tendered apologies for not able to attend the meeting while Ms. Maggie Chan and Prof. Edwin Chan had not yet arrived at the meeting. Members agreed that since it was only a briefing session, other Members who had declared interest could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

5. The following representatives from Government and the Consultant Team were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Ms. Phyllis Li Assistant Director / Special Duties, PlanD
- Miss Fiona Lung Chief Town Planner / Special Duties, PlanD
- Ms. Alice Cheung Principal Assistant Secretary (Harbour), DEVB
- Mr. K. S. LI Chief Engineer/ Hong Kong (1) (Atg.), CEDD
- Mr. C. Y. Chan Senior Engineer /HP, TD
- Prof. Peter Yuen Polytechnic University of Hong Kong (PolyU)

Prof. Lee Ngok	Polytechnic University of Hong Kong
Dr. Anthony Lok	Polytechnic University of Hong Kong
Mr. Kyran Sze	Aedas Limited
Ms. Irene Ip	Aedas Limited
Mr. Tony Yeung	Aedas Limited
Miss Elaine Lee	Aedas Limited

6. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the representatives from Government and the Consultant Team to brief Members on the Paper.

7. Ms. Phyllis Li gave a short introduction and made the following main points :

- (a) the Planning Department (PlanD) commissioned the Study in 2007 at the request of the Board to refine the existing urban design framework and to prepare planning/design briefs for eight key sites in the new Central harbourfront ;
- (b) the Stage 2 Public Engagement was launched in April 2008 to consult the public on the refined proposals for the new Central harbourfront ;
- (c) extensive consultation was conducted through different means and the PolyU was commissioned to collect public views and to conduct an independent analysis of the collected views ;
- (d) the TGUDS under the HEC provided very useful suggestions to the Study. They also conducted a consolidation forum to hear views of the public and presented their recommendations to the Administration in August 2009 ; and
- (e) the Study Team would brief Members on the comments collected at the Stage 2 Public Engagement and the revised proposals.

[Dr. C.N. Ng and Dr. Daniel To arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

8. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Prof. Peter Yuen gave a summary of the results of the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study and made the following points :

Background

- (a) the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study was conducted from 11 April to end-July 2008 ;
- (b) the objectives of the Stage 2 Public Engagement was to collect public views and suggestions on the proposed urban design vision and design framework as well as the design concepts for the key sites (including the design concepts for re-assembling Queen's Pier and reconstructing the old Star Ferry Clock Tower) ;

Engagement Process

- (c) public views and suggestions were collected through various public engagement activities including public exhibitions, roving exhibitions, focus group workshop, community engagement forum, comment cards, face-to-face interviews, telephone polls, and briefings to the relevant public organizations, advisory bodies and the 18 District Councils. The public was also invited to send in their written comments ;
 - (i) a wide range of public engagement activities was held as follows:
 - two public exhibitions (with about 13,700 visitors);
 - seven roving exhibitions (with about 11,340 visitors);
 - focus group workshop (attended by 49 participants from relevant professional groups and academic institutions) ; and
 - community engagement forum (attended by 142 participants from the general public) ;

- (ii) the Public Policy Research Institute of the PolyU was also commissioned to collect public opinions through different sources :
 - 1,872 comment cards were collected ;
 - 365 valid face-to-face interviews were completed at the public exhibition venues ; and
 - 2,471 successful telephone interviews were conducted ;

- (iii) a total of 64 written submissions were received from various organizations and individuals ;

- (iv) briefings were provided to all 18 District Councils, relevant public and advisory bodies, interested professional groups and organizations ;

Analysis of Responses

- (d) analysis of responses was divided into quantitative and qualitative analyses :
 - (i) quantitative data analyses were performed on the responses to the close-ended questions in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews and telephone polls and quantitative data recorded in the focus group workshop and community engagement forum ;

 - (ii) qualitative data analyses were performed on any other comments and suggestions raised in the comment cards and face-to-face interviews, the focus group workshop and community engagement forum, the written submissions, and records of briefings to the relevant public and advisory bodies and the 18 District Councils. The main profiles of public opinions were obtained by transcribing and coding the qualitative data from different sources into a total of 10,203 text units (that was, a sentence or a group of sentences expressing a particular view). Views were considered “positive” if respondents clearly stated that they agreed to the design of a

particular concept, “negative” if they did not agree and “others” if the views were neither clearly positive nor negative ;

- (e) overall speaking, the data analysis process was robust with diverse sources of data, large number of cases from most sources, computer assisted analysis of qualitative data and the use of triangulation method to cross verify the quantitative and qualitative data ;

Summary of Findings

- (f) there was an overwhelming support for the overall design vision of creating a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront in the quantitative findings. About 59% of the relevant views recorded in the qualitative analysis were considered positive ;
- (g) there was general support for adopting a sustainable and balanced approach in designing the new Central harbourfront. The quantitative data showed that the majority of the respondents/participants agreed or strongly agreed to the sustainable and balanced approach. About 59% of the relevant views recorded in the qualitative analysis were considered positive ;
- (h) the majority of the respondents/participants agreed or strongly agreed that the refined urban design framework had met the public aspiration for a vibrant, green and accessible new Central harbourfront ;

Sites 1 and 2 (“Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) Site adjoining Central Piers 4 to 6 and “Commercial” (“C”) Site north of International Finance Centre (IFC) II)

- (i) the proposed design concepts for Sites 1 and 2 were generally supported, particularly as shown in the quantitative findings of the comment cards and face-to-face interviews. About 84% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A (Hotel and

Office), while about 16% were related to Concept B (Office and Office) ;

- (j) the main finding was that there was general support for the design concepts except for about half of the participants in the focus group workshop who disliked both Concept A and Concept B and about another half preferred Concept A, or Concept B, or liked both concepts. For those who had chosen between Concepts A and B, there was a clear preference for Concept A as compared to Concept B ;
- (k) the supportive views for Concept A were that commercial development at the sites was needed and the development intensity was acceptable. The opposing views were related to the hotel and office buildings at the sites, in particular Site 1, for blocking views, and obstructing air flow or pedestrian circulation ;

[Mr. B.W. Chan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Site 3 (“CDA” site north of Statue Square)

- (l) the proposed design concepts for Site 3 were generally supported. There was more support for Concept B (Larger Landscaped Deck) as compared to Concept A (Reduced Landscaped Deck), though the preference was not clear in the face-to-face interviews and focus group workshop. About 53% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept B, while about 47% were related to Concept A ;
- (m) the supporting views for Concept B were about the proposed reduction in building density and the provision of multi-level pedestrian links. The opposing views were generally related to the poor design of the landscaped deck and the lack of street-level activities ;

Site 4 (Site north of City Hall)

- (n) the design concepts had received general support. Most responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews and community engagement forum were in favour of Concept A (More Separate Blocks with Star Ferry Clock Tower) as compared to Concept B (Fewer Separate Blocks without Star Ferry Clock Tower). On the other hand, Concept B was preferred in the focus group workshop. About 63% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, and 37% were related to Concept B ;
- (o) the supporting views for Concept A were related to the small and separate blocks with open vista in the design concepts. The opposing views were mainly related to whether the proposed building would match with City Hall ;

Sites 5 and 6 (Site north of CITIC Tower and near the HKCEC Extension)

- (p) for Sites 5 and 6, the majority of the respondents/participants liked the design concepts, as shown in the qualitative analysis. About 55% and 58% of the relevant views recorded, respectively in the qualitative analysis were positive ;
- (q) the proposed arts and cultural facilities at the sites were generally supported. There were concerns on the possible duplication of such facilities with those in West Kowloon. There were suggestions for further improvement to the accessibility and vibrancy of the area ;

Site 7 (Waterfront Promenade)

- (r) the proposed design concepts were generally supported. The majority of the responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews and telephone polls were in favour of Concept B (Urban Green), while more participants in the focus group workshop and community engagement

forum were in favour of Concept A (Urban Park). The majority (about 68%) of the relevant positive views in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept B, while about 32% were related to Concept A ;

- (s) the supporting views for Concept B were that the design concepts were commendable and having their own special characters. The opposing views were mainly related to the design and themes of the proposed promenade ;

Re-assembling Queen's Pier and Site 8

- (t) the majority of the responses in the comment cards, face-to-face interviews and community engagement forum were in favour of Concept A (Queen's Pier by the Harbour). There was also clear support from the District Councils for Concept A in that 16 out of the 18 District Councils consulted had passed motions in support of re-assembling Queen's Pier at the harbourfront for public use. The views of the focus group workshop were diverse. While more responses were in favour of Concept B (Queen's Pier at Original Location), there were also many views that liked both concepts, or just Concept A, or had no preference. For the telephone polls, there was quite an even distribution among those who preferred Concept A, those who preferred Concept B, and those with no preference. About 61% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, while about 39% were related to Concept B ;
- (u) supporting views on Concept A included reviving the pier function of Queen's Pier, whilst Concept B could respect the historical significance of Queen's Pier. A small number of respondents advocated no reassembly of Queen's Pier ;

Reconstructing Old Star Ferry Clock Tower

- (v) there was a general support on the proposed design concepts, but there

was no obvious convergence of views on their preference. More responses in the comment cards and community engagement forum liked Concept A (Clock Tower at Site 4), whilst more responses in the face-to-face interviews, telephone polls and focus group workshop liked Concept B (Clock Tower close to Original Location) ;

- (w) the relevant positive views in the qualitative analysis were quite evenly distributed between Concepts A and B. About 49% of the relevant positive views recorded in the qualitative analysis were related to Concept A, while 51% were related to Concept B ;
- (x) the supporting views for Concept A were that the design concept would turn the old Star Ferry Clock Tower into a focal point, and the supporting views for Concept B were that it would emphasize its historical significance. There were however views that there was no need to reconstruct the Clock Tower ; and

Other Issues

- (y) other issues that were raised in many of the comments received included sustainable building design, greening, provision of eco-friendly facilities, concerns on roads and pedestrian access, formulation of a broad landscape design for a tree-lined boulevard along Road P2, provision of more multi-purpose facilities, the public engagement process for the Study, harbour reclamation, proposals for cycling tracks or other environmentally friendly transport modes, and management of the harbourfront development.

9. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Ms. Fiona Lung gave a short summary of the recommendations of the TGUDS and made the following points :

- (a) the TGUDS was set up under the HEC to provide input to the Study and its public engagement. The TGUDS was briefed on the findings of the Stage 2 Public Engagement and the initial design responses on

10.12.2008 and 8.1.2009. Subsequently, the TGUDS held a public consolidation forum on 28.2.2009 to hear the presentation of the alternative proposals and the views of the public. The TGUDS submitted its recommendations to the Administration and HEC on 17.8.2009, which were included in Annex B of the Paper ;

- (b) throughout the process, concerns raised by the TGUDS on the design and development of the new Central harbourfront were addressed and most of its recommendations were adopted, including the redistribution of GFA from Sites 1 and 2 to other locations (such as Site 5), removal of the public transport interchange (PTI) from Site 2, reconstruction of the old Star Ferry Clock Tower at its original location, improvement to connectivity around the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts extension and the proposed Hong Kong Visual Arts Education Centre, amendment of the Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) to cater for the new design concepts, provision of a continuous cycle track and mitigation of the presence of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) pier ; and

- (c) as regards the reassembly of Queen's Pier, though the majority of the non-official members of the TGUDS preferred reassembling Queen's Pier at its original location with a large lagoon in front of it, the TGUDS' recommendation was not adopted by the Administration as the summary of public responses indicated that the in-situ reassembly option clearly commanded less public support. 16 of the 18 District Councils consulted (including the Central & Western District Council) supported reassembling Queen's Pier by the harbour to revive its pier function. The lagoon proposal was not preferred by the Administration because it would require realignment of Road P2, reassembly of Queen's Pier would be delayed by one year, the realigned P2 would diagonally bisect part of Sites 3 and 4, and the north-south pedestrian link would be compromised. Setting those aside, the crux of the matter was where Queen's Pier should be reassembled, if Queen's Pier was reassembled by the harbour to revive its pier function, the arguments for the "lagoon" proposal, which was associated with the reassembly of Queen's Pier at

its original location, would fall away. Therefore, the Administration informed the HEC and announced in public in August 2009 that the Queen's Pier would be reassembled at the harbourfront between Central Piers 9 and 10.

10. With the aid of a Powerpoint Presentation, Mr. Kyran Sze presented the revised design concepts and proposals for the key sites in the Study and the revised Master Layout Plan (MLP) and made the following main points :

Sites 1 and 2 (“CDA” and “C” sites adjoining Central Piers 4 to 6 and IFC II)

- (a) Sites 1 and 2 were proposed to change from hotel and office developments to a vibrant, attractive and accessible civic node and a mixed-use precinct featuring a low-rise iconic development made up of two 2-storey blocks (25mPD) and a 6-storey block (60mPD) with a total Gross Floor Area (GFA) of 22,520 sq.m. Possible uses included exhibition showcasing Hong Kong, civic and “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) uses, retail, dining and entertainment uses ;
- (b) an extensive landscaped deck connecting the Central Business District (CBD) to the new harbourfront was proposed by decking over the road and G/IC zone. The landscaped deck would provide about 1.7 hectares of public open space including a central plaza for festive events ;
- (c) one and a half additional commercial floors were proposed above Central Piers 4 to 6 for dining, retail and other waterfront related uses, making up a total commercial GFA of about 12,600 sq.m. at the piers. The pier design would be integrated with the comprehensive development at Sites 1 and 2 ;
- (d) the PTI originally planned for Site 2 would be deleted to allow more ground level space and street level activities. The existing public transport facilities at Site 2 would be redistributed to other sites close to the new Central harbourfront ;

Site 3 (“CDA” north of Statue Square)

- (e) the development for office/retail uses would be in five separated building blocks, the building heights were proposed to range from +30mPD to +50mPD to complement the revised design concept for Sites 1 and 2. The GFA would be reduced from 190,000 sq.m. to 157,400 sq.m. ;
- (f) the built form and size of the landscaped deck would be refined to enhance the “Statue Square Corridor”, and the visual permeability of the deck would be improved by adding more sunken courtyards and openings ;
- (g) pedestrian access and connections would be enhanced with at-grade crossings. Retail shops would be provided along street frontages to induce greater pedestrian circulation. The landscaped deck of Site 3 would be connected to Sites 1 and 2 ;
- (h) the old Star Ferry Clock Tower would be reconstructed at its original location in Site 3 and a new Clock Tower Gallery would be built to exhibit the salvaged items of the pier. The design would be integrated with the surroundings and the development on Site 3 ;

Site 4 (“Other Specified Uses (“OU”) (Waterfront related Commercial and Leisure Uses)” site north of City Hall)

- (i) the built form, disposition and massing of development for Site 4 would be refined while maintaining the GFA as proposed during the Stage 2 Public Engagement. In the revised concept, three separate 2-storey blocks were proposed for waterfront related dining and leisure uses. A series of courtyard spaces would be incorporated as a landscape and visual buffer for Road P2 ;

Site 5 (“G/IC” site north of CITIC Tower)

- (j) Site 5 was proposed to change from “G/IC” (currently with no specific designated use) to office and hotel uses to compensate for the loss in

commercial GFA from Sites 1 and 2. Site 5 was proposed to accommodate a total GFA of about 58,000 sq.m. GFA, including 33,000 sq.m. GFA for hotel and 25,000 sq.m. GFA for office. The maximum building height was proposed to be 80mPD ;

- (k) office and hotel uses on Site 5 were considered suitable with the increasing prominence of Wan Chai North as an extension of the CBD and better connectivity between Site 5 and Admiralty upon the completion of the Tamar development ;
- (l) the proposed commercial development in Site 5 would give rise to potential of further increasing the supply of Grade A offices in the vicinity. That would involve an additional medium-scale office development site with approximately 21,000 sq.m. GFA to the south of Site 5 currently occupied by the Red Cross Headquarters and Water Supplies Department's Harcourt Road Fresh Water Pumping Station after their relocation, which was being actively explored. Together with those sites, the new Central harbourfront would yield a total of about 90,000m² GFA for Grade A offices ;
- (m) Site 5, the Red Cross Headquarters and Fresh Water Pumping Station sites were all now zoned "G/IC" on the Central District (Extension) OZP. The Board's agreement was required to rezone these sites for the proposed uses ;

Site 6 ("OU (Waterfront related Commercial and Leisure Uses)" site north of CITIC Tower)

- (n) the design of the waterfront related commercial and leisure uses would highlight the marine theme of the area ;
- (o) Road D11 would be modified into a tree-lined boulevard with wide pedestrian promenade to cater for street activities. Additional at-grade crossings were proposed ;

- (p) an integrated pedestrian walkway system was proposed to connect the hinterland to the harbourfront through the proposed public open space, the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts extension and the proposed Hong Kong Visual Arts Education Centre in the arts and cultural precinct ;

Site 7 (Waterfront Promenade)

- (q) a two-kilometre continuous waterfront promenade would be provided at the new Central harbourfront with 11 hectares of public open space. Attraction nodes including plazas and viewing platform would be better defined along the promenade ;
- (r) an area within Site 7, to the north of Site 4, had been designed to cater for alfresco dining within the waterfront promenade to further enhance the vibrancy of the harbourfront,;
- (s) the promenade design would be refined to better integrate with the PLA berth. The berth area would be open for public enjoyment when not in use and a folding gate concept was adopted to avoid creating visual obstruction to the harbour ;
- (t) various utility building structures such as underground pump houses, electricity supply buildings and vent shafts would be better integrated with the promenade design ;
- (u) a cycle track would be provided within the waterfront promenade for recreation and leisure uses. Provision had also been made for other environmentally friendly transport modes such as electric cars, which were subject to detailed assessment and design ;

Site 8 (“OU (Waterfront related Commercial and Leisure Uses)” site near Central Piers 9 and 10)

- (v) as Queen’s Pier would be reassembled by the harbour to revive its pier function, the exterior design for Central Piers 9 and 10 would be refurbished. The design of the adjacent new pier plaza and public open

space would be further refined to integrate with the reassembled Queen's Pier ; and

- (w) memorial elements like paving and landscaping design would be added at the original site of Queen's Pier to commemorate the historical significance of Queen's Pier. Planning approval from the Board would be required to reassemble Queen's Pier between Central Piers 9 and 10.

11. A table showing details of the planning and design proposals and the Master Layout Plan as attached to Annexes C and D of the Paper were shown to sum up the presentation.

12. Ms. Fiona Lung further elaborated that as announced in the Policy Address, the Administration intended to develop Sites 1 and 2 through a Public-Private Partnership (PPP) by a design, build and operate approach in order to capture the creativity and expertise of the private sector to develop the space for public enjoyment. The Administration would consult HEC and ascertain private sector's interest through an Expression of Interest (EOI) exercise before issuing of the formal tender. She invited Members to note the results of the Stage 2 Public Engagement of the Study and to consider the revised design concepts and proposals for the key sites in the Study.

[Ms. Starry W.K. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

13. Members generally expressed appreciation on the comprehensiveness of the public engagement activities and improvements made to the proposals for the new Central harbourfront. Pertaining to specific issues, the following views and questions were expressed by individual Members :

Urban Design Principles

- (a) the revised built form for Site 3 in separate blocks with increase of ground level space was a good improvement. Consideration might be given to including important design principles, such as permeability on the ground floor, pedestrian accessibility and ground floor shops to

enhance street life in the planning brief ;

- (b) the Central Government Complex and the Legislative Council Complex were symbolically important buildings and their visual prominence at the harbourfront should be preserved. As such, the disposition of buildings on Site 5 should respect their relationship with these two complexes. A visual corridor should be preserved as far as possible between the Central Government Complex and the Legislative Council Complex and the major vantage points such as the Golden Bauhinia Square and the waterfront promenade ;
- (c) the spaces in the new Central harbourfront should not only be designed for festive celebrations, but also to attract patronage of office workers both during office hours and after-work ;
- (d) the open space proposed was mainly green and passive. There should be more space to accommodate and encourage street performance ;
- (e) the spatial axis from the Statue Square to the harbourfront was disrupted by an extensive road network and blocked by a building annotated as C6 at the southern tip of Site 3 on the MLP (Annex D of the Paper). This important spatial axis should be strengthened by some creative design to enhance visual continuity ;
- (f) how could the cohesiveness among the different sites be ensured since the concepts presented and the comments collected were on a site-by-site basis ?
- (g) clarification on the proposed use of a yellow strip of land to the north of City Hall leading to the reassembled Queen's Pier by the harbour as shown on the MLP (Annex D of the Paper) ;
- (h) if G/IC facilities were to be proposed within Sites 1 and 2, there should

be careful consideration to their nature and appropriateness for the CBD ;

- (i) a lighting corridor could be designed along the waterfront promenade to turn it into a special feature of Victoria Harbour ;

Reassembling of Queen's Pier

- (j) would the reassembled Queen's Pier really resume its pier function ?
- (k) although Queen's Pier was now proposed to be reassembled by the harbour, the original location of Queen's Pier should still be marked for remembrance ;
- (l) one Member requested to put on record the Member's support for reassembling Queen's Pier at its original location rather than at the harbourfront as currently proposed ;

Pedestrian Connectivity and Other Transport Related Matters

- (m) it appeared difficult for pedestrians to walk from Wanchai to the new Central harbourfront. The footbridge system was not continuous and pedestrians might need to cross over roads around the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts Extension area, Site 5 and the Central Government Complex and Legislative Council Complex. Consideration should be given to incorporate some interesting land uses to both facilitate pedestrian access and create activities to enhance the walking environment ;
- (n) noting that pedestrians had to cross over P2 to access the harbourfront from City Hall, was it feasible to provide a subway under Road P2 to enhance pedestrian accessibility ?
- (o) accessibility from the Mass Transit Railway Stations in the inland areas

to the new Central harbourfront would need to be improved ;

- (p) one Member expressed reservation on deleting the PTI from Site 2 as it might affect public accessibility to the Central Piers. Another Member asked whether a smaller scale PTI might be provided underground. One other Member supported the deletion of the PTI as the valuable land area in Central should be put to more beneficial use, and that Member indicated that accessibility to the Central Piers could be maintained by allowing sufficient bus and min-bus stops near the harbourfront ;
- (q) whether the elevated walkway system in Central could be extended to link up the separated blocks in Site 3 ;
- (r) whether the Fenwick Pier would be affected by the Study's proposals and if it would be relocated ;
- (s) what were the details of the environmentally friendly transport proposed for along the waterfront promenade ;
- (t) the stretch of PLA berth along the harbourfront appeared barren. Were there any resting places for pedestrians ?
- (u) what were the proposals to enhance connections from the Central Piers to the CBD ?
- (v) ways to improve the ease of walking from the Central Piers to the Wanchai waterfront, such as the provision of travelators might be considered.

Public-Private Partnership and Implementation Issues

- (w) the PPP approach for Sites 1 and 2 should be used with care given the experience for the Kai Tak Cruise Terminal. While noting that the locations of the two projects were different, as Central District was

already a well developed area whereas the provision of ancillary and supporting facilities for the cruise terminal at Kai Tak was unclear at the time of the PPP, the PPP approach would only be successful if the relevant expertise from the private sector could be engaged. Since private companies seldom had a full range of expertise as the Government, it might not be appropriate to tie up all the different scopes of businesses under the proposed PPP. Government should make use of the EOI to collect views and get a better idea on the feasibility and potential problem which might be encountered ;

- (x) Site 3 should not be disposed of under one single tender to avoid the impression from the public that the proposals were tailormade for large developers ;
- (y) other than the Central harbourfront, harbourfronts in other districts such as those on the Kowloon side should also be improved and upgraded ;

Engagement Process

- (z) the use of computer to analyse views collected at the public engagement was commended. Consideration should be made to increase the use of Internet in the consultation process to facilitate the collection of feedback from the younger members in the society ;
- (aa) one Member questioned whether it was necessary to consult all District Councils for a proposal in Central, and that might have set an undesirable precedent, whilst another Member tendered a contrary view and expressed support for the approach ; and
- (bb) the comments received on the reconstruction of the old Star Ferry Clock Tower were diverse. How did the Study Team consider and strike a balance among those different views ?

14. The Study Team noted the comments made by Members and in response to

Members' questions as recorded in paragraph 13 above, Ms. Phyllis Li, Miss Fiona Lung, Ms. Alice Cheung, Mr. K.S. Li, Prof. Peter Yuen, Mr. Kyran Sze and Ms. Irene Ip made the following responses :

Urban Design Principles

- (a) the suggestion to preserve a visual corridor from the Golden Bauhinia Square to the Central Government Complex and the Legislative Council Complex to maintain their visual prominence would be considered in the detailed planning stage ;
- (b) the design objective was to attract people from all walks of life to visit the new Central harbourfront at different times of the day including the office population, Sites 1 to 4 would provide space to accommodate a diversity of uses and enhance vitality in the new Central harbourfront ;
- (c) the public comments revealed a strong preference for more greenery and green lawns at the new Central harbourfront, hence, more green spaces were proposed. Provision of spaces for street performance and festive celebrations was one of the important design foci and the details would be further examined in the detailed design stage ;
- (d) with regard to the spatial axis from Statue Square, the entrance to the Central MTR station might be extended to the location where C6 building was located. The C6 building was intended to be an anchor point for the development at Site 3 and the design would be further refined to minimise visual disruption to the Statue Square corridor ;
- (e) notwithstanding that public comments were collected on a site-by-site basis, the different concepts could be mixed and matched readily to ensure cohesiveness between different sites in the consideration of a comprehensive MLP for the Study area ;
- (f) a visual corridor was preserved from the City Hall to the harbour and the

yellow strip shown on the MLP was an at-grade open piazza ;

Reassembling of Queen's Pier

- (g) the reassembled Queen's Pier by the harbour would resume its pier function, and that had been made clear in the public engagement. The reassembled pier would have one side for boarding, whereas boats could board on three sides in the original Queen's Pier ;
- (h) the original location of Queen's Pier at Edinburgh Place would be marked by memorial elements with some water features ;
- (i) Queen's Pier was proposed to be reassembled at the harbourfront as that concept received more support from the public. In addition, 16 out of the 18 District Councils also supported the concept ;

Pedestrian Connectivity and Other Transport Related Matters

- (j) with regard to accessibility from Wanchai to the new Central harbourfront, Transport Department had planned a comprehensive pedestrian footbridge link from Wanchai to the Central Government Complex. Pedestrians could access the harbourfront through the "green carpet" or the footbridge from Site 5. In addition to elevated pedestrian links, another important design concept was to provide quality at-grade crossings to encourage activities on the ground level. One example was Road D11 between the Hong Kong Academy for Performing Arts Extension and Site 5, which was designed as "La Ramblas" and would be a tree-lined boulevard with wide pedestrian promenade to cater for street activities with an arts and culture theme ;
- (k) a section of Road P2 was depressed near Tamar to allow an unobstructed pedestrians link to the harbourfront. As for the section near City Hall, at-grade crossings were provided. As there was a large underground box culvert located in front of City Hall, there would not be

sufficient space for constructing a subway. CEDD's representative agreed to confirm the matter after the meeting ;

[Posting meeting notes : CEDD confirmed that the distance between the ground level and the underground box culvert in the vicinity of City Hall was only about 1.5m, which was not sufficient for a subway.]

- (l) access from the Mass Transit Railway Stations in Central to the harbourfront would be provided by the pedestrian passageway through the IFC, the new landscaped deck at Sites 1 and 2 as well as through the "CDA" development at Site 3 ;
- (m) the PTI currently outside the IFC was proposed to be deleted so that the ground floor space could be used to provide better access for pedestrians to the harbourfront. The changes had taken into account public comments received. The Transport Department was consulted on the future transport arrangement with the aim to optimise the public transport facilities requirements, the required bus and mini-bus stops would be provided near the existing piers and at appropriate locations in the new Central harbourfront. As the Transport Department had confirmed the acceptance of the public transport facilities provision, the idea of an underground PTI would not be further considered ;
- (n) additional footbridge links were not needed for Site 3 as the separate blocks in Site 3 would already be linked up by an elevated landscaped deck ;
- (o) the current location of Fenwick Pier would be affected by the proposals of the Study. The Servicemen's Guides Association which was located at the Fenwick Pier had already approached the Administration for reprovisioning and that had been taken up separately ;
- (p) the environmentally friendly transport reserve would be further examined in the detailed design of the waterfront promenade. A cycle track had been reserved at the waterfront promenade to connect to Wanchai north

and other harbourfront areas. As there was a requirement to reserve an emergency vehicular access along the harbourfront, the cycle track would be provided along the north side of Road P2 ;

- (q) there would be waterfront related commercial and leisure uses at Site 4 near the PLA berth to provide alfresco dining and some sheltered resting places for pedestrians to enhance the vibrancy of the PLA berth area ;
- (r) the landscaped deck proposed at Sites 1 and 2 would connect all the piers and the pier-top dining facilities. The landscaped deck would also enhance the connectivity to the CBD by connecting with the elevated footbridge system through IFC ;

Public-Private Partnership

- (s) the main objective for adopting the PPP approach for Sites 1 and 2 was to create an integrated leisure and entertainment node, which would feature cultural, exhibition, commercial, tourist and festival celebration operations and events. Of the total of 35,000 sq.m. GFA, after discounting the GFA at Piers 4, 5 and 6, the actual GFA for Sites 1 and 2 would only be around 22,500 sq.m. In addition to new buildings, the PPP would also include requirements to build the landscaped deck, connection with Site 3, improvement to the external design of Central Piers 4, 5 and 6, and roofscape enhancement to Central Piers 2 and 3. Interest to the PPP approach would first be ascertained through an EOI. Private companies, community and non-profit making organisations would also be considered as private partners. The Administration would consult the Task Group on Management Model for the Harbourfront under HEC on the way to proceed with the EOI and PPP. The Administration would closely monitor the operation and management of the PPP and there might also be a need for participation from members of the public ;

Engagement Process

- (t) the comment cards could be downloaded from the website of PlanD and a fair amount of comment cards were collected through the website. However, other formats like on-line forum or chat boards were not used ;
- (u) consultation with all District Councils was considered necessary as the proposals for the new Central harbourfront were considered of concern to the general community. Of the 16 District Councils that supported the reassembling of Queen's Pier at the harbourfront, five of them had unanimously supported the proposal whilst 11 of them supported that with majority votes. Since District Council comprised people from different sectors, their views were considered representative of the public ; and
- (v) public views about the reconstruction of the old Star Ferry Clock Tower were diverse. After balancing the views and taking into account the recommendations of the TGUDS of HEC, the old Star Ferry Clock Tower was proposed to be incorporated into Site 3 at its original location.

15. In summing up, the Chairman said that the Board appreciated the efforts in the extensive public engagement conducted and generally agreed with the improvements made to the proposals. He especially thanked the TGUDS for their support and advice to the Study. The Chairman noted that in the next stage, the Study Team would prepare planning and design briefs for the key sites and would brief the Board again next year. As Members had no more questions to raise, the Chairman thanked the representatives of Government and the Consultant Team for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting adjourned for a break of five minutes.]

[Dr. Daniel B.M. To, Prof. Bernard V.W.M. Lim, Mr. Raymond Chan, Hon. Starry W.K. Lee, Mr. Rock C.N. Chen, Dr. Winnie Tang, Mr. Benny Wong left the meeting at this point. Mr Timothy K.W. Ma arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in Respect of the Draft Ma On Shan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/15

(TPB Papers No. 8440, 8441, 8442, 8443 and 8444)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Group 4 (R11 to R13, C236 & C237)

(TPB Paper No. 8443)

Presentation and Question Session

16. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers and commenters to invite them to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in the absence of C237 who had made no reply.

17. The following representatives from PlanD, the representers, representer's representatives and commenter were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Mr. W.K. Hui - District Planning Officer / Shatin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Planning Department (PlanD)
- Mr. W W Chan - Senior Town Planner / Shatin, PlanD

R11 (Ma On Shan Promotion of Livelihood and Recreation Association)

- Mr. Yeung Cheung Li - Representer's representative

R12 (Owners' Committee of Ocean View)

Mr. Lee Chi Wai - Representer's representative

Mr. Simon Law - Representer's representative

Mr. Chan Chi Keung - Representer's representative

Mr. Edmund Tong - Representer's representative

R13

Mr. Leung Yiu Choi - Representer

C236

Mr. Wu Wai Lun - Commenter

18. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. He then invited the representatives from PlanD to brief Members on the background to the representations.

19. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.W. Chan made the following main points as detailed in the Paper :

Background

(a) the representations and comments to be considered under Group 4 and their broad subject of representations were as follows :

- **R11** : related to proposals for the “Other Specified Use (Pier)” zone and “Government / Institution / Community” (“G/IC”) in Area 103, opposition to building height (BH) for the “C” site in Area 77, opposition to the development intensity and BH of Chevalier Garden ;
- **R12, C236, C237** : related to the “C” site in Area 77 ;
- **R13** : related to plot ratio of Heng On Estate, Yiu On Estate, Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court ;

- (b) the subject of the representations was mainly related to the imposition of plot ratio and BH restrictions ;
- (c) a comprehensive review of all the development zones on the Ma On Shan (MOS) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was undertaken. The purposes of the proposed amendments to the MOS OZP were to enhance certainty and transparency in the development of the MOS New Town, to allow for more effective planning for the provision of infrastructure and Government / Institution / Community (G/IC) facilities and to regulate BH ;
- (d) in formulating the development parameters for the OZP, relevant considerations had been given to the lease conditions, the existing topography, the infrastructure as well as broad urban design principles ;
- (e) the MOS New Town was developed since the 1980's and the New Town development had largely been completed, details of the existing profile of the MOS New Town were provided in Annex 2 of the Paper. The development concept of MOS was based on one town centre and two gateway nodes at Tai Shui Hang in the south and Wu Kai Sha in the north. The proposed BH profile was to step down from the foothill areas toward the waterfront, and descending from the town centre and the two gateway nodes. Along the waterfront, varying BHs were to be encouraged ;
- (f) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) of the New Town was commissioned by PlanD to assess the likely impact of the amendments on the OZP. The final AVA Report was available for public viewing on PlanD's website and was attached to Annex 6 of the Paper. According to the findings of the AVA, there was no major air ventilation issue for the New Town. However, to further improve the air path network, the AVA recommended a few strips of air paths and permeable area for better air ventilation of the New Town and those were

incorporated as Amendment Items B1 (in the form of designating non-building areas) and B2 and B3 (in the form of stipulating 2-storey BH restrictions). In proposing Amendment Items B1 to B3, site constraints and development / redevelopment potential of the affected sites had been considered. R13 supported the imposition of 2-storey BH restrictions under Amendment Item B2 ;

- (g) a 3D animation was shown to illustrate the BH concepts for MOS, the sites and features related to the representations were highlighted, including the Lake Silver Development above the Wu Kai Sha Station, Lok Wo Sha development with an approved Master Layout Plan and the preserved view corridors, the location of Whitehead, the MOS Town Centre, the Horizon Suite Hotel near the OU(Pier) zone, the green corridors in the New Town, variation of BH along the waterfront, the public rental housing development in Area 86, the Ocean View development at the waterfront, the “C” site in Area 77, the Tai Shui Hang southern node, Kam Tai Court and Chevalier Garden that were separated by a valley, Monte Vista, Lee On Estate, and the Cheung Muk Tau Urban Fringe ;
- (h) for development intensity restrictions - like many other new towns, MOS was mainly planned in accordance with the administrative control for new towns at domestic plot ratio of 5 and non-domestic plot ratio of 9.5, although development intensities on some sites might differ from the administrative control. In the review, for those developments with existing plot ratio higher than the administrative control, they were restricted to 5 / 9.5 ; and a clause had been added in the Notes that upon redevelopment the existing PR could be retained if the lot was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building. For those developments with existing plot ratio lower than 5 / 9.5, the development intensity restrictions were based on lease conditions ;
- (i) for building height restrictions – BH restrictions for residential / commercial buildings were made with reference to existing BHs and the

stepped BH profile. BH restrictions for G/IC facilities were made with reference to the existing BH and operational needs of the concerned facilities ;

Development Intensity – Representations and PlanD’s Response

- (j) based on the above planning principles, the OZP plot ratios for the representation sites were highlighted :
- “C” site in Area 77 – plot ratio of 3 (based on layout plans)
 - Chevalier Garden – plot ratio of 3 (based on lease)
 - Kam On Court – plot ratio of 3.8 (based on lease)
 - Heng On Estate and Yiu On Estate – domestic / non domestic plot ratios of 5 / 9.5 (based on Zone 1 administrative control in New Town) ;
- (k) representers (R11 and R13) proposed that the plot ratio for Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court should be increased to 5. As the representers did not submit any technical assessments to support their proposals, PlanD did not support the representations. Regarding R13’s proposal for Heng On Estate and Yiu On Estate to be under a plot ratio restriction of 5, the stipulated PR restrictions on the OZP for the two estates were in fact the same as the representers’ proposal ;

Building Height – Representations and PlanD’s Response

- (l) the stated BH restrictions on the OZP for the representation sites were :
- “C” site in Area 77 at 100mPD
 - Chevalier Garden at 85mPD ;
- (m) the stipulation of a BH of 100mPD for the “C” site in Area 77 was based on the stepped BH concept. The site was sandwiched between Ocean View with a BH restriction of 100mPD which was closer to the waterfront and the public rental housing development at Area 86 with a BH of 120mPD which was in a more inland location. The 100mPD for

the “C” site had no visual impact and hence, PlanD did not support the representer's (R11 and R12) proposals to reduce the building height for the “C” site ;

- (n) the representer's (R11) proposal to relax the BH restriction of Chevalier Garden to 120mPD, which was the same as the height of Kam Tai Court at the southern node, would undermine the overall BH concept for the New Town, and PlanD did not support the proposal ;

Commercial Site in Area 77 – Representations and PlanD’s Response

- (o) representers R11, R12 and C236 proposed to amalgamate the “Commercial” (“C”) and the adjacent “Open Space” (“O”) sites into a Comprehensive Development Area (“CDA”) for low-rise comprehensive development for commercial, cultural and recreational uses. PlanD considered that the “O” site was considered suitable for a neighbourhood local open space to serve the residents of Ocean View and La Costa. Besides, the “O” site was located next to the major air path along Sai Sha Road and the major breezeway along Po Tai Street, it should be retained as “O” for the benefit of better air ventilation ;
- (p) the representers’ (R11 and R12) proposal to restrict the development on the “C” site to 3 storeys was not supported, because with a plot ratio restriction of 3 and a BH restriction of 3 storeys, there might be need for basements which would increase the cost of development. Furthermore, based on PlanD’s assessments, the height restriction of 100mPD would not create visual or air ventilation impacts ;

Other Proposals – Representations and PlanD’s Response

- (q) the representers (R11, R12, C236 and C237) also made other proposals including, the provision of public transport facilities in the “C” site such as sheltered bus stops, covered walkway and a footbridge linking the “C” site in Area 77 with the Area 86 public rental housing development.

These might be dealt with by relevant departments during the implementation stage and they were not related to amendments to the OZP ; and

- (r) PlanD's views - PlanD did not support the opposing representations. The other proposals not related to any amendments of the OZP were noted.

20. The Chairman then invited the representers' representatives and commenter to elaborate on their representations and comments.

Representation No. 11

21. With the aid of overhead slides (Annex 1 of R11 attached to Annex IIIa of the Paper), Mr. Yeung Cheung Li made the following main points:

- (a) as the MOS New Town was developed for more than 20 years, it was a good time for Government to review the New Town development. The representation were proposals of the Ma On Shan Promotion of Livelihood and Recreation Association, which was an organisation set up for the betterment of MOS. Their proposals were highlighted below ;
- (b) comprehensive development of Whitehead Headland which included the following proposals :
 - (i) a cycling city to complement Government's effort to build a super cycle track linking north east and north west New Territories, including the link from Ma On Shan to Sai Kung. The cycling city was proposed to include a cycling exhibition gallery, cycle tracks for competition of international standard and a cycle safety park ;
 - (ii) a geological park cum geological resource centre at the scenic Whitehead headland to promote the geological and topographical

education to the public ;

(iii) a water sports centre to make better use of the natural environment of the Tolo Harbour for windsurfing, canoeing, sailing and rowing ;
and

(iv) improvement to To Tau Village where there were already some recreational facilities, including boat rental and swimming ;

(c) Hong Kong Mining Ground Park

(i) to establish a new tourist spot in Hong Kong by building a unique and vibrant mining ground theme park for education value at the desolate mining ground ;

(ii) to build a visitor centre on the level land near 100ML mine cave area and the ore selection factory so as to allow the public to have a better understanding of the history of mining in Hong Kong and the work of miners in the old days. That proposal was put forward to Government before but was not supported on grounds that the area was not accessible. However, a road was gazetted last year and would be built by a private developer making the area accessible. It was timely for Government to re-consider the proposal ;

(iii) to turn the level ground in front of the 240ML cave into an exhibition area for exhibiting the quarrying and digging processes and the different types of ore ;

(iv) preservation and refurbishment of the Catholic Church and Yan Kwong Church, both buildings were with high historical value ; and

(v) to exhibit the spoilt landscape from the mining activities in the openpit mining area to remind people of the importance of co-existence of man and nature ;

- (d) rezoning of the “C” and “O” sites in Area 77 to “CDA”
 - (i) there was an acute lack of commercial facilities in Area 77 and the situation would be worsened with the completion of the public rental housing development in Area 86B. Currently, residents in Area 77 had to travel to the MOS town centre to buy even daily necessities, which was very inconvenient ;
 - (ii) to reinstate the original plan for a footbridge linking the “C” site in Area 77 with the public housing estate under construction in Area 86B. Although the footbridge might increase the cost of construction, it might in turn increase the value of the “C” site by increasing pedestrian flow. Housing Department (HD) had already reserved the space for the landing of the footbridge ;
 - (iii) within the “O” site, there should be provision for more recreational facilities ;
 - (iv) residents were worried that development on the small sized “C” site would turn out to become a replica of the Sha Tin Fun City, which was an unsuccessful development and did not satisfy residents’ needs ;
- (e) to build the tourist pier near Horizon Suite Hotel to allow visitors easy access to scenic areas like the geological parks, Port Island and Wong Chuk Kok Tsui. The pier would also be easily accessible by the MOS rail ;

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) to turn the temporary by-pass to Road T7 into a permanent road to provide better linkage from Hang Tai Road to Ma On Shan Road from Area 77 ;

- (g) to plan the government land along Tai Shui Hang River for recreational use to meet the needs of the ageing population living in the area.

[Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Representation No. R12

22. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation which was tabled, Mr. Simon Law made the following points :

- (a) they objected to the BH restriction of 100mPD on the “C” site as it would affect air ventilation in Area 77. That was supported by 80% of the respondents in a survey they conducted ;
- (b) according to the AVA conducted by Chinese University of Hong Kong for the MOS OZP amendments, the “C” site was located on the air path for wind flowing from southeast to north. The developer of the site to the north of the “C” site had already responded to the recommendations of the AVA by building low-rise houses in areas of the air path. If the “C” site was allowed to be built up to 100mPD, it would adversely affect air ventilation ;
- (c) if the “C” site was allowed to be built up to 100mPD, wind from the south would be obstructed as wind would be shielded by the elevated East Rail Viaduct to the east, the car park podium of La Costa to the west of the “O” site and the future development on the “C” site in the north. That would lead to stagnation of air, reduce the dispersion of pollutants and would affect the air quality for surrounding residents. That would not be in line with the air ventilation guidelines in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) ;
- (d) to resolve the air stagnation problem, the “C” and “O” sites should be kept as low-rise. The air stagnation problem at the “O” site might be resolved by elevating it from the ground level to the roof-top of the

future commercial development so as to reduce the shielding from surrounding structures and buildings. The loss in open space might be compensated by roof-top greening on the development to be built on the amalgamated “C” and “O” sites, and the area of green space would be doubled. A viewing deck might be built on the roof-top garden to allow for better views of the mountainscape in MOS ;

- (e) with the increase in population in Area 77, there was a need to increase the provision of community facilities. The larger “C” site should be provided with social and recreational facilities, including badminton and table tennis courts, which would be in accordance with the HKPSG requirements ; and
- (f) a public transport interchange should be provided in the “C” site to serve the growing population which was expected to reach 220,000.

[Mr. B.W. Chan returned to the meeting at this point.]

23. Mr. Lee Chi Wai further elaborated on R12 and made the following main points:

- (a) a tall building on the “C” site would affect air ventilation. He questioned whether the provision of the 15m wide non-building area was for enhancing air ventilation or for compensating the damage to air ventilation caused by the tall commercial development ;
- (b) the planning intention of the “C” site was to provide basic shopping needs of local residents. There was no demand for large shopping centres. It was therefore not necessary to allow for a tall building on the “C” site ;
- (c) a “stepped building height” profile was adopted in the OZP. Although allowing for a development at 100mPD would be visually compatible with surrounding developments as viewed from the harbour, there would be adverse visual impact on the Ocean View development ;

- (d) with regard to the loss of open space, it should be noted that sufficient open space was provided within private residential developments in the area. There was also a much larger “O” site in Area 90 which had access to the waterfront promenade. That site was more suitable for open space use as compared with the smaller “O” site in Area 77. The Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) had confirmed that the open space provision in the area was sufficient and that there was no firm programme to develop the open space in Area 77 ;

- (e) if the “C” site was permitted to be built up to 100mPD, many storeys of the future development might be used for non-accountable GFA to accommodate uses such as car parks. The site was already occupied by open car parks and there was shortage of car parking spaces in the area ;
and

- (f) the “C” site should only provide for basic shopping and recreation needs of the local residents. Instead of open space use, there might be a need to provide G/IC facilities as most of the existing G/IC facilities were in the MOS town centre and might not be sufficient to cater for the needs of the growing population. The proposed “CDA” zoning would be appropriate and would lead to better design and better meet the planning intention.

Commenter No. 236

24. Mr. Wu Wai Lun made the following points :

- (a) residents of Kam Tai Court generally felt that there was a lack of supporting facilities. There was no sports and recreation centres and limited choices for shopping and dining places. To satisfy their shopping needs, residents had to travel by car to Shatin or MOS town centre or walk to a small shopping centre at Chevalier Garden ;

- (b) combining the “C” and “O” sites into a “CDA” zone for a commercial complex would increase the diversity of commercial uses and would be more easily accessible to residents of Kam Tai Court. There could also be provision for recreational facilities, such as ball courts and sports centre. There were growing numbers of elderly and children in Kam Tai Court but the only available recreational space was the playground within the estate and the waterfront promenade ; and
- (c) public transport facilities for Kam Tai Court were currently inadequate and needed improvements.

25. As the presentations from R11, R12 and C236 had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

26. The Vice-chairman said that the main concern was the development parameters for the “C” site. He said that a BH restriction of 100mPD would allow for a building of 20 to 30 storeys, which would likely be an office or hotel rather than a shopping centre. Since the site was far from the MTR stations, he doubted whether there would be demand for office or hotel at that location. If the planning intention was for a local shopping centre, there was no need for a tall building. Mr. Hui Wai Keung explained that the “C” site was intended for a shopping centre and the 100mPD BH restriction would provide flexibility for the future development. With a plot ratio restriction of 3 and assuming 100% site coverage, the development might only be three to four storeys in height. The BH restriction of 100mPD was considered compatible with the surrounding developments and the AVA had confirmed that a development of such BH would not create any air ventilation problem. Mr. Hui also said that the problems about management of the roof-top open space would need to be carefully considered. In response to a Member’s question, Mr. Hui confirmed that the AVA had already assumed a building at 100mPD on the “C” site.

27. A Member remarked that although some of Mr. Yeung’s proposals were not related to any amendment items, some of them like the mining park, cycle park and pier were good ideas worth noting for consideration in future planning. Mr. Hui Wai Keung said that the proposals, especially that for Whitehead could be considered in the future

planning of the MOS new town.

28. A Member asked whether recreational facilities which were in shortfall could be included in the commercial development on the “C” site. Mr. Hui Wai Keung replied that the major shortfall was in shopping facilities, but that although commercial uses were always permitted in the lowest three floors of buildings under R(A) zones, not many commercial facilities were found in Area 77. A BH restriction of 100mPD was intended to provide design flexibility so as to increase the marketability of the site. Notwithstanding, he said that there were sufficient sports and other community facilities within the MOS New Town though they might not be close to developments in Area 77.

29. A Member asked whether the footbridge proposal mentioned by R11 could be further considered. Mr. Hui Wai Keung indicated that when the Board considered the zoning amendment of the public rental housing site in Area 86, the Board had already noted the footbridge proposal, and HD had already reserved space for the connection of the footbridge in the public housing development. The requirements for the footbridge could be included in the land sale conditions. He said that Transport Department did not consider the footbridge necessary, as there was already an existing subway system at the Hang Fai Street and Sai Sha Road roundabout.

30. A Member said that the cycling park and mining park were good ideas and should be considered as additional recreational facilities for the whole MOS New Town. Another Member commented that most developments in MOS were linked up by footbridges and at-grade pedestrian crossing was not common. There was a lack of public square or piazza and at-grade pedestrian flow was low in the area. The viaduct of the railway made the surrounding ground level space unattractive. It gave people an impression that there was a lack of vitality in MOS as compared to the Shatin New Town.

[Dr C.N.Ng left the meeting at this point.]

31. In response to the point on the availability of shopping facilities, Mr. Wu emphasized that there was a need for shopping facilities in Area 77. Mr. Yeung said that the value of the “C” site could be increased by combining the “C” and “O” sites into a larger site for more comprehensive development and the footbridge proposal would

increase pedestrian flow. He said that the existing subway system was very inconvenient.

32. Mr. Lee said that the planning intention of the “C” site should be a small scale shopping centre to serve the local residents. If the BH restriction was too relaxed, the future development might use the floors for uses such as car park, which were not GFA accountable. The “O” site was not needed for recreational use, as there were open space provisions within all private housing estates, at the waterfront promenade and on the “O” site in Area 90. A larger site formed by amalgamating the “C” and “O” sites would increase design flexibility. Social and recreational facilities could be included at the site to complement those facilities currently provided in the MOS town centre. If office use was to be accommodated on the “C” site, the site could be zoned to “G/IC” or “CDA” for government and / or private offices.

[Mr. David W.M. Chan left the meeting at this point.]

33. Mr. Yeung indicated that LCSD had no programme to develop the “O” site in Area 77. The chance for development of the “O” site might be increased by combining it with the “C” site and the requirements for greenery on the roof-top might be included in the lease conditions. He said that due to an acute shortage of car parking spaces in Area 77, he suggested that car parking requirements might be provided in the future development on the “C” site.

34. A Member was concerned that the roof-top garden would become a private garden in the future development. Mr. Yeung said that it was important to facilitate air ventilation by a low-rise development and a green roof, and whether the roof would be made available for public use could be further considered. A Member asked whether there were examples of successful roof-top garden and the appropriate type of commercial facilities to be provided in the “C” site. Mr. Wu opined that the “C” site should be for meeting basic shopping needs of the local people. Mr. Yeung said that a roof-top garden might be more feasible on a low-rise building. He further said that there were places in MOS that were filled with vitality and he cited the recent opening of the waterfront promenade and the cycle track that was well used by pedestrians and cyclists. Mr. Lee said that should the Board consider the management of the roof-top garden a problem, the garden might not necessarily be accessible to the public. A green podium for passive

recreation would be good for air ventilation and would not create visual impact.

[Mr. Andrew Tsang left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Representation 13

35. The Chairman invited Mr. Leung Yiu Choi to elaborate on his representation and Mr Leung said it was not appropriate for the plot ratio restrictions for Kam On Court and Chevalier Garden to be restricted to plot ratios of 3.8 and 3, respectively. That was not in line with the stepped building height profile and would affect the redevelopment potential of these sites. He was pleased to know that the plot ratios stipulated for Heng On and Yiu On Estates were 5, and he requested that the plot ratios of Kam On Court and Chevalier Garden be also increased to 5.

36. As the representers, representer's representatives and commenter had finished their presentations and Members had no further questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed and the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked them and the PlanD's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

37. A Member said that the BH restriction might be reduced to better reflect the intended use for a local shopping centre but there was no need to combine the "C" and "O" sites since the shopping centre would only be small in scale. Another Member said that development on the "C" site should be low-rise to allow better air ventilation.

[Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee left the meeting at this point.]

38. A Member considered that the footbridge proposal was an important issue that should be taken account as far a possible. Another Member said that the footbridge would only be provided when the "C" site was developed. The Government should decide on the need for such provision.

39. A Member said that requirements for roof-top greening should be decided by the market. Another Member said that the amount of commercial facilities planned in the public housing development within Area 86 would affect the need for a shopping centre at the “C” site. A Member said that the other proposals such as the mining parks should not be considered by the Board as part of the agenda item as they were not related to amendments to the OZP.

40. Members generally agreed that there was no need to combine the “C” and “O” sites as the shopping centre was only intended to be a local shopping centre which might not be high rise. In that regard, it was not necessary to allow a BH of 100mPD to cater for flexibility. Members agreed that the BH for the “C” site should be reduced to 30mPD.

41. On the footbridge proposal, Mr Simon Yu said that as the footbridge would need to be tall and long to cross over the railway viaduct, the high cost of construction would affect the attractiveness of the sale site. He asked whether it would be more appropriate for the Government to build the footbridge should there be a traffic need. The Secretary said that as footbridge was always permitted under the OZP, there was no need for the Board to consider if amendments to the OZP was required. That question could be considered by concerned departments at the stage of drawing up the lease conditions of the sale site.

42. The Chairman concluded that Members agreed to amend the building height restriction of the “C” zone to 30mPD, and there was no need to change the zoning of the adjoining “O” site. With regard to the proposal to increase the plot ratio of Kam On Court and Chevalier Garden to 5, as the representers had not provided justification nor technical assessments to support their proposal, Members agreed that the related representations should not be upheld. Regarding the footbridge proposal and the need to provide other facilities as suggested by representers and commenters for Area 77 and other general proposals suggested by R11, Members agreed to refer the issues to the relevant departments for consideration as they were outside the scope of the agenda item.

Representation No. R11

43. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially uphold the Representation No. R11 by amending the BH restriction for the “C” zone to 30mPD. The Board also noted the proposals from R11 for the MOS district, which were not related to any amendment item of the OZP as set out in paragraph 3.11 of the Paper.

44. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of the Representation No. R11 for the following reasons:

- (a) no strong planning justification had been submitted to support the proposed amalgamation of the “C” site with the adjoining “O” site into a “CDA” site for comprehensive development for commercial, cultural and recreational uses ;
- (b) the “O” site was intended to be a local open space to serve the residents of Ocean View and La Costa which were within short walking distance. Besides, the “O” site was located next to the major air path along Sai Sha Road and the major breezeway along Po Tai Street. The “O” zoning was thus appropriate for the site for the benefits of providing public open space facilities to nearby residents as well as better air ventilation to the area ;
- (c) the PR restrictions for Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court were up to the maximum development intensities under the leases. Besides, the Notes of the OZP also allowed that upon redevelopment, the existing PR/GFAs could be retained if the lot was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building. Hence, there would not be adverse impact on the development potential of the sites ;
- (d) no relevant technical assessments had been submitted to support the proposed increase in PR restrictions for Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court up to 5 ;

- (e) Chevalier Garden was subject to a BH restriction of 85mPD, which was considered compatible with the valley setting as well as reflecting the as-built situation. The AVA study concluded that there was no major air ventilation issue for the New Town and the proposed building height and PR restrictions for Chevalier Garden would not result in adverse air ventilation issues. The proposal to relax the BH restriction to 120mPD was out of context with the adjacent Tai Shui Hang Village occupied by three storeys village houses and the mountain backdrop. Besides, the proposed BH of 120mPD for Chevalier Garden, which was the same as that for the southern node, would undermine the overall BH concept for the New Town of having the Tai Shui Hang Station as the southern node ; and

- (f) the Notes of the OZP for the Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court sites had already provided the necessary flexibility for application to the Board for minor relaxation of the PR and BH restrictions based on individual merits of development/redevelopment proposal.

Representation No. R12

45. After further deliberation, the Board decided to partially uphold the Representation No. 12 by amending the BH restriction for the “C” zone to 30mPD.

46. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of the Representation No. R12 for the following reasons:

- (a) no strong planning justification had been submitted to support the proposed amalgamation of the “C” site with the adjoining “O” site into a “CDA” site for comprehensive development for commercial, cultural and recreational uses ; and

- (b) the “O” site was intended to be a local open space to serve the residents of Ocean View and La Costa which were within short walking distance. Besides, the “O” site was located next to the major air path along Sai

Sha Road and the major breezeway along Po Tai Street. The “O” zoning was thus appropriate for the site for the benefits of providing public open space facilities to nearby residents as well as better air ventilation to the area.

Representation No. R13

47. After further deliberation, the Board noted the support on the stipulation of 2-storey BH restriction at Heng On Estate under Amendment Item B2 of Representation No. R13.

48. The Board decided not to uphold the remaining part of the Representation No. R13 for the following reasons:

- (a) the PR restrictions for Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court were up to the maximum development intensities under the leases. Besides, the Notes of the OZP also allowed that upon redevelopment, the existing PR/GFAs could be retained if the lot was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building. Hence, there would not be adverse impact on the development potential of the sites ;
- (b) no relevant technical assessments had been submitted to support the proposed increase in PR restrictions for Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court up to 5 ; and
- (c) the Notes of the OZP for the Chevalier Garden and Kam On Court sites had already provided the necessary flexibility for application to the Board for minor relaxation of the PR and BH restrictions based on individual merits of development/redevelopment proposal.

[Mr. Edmund Leung, Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong, Ms. Sylvia S.F. Yau, Mr. B.W. Chan, Mr. Walter Chan, Dr James Lau left the meeting at this point.]

Group 5 (R15 to R25, C1 to C17, C19 – C124, C126 to C131, C133 to C234)

(TPB Paper No. 8444)

Presentation and Question Session

49. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers and commenters to invite them to the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in the absence of the other representers and commenters who had indicated either not to attend or made no reply.

50. Members noted four written submissions by commenters which were tabled for Members information as they said they could not attend the hearing meeting. C7 and C188 restated their support for the “Open Space” (“O”) zoning. C181 stated his concern that roads in Hong Kong were not designed up to the standard for universal access. C214 requested to withdraw his comment in support of the “O” zoning and instead requested for the land to be rezoned “Green Belt” (“GB”).

51. The following representatives from PlanD, the representer, commenters and commenter’s representative were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. W.K. Hui - District Planning Officer / Shatin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr. W W Chan - Senior Town Planner / Shatin, PlanD

R25

Ms. Wendy Lam - Representer

C6

Mr. Lee Sai Wing - Commenter's representative

Ms. Lo Tai Suen - Commenter's representative

C187

Mr. Tsang Loi Fat - Commenter

C230

Ms. Chu Siu Yung - Commenter

52. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. He then invited the representatives from PlanD to brief Members on the background to the representations.

53. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.W. Chan made the following main points :

Background

(a) the representations and comments to be considered under Group 5 were about the “O” zoning and three pieces of government land located between Monte Vista and Lee On Estate under Amendment Item E5 as follows :

- **R15 to R23, C2 to C17, C19 – C124, C126 to C131, C133 to C234** (excluding C214 which was withdrawn in a letter as tabled) : supported the “O” zoning ;
- **R24, R25, C1** : opposed the “O” zoning ;

(b) Members’ attention was drawn to written submissions from the four commenters, especially C214 who requested withdrawal of his supporting comment ;

(c) the representation sites involved three pieces of vacant Government land with an area of 0.27 ha., adjoining Lee On Estate and Monte Vista. Amendment Item E5 was mainly to rationalize the land allocation boundaries of these developments. As the sites were in close proximity to nearby residences and adjacent to an “O” site, it was proposed to include them into the “O” zone for public open space development ;

- (d) about the representers' concerns on the safety, hygiene and environmental problems of the existing green area, it was considered that zoning the sites as "O" for open space development would put them under proper design and management.
- (e) PlanD's Views – PlanD did not support the opposing representations R24, R25 and C1.

54. The Chairman then invited the representer, commenters and commenter's representative to elaborate on their representations and comments.

Representation No. 25

55. Ms. Wendy Lam said that she was a resident of Monte Vista and she opposed the "O" zoning. As the "O" site was too close to Monte Vista, she was worried that people using the park might create noise nuisance to nearby residents and suggested that the "O" site should be left as a managed green amenity area rather than a park. She opined that there was ample provision of open space in MOS, Lee On Estate and within the private residential developments and there was no need for an additional park in the vicinity.

Commenter No. 6

56. Ms. Lo Tai Suen said that they had conducted a survey amongst residents and 200 to 300 of the returned questionnaires were in support of the "O" zoning. She also urged that before there was a confirmed programme for the park, drainage improvement works should be carried out in the representation site and the surrounding area to resolve the mosquito problems caused by flooding of the grassland after raining.

Commenter No. 187

57. Mr. Tsang Loi Fat supported a park development on the site and suggested that facilities such as ponds, chessboards and trees should be provided in the park.

Commenter No. 230

58. Ms. Chu Siu Yung indicated support for the open space development as it was in line with the principle of people-oriented planning.

59. As the presentations from PlanD, the representer, commenters and commenter's representative had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members. As Members had no questions, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed and the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked them and the PlanD's representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

60. A Member indicated that the "O" zoning should remain as the open space proposal was beneficial to the community, and park users should not be regarded as creating noise nuisance. Members agreed and decided not to uphold the representations.

Representation Nos. R15 to R23

61. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supporting Representation Nos. R15 to R23.

Representation No. 24

62. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold the Representation No. R24 for the following reason :

- (a) The "Open Space" zoning was considered appropriate for the site. The site was in close proximity to local residents and a planned open space, and its size and configuration were capable of supporting active and/or passive recreational facilities including landscaping with trees and shrub planting. Zoning the site as "O" would put it under proper design and

management in future.

Representation No. 25

63. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold the Representation No. 25 for the following reason :

- (a) The “Open Space” zoning was considered appropriate for the site. The site was in close proximity to local residents and a planned open space, and its size and configuration were capable of supporting active and/or passive recreational facilities including landscaping with trees and shrub planting. Zoning the site as “O” would put it under proper design and management in future.

64. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:30pm.

65. The meeting was resumed at 2:30pm.

66. The following Members and the Secretary were present in the afternoon session :

Mr. Thomas Chow

Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong

Mr. Nelson W.Y. Chan

Mr. Tony Kan

Dr. C.N. Ng

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr. Simon Yu

Mr. Andrew Tsang

Mr. Benny Wong

Mrs. Ava S.Y. Ng

Agenda Item 4 [resumed after lunch]

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in Respect of the Draft Ma On Shan
Outline Zoning Plan No. S/MOS/15

(TPB Papers No. 8440, 8441, 8442, 8443 and 8444)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Group 1 (R1 to R7, C235)

(TPB Paper No. 8440)

67. The following Members had declared interest on the item :

Mr. Alfred Donald Yap - having current business dealings with Henderson
Land Development Co. Ltd., the mother company
of R7

Mr. Raymond Chan - having current business dealings with Henderson
Land Development Co. Ltd., the mother company
of R7

68. Members noted that Mr. Donald Yap had tendered apologies for not able to
attend the meeting while Mr. Raymond Chan had left the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

69. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers and commenter to invite
them to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the
representations in their absence as they had either indicated not to attend the meeting or
made no reply.

70. The following representatives from PlanD were invited to the meeting at this
point :

- Mr. W.K. Hui - District Planning Officer / Shatin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Planning Department (PlanD)
- Mr. W W Chan - Senior Town Planner / Shatin, PlanD

71. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.W. Chan made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) the representations and comments to be considered under Group 1 were as follows :
- **R1 to R6, C235** : related to the entire “CDA(1)” site at Lok Wo Sha ;
 - **R7** : related to the northeast portion of the “CDA(1)” site at Lok Wo Sha ;
- (b) the land status of the “CDA(1)” could be broadly delineated into three portions – the north east was a proposed land sale site, a large portion of the site in the south was the proposed STTL 502 which was owned by R7, and in the north was a site reserved for G/IC facilities ;
- (c) the subject of the representations was related to the BH and development intensity of the “CDA(1)” at Lok Wo Sha. It should be noted that there was no amendment to the PR restriction of the “CDA(1)” in the current OZP and only the BH restriction was amended ;
- (d) in the previous OZP, the Lok Wo Sha “CDA(1)” site was subject to a BH restriction of 32 storeys above 2 storeys of podium. In the current OZP, the amendment was only to change the BH restriction to be in the form of mPD for clarity and certainty ;
- (e) in determining the development parameters for the Ma On Shan (MOS) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP), a comprehensive review of all the development zones on the OZP was undertaken. Details of the existing profile of the MOS New Town were contained in Annex 2 of the Paper ;

- (f) the development concept of MOS was based on one town centre and two gateway nodes at Tai Shui Hang in the south and Wu Kai Sha in the north. The proposed BH profile was to step down from the foothill areas toward the waterfront, and descending from the town centre and the two gateway nodes. Along the waterfront, varying BHs were to be encouraged ;

- (g) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) of the New Town was commissioned by PlanD to assess the likely impact of the amendments on the OZP. The final AVA Report was available for public viewing on PlanD's website and was attached to Annex 5 of the Paper. According to the findings of the AVA, there was no major air ventilation issue for the New Town. However, to further improve the air path network, the AVA recommended a few strips of air paths and permeable area for better air ventilation of the New Town and these were incorporated in the form of designating non-building areas and stipulation of 2-storey BH restrictions ;

- (h) Amendment Item B3 was for stipulation of 2-storey BH restriction within two strips of land within the "CDA(1)". The 2-storey BH restrictions on the site followed two of the visual corridors in the approved MLP (Application No. A/MOS/61-7) for the Lok Wo Sha development ;

Representations – Ground of Representations and PlanD's Response

- (i) the representers (R1 to R6, C235) opposed the Lok Wo Sha development. PlanD's response was that in terms of BH, the MLP approved by the Board already followed the "stepped height" building profile descending from the Wu Kai Sha Station to the waterfront. With respect to the representers' concern on visual impact of the development, the approved MLP already included tree plantings to provide visual buffer at the pedestrian level ;

- (j) with regard to representer's concern (R4, C235) on landscaping, PlanD's response was that according to the landscape master plan for the approved MLP, there would be ample tree planting and landscaping works on the site ;
- (k) the amendment to the BH restriction of the site was to replace the BH in number of storeys to BH in mPD to provide certainty and clarity. The height bands in the "CDA(1)" were derived based on the approved building plans for the site. The AVA had recommended two ventilation corridors which divided the site into three portions, hence, three height bands were incorporated into the "CDA(1)" zone ;
- (l) the representers (R1 to R6) requested reducing the BH restrictions on the "CDA(1)", the specific proposals were BH of 80m, 10 storeys or 20 storeys. PlanD's response was that more stringent BH restrictions would impose undue design constraints and likely to result in an unsatisfactory layout with reduced green areas and might not be able to achieve a "stepped height" profile ;
- (m) the representer R7 proposed to add a height band of 96mPD on the future sale site in the northeast of the "CDA(1)". PlanD's response was that it was not necessary to add another height band of 96mPD for the northeastern portion of the site, as the three height bands of 130mPD, 120mPD and 105mPD broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the MLP approved by the Board, followed the "stepped height" building profile, and the Board had adequate control of BH of developments within the "CDA(1)" through the MLP process submitted under a Section 16 planning application ; and
- (n) PlanD's View – PlanD did not support the opposing representations (R1 to R7).

72. As the presentation from PlanD had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members. As Members had no questions, the Chairman thanked PlanD's

representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

73. Members generally considered that the BH restrictions for the “CDA(1)” was appropriate and there was no strong planning justification to uphold the representations.

Representation No. 1

74. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 1 for the following reasons :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP ;
- (b) according to the AVA study, the stated BH restrictions for the site should not result in adverse air ventilation to the area. The added requirement on the submission of AVA report in the Notes of the “CDA” zone together with the stipulation of two 15m wide strips of BH restriction of 2 storeys would ensure that the impact on air ventilation arising from the development at the site could be minimized ; and
- (c) the proposed more stringent BH restrictions would impose undue constraints on the design and layout of the development resulting in larger building blocks, congested layout, less distinct “stepped height” building profile, and might not be able to keep the wooded area intact. It was likely that the resultant layout would be unsatisfactory in terms of visual and air ventilation aspects because more space would be occupied by buildings and hence less open area would be reserved for the purposes of view corridor, air path and tree planting.

Representation No. 2

75. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 2 for the following reasons :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP ;
- (b) according to the AVA study, the stated BH restrictions for the site should not result in adverse air ventilation to the area. The added requirement on the submission of AVA report in the Notes of the “CDA” zone together with the stipulation of two 15m wide strips of BH restriction of 2 storeys would ensure that the impact on air ventilation arising from the development at the site could be minimized ; and
- (c) the proposed more stringent BH restrictions would impose undue constraints on the design and layout of the development resulting in larger building blocks, congested layout, less distinct “stepped height” building profile, and might not be able to keep the wooded area intact. It was likely that the resultant layout would be unsatisfactory in terms of visual and air ventilation aspects because more space would be occupied by buildings and hence less open area would be reserved for the purposes of view corridor, air path and tree planting.

Representation No. 3

76. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 3 for the following reasons :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual

and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP ; and

- (b) according to the AVA study, the stated BH restrictions for the site should not result in adverse air ventilation to the area. The added requirement on the submission of AVA report in the Notes of the “CDA” zone together with the stipulation of two 15m wide strips of BH restriction of 2 storeys would ensure that the impact on air ventilation arising from the development at the site could be minimized.

Representation No. 4

77. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 4 for the following reasons :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP ;
- (b) according to the AVA study, the stated BH restrictions for the site should not result in adverse air ventilation to the area. The added requirement on the submission of AVA report in the Notes of the “CDA” zone together with the stipulation of two 15m wide strips of BH restriction of 2 storeys would ensure that the impact on air ventilation arising from the development at the site could be minimized ; and
- (c) the proposed more stringent BH restrictions would impose undue constraints on the design and layout of the development resulting in larger building blocks, congested layout, less distinct “stepped height” building profile, and might not be able to keep the wooded area intact. It was likely that the resultant layout would be unsatisfactory in terms of

visual and air ventilation aspects because more space would be occupied by buildings and hence less open area would be reserved for the purposes of view corridor, air path and tree planting.

Representation No. 5

78. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 5 for the following reasons :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP ;
- (b) according to the AVA study, the stated BH restrictions for the site should not result in adverse air ventilation to the area. The added requirement on the submission of AVA report in the Notes of the “CDA” zone together with the stipulation of two 15m wide strips of BH restriction of 2 storeys would ensure that the impact on air ventilation arising from the development at the site could be minimized ; and
- (c) the proposed more stringent BH restrictions would impose undue constraints on the design and layout of the development resulting in larger building blocks, congested layout, less distinct “stepped height” building profile, and might not be able to keep the wooded area intact. It was likely that the resultant layout would be unsatisfactory in terms of visual and air ventilation aspects because more space would be occupied by buildings and hence less open area would be reserved for the purposes of view corridor, air path and tree planting.

Representation No. 6

79. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 6 for the following reason :

- (a) the Board had approved a MLP for the site in 2005 under application No. A/MOS/61 as the MLP had addressed the issues of wall effect, visual and landscape impacts. The BH restrictions were considered appropriate as they broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the approved MLP.

Representation No. 7

80. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 7 for the following reason :

- (a) the site was zoned “CDA” on the OZP. The development control of the site was governed by MLP approved by the Board through planning application under section 16 of the Ordinance. The stipulation of height bands on the Plan broadly reflected the height of the proposed residential buildings on the MLP approved by the Board under Application No. A/MOS/61. The Notes of the “CDA” zone stated clearly that a “stepped height” building profile descending from the southern part to the northern part of the site was required. Hence, it was not necessary to add another height band of 96mPD for the northeastern portion of the site in view of the MLP control for the site.

Group 2 (R8, R10)

(TPB Paper No. 8441)

Presentation and Question Session

81. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers to invite them to attend the meeting, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representations in their

absence as they had made no reply.

82. The following representatives from PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. W.K. Hui - District Planning Officer / Shatin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr. W W Chan - Senior Town Planner / Shatin, PlanD

83. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.W. Chan made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) the representations to be considered under Group 2 were as follows :
 - (a) **R8** : opposed generally the BH and development intensity restrictions stipulated on the draft plan with no specific site mentioned ;
 - (b) **R10** : supported the imposition of 2-storey BH restriction on the Plan, which was related to Amendment Items B2 and B3 ;
- (b) a comprehensive review of all the development zones on the Ma On Shan (MOS) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was undertaken. In formulating the development parameters for the OZP, relevant considerations had been given to the lease conditions, the existing topography, the infrastructure as well as broad urban design principles ;
- (c) the MOS New Town had largely been developed, details of the existing profile of the MOS New Town were contained in Annex 2 of the Paper. The development concept of MOS was based on one town centre and two gateway nodes at Tai Shui Hang in the south and Wu Kai Sha in the north. The proposed BH profile was to step down from the foothill areas toward the waterfront, and descending from the town centre and the two gateway nodes. Along the waterfront, varying BHs were to be encouraged ;

- (d) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) of the New Town was commissioned by PlanD to assess the likely impact of the amendments on the OZP. The final AVA Report was available for public viewing on PlanD's website and was attached to Annex 5 of the Paper. According to the findings of the AVA, there was no major air ventilation issue for the New Town. However, to further improve the air path network, the AVA recommended a few strips of air paths and permeable area for better air ventilation of the New Town and these were incorporated in the form of designating non-building areas and in the form of stipulating 2-storey BH restrictions, the stipulation of 2-storey BH restrictions was supported by R10.

- (e) PlanD's view - PlanD considered the BH restrictions on the OZP appropriate and did not support the opposing representation (R8).

84. As the presentation from PlanD had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members. As Members had no questions, the Chairman thanked PlanD's representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

85. Members generally considered that there was no strong planning justification to uphold the opposing representation.

Representation No. 8

86. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 8 for the following reasons :

- (a) the BH restrictions for various zones on the MOS OZP had taken due account of the proposed PR/GFA restrictions, the existing topography, the settings, the local character, existing land uses and building profile, urban design considerations, as well as the wind performance of the existing condition and the recommendations of the AVA, as appropriate.

It had struck a balance between meeting the public aspiration for a better living environment and private development right. No strong planning justification had been submitted to support a more stringent BH control on the various development zones in the OZP; and

- (b) as demonstrated by the air ventilation assessment study, the stated PR/GFA and BH restrictions for the development zones of MOS OZP would not result in adverse air ventilation for the New Town.

Representation No. 10

87. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supporting Representation No. 10.

Group 3 (R9)

(TPB Paper No. 8442)

Presentation and Question Session

88. The Chairman said that R9 had indicated that he would not attend the hearing. As sufficient notice had been given to the representer, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing of the representation in his absence.

89. The following representatives from PlanD were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. W.K. Hui - District Planning Officer / Shatin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN), Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr. W W Chan - Senior Town Planner / Shatin, PlanD

90. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. W.W. Chan made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) R9 was submitted by the China Light and Power (CLP) Hong Kong Limited opposing the BH restrictions for three of their CLP Electric Substation sites (ESS) - Ma On Shan 'B' and Gas Insulated Switchgear 'GIS' ESS (under Amendment Item A) and Lee On ESS (under Amendment Item E2) ;
- (b) a comprehensive review of all the development zones on the Ma On Shan (MOS) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) was undertaken. In formulating the development parameters for the OZP, relevant considerations had been given to the lease conditions, the existing topography, the infrastructure as well as broad urban design principles ;
- (c) details of the existing profile of the MOS New Town were contained in Annex 2 of the Paper. The development concept of MOS was based on one town centre and two gateway nodes at Tai Shui Hang in the south and Wu Kai Sha in the north. The proposed BH profile was to step down from the foothill areas toward the waterfront, and descending from the town centre and the two gateway nodes. Along the waterfront, varying BHs were to be encouraged. The BH profile was mainly for determining the BH restrictions for residential and commercial buildings ;
- (d) an air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) of the New Town was commissioned by PlanD to assess the likely impact of the amendments on the OZP. The final AVA Report was available for public viewing on PlanD's website and was attached to Annex 4 of the Paper. According to the findings of the AVA, there was no major air ventilation issue for the New Town ;

- (e) the BH restrictions for residential and commercial buildings were made with reference to existing building heights and the stepped BH profile. The low-rise profile of the G/IC sites should be maintained as spatial relief and breathing space, BH restrictions for G/IC facilities, such as the ESSs, were to reflect the existing height and were made with reference to operational needs of the concerned facilities ;
- (f) the Ma On Shan ‘B’ ESS, Ma On Shan ‘GIS’ ESS and Lee On ESS were all 2 storeys. Those sites were also under a BH restriction of 2 storeys under the lease. The representer indicated that the BH restrictions would affect their future development plans and requested for relaxation to 120 to 130mPD ;
- (g) PlanD considered that there was no strong justification to support the relaxation of BH restrictions on the three ESS sites. If there were any development proposals which exceeded the BH restriction, the representer might seek the Board’s permission for minor relaxation of the BH restrictions under Section 16 or to apply for amendment to the OZP under s.12A of the Ordinance ; and
- (h) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the opposing representation R9.

91. As the presentation from PlanD had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members. As Members had no questions, the Chairman thanked PlanD’s representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

92. Members generally considered that there was no strong planning justification to relax the BH restrictions on the ESS sites and agreed not to uphold the representation.

Representation 9

93. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. 9 for the following reasons :

- (a) a BH restriction of 2 storeys (excluding basement) was imposed on these 3 ESS sites, basically to reflect the as-built situation and the development intensity permitted under the lease. It would not result in deprivation of their development right ;
- (b) according to the AVA Study, the “G/IC” sites located next to the existing air paths/breezeways should be kept at their existing BHs for benefit of better air ventilation. The sites were located next to the major air paths along Sai Sha Road or the major breezeway along On Luk Street Garden. They should be kept at their existing BHs for benefit of better air ventilation ;
- (c) no strong planning justification had been submitted to support the relaxation of the BH restriction to 120mPD and 130mPD for MOS ‘B’/‘GIS’ and Lee On ESS sites, respectively ; and
- (d) should there be any functional or operational needs for GIC developments to exceed the stipulated BH restrictions, or any development proposals with planning/design merits that could further improve the environment of the locality, the representer might seek the Board’s permission for a minor relaxation of the BH restrictions under s.16 or to apply for amendments to the OZP under s.12A of the Ordinance, respectively.

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Review of Air Quality Objectives

(TPB Papers No. 8423)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

94. Mr. Benny Wong declared an interest in this item as Environmental Protection Department (EPD) was responsible for the subject review. As the item was a briefing to Members on the recommendations of the review of air quality objectives, Members considered that Mr. Benny Wong should be allowed to stay at the meeting.

Presentation and Question Session

95. The following representatives of EPD were invited to the meeting at this point :

Mr. Carlson K.S. Chan	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (DDEP)
-----------------------	--

Mr Mok Wai Chuen	Assistant Director (Air Policy)
------------------	---------------------------------

96. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the representatives to brief Members on the Paper.

97. Mr. Carlson K.S. Chan, DDEP, made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) The EPD commissioned a consultancy study in June 2007 to undertake the Air Quality Objectives Review (the Review) for Hong Kong. The Review aimed to update Hong Kong's Air Quality Objectives (AQOs) taking into account the Air Quality Guidelines (AQGs) issued by the World Health Organisation (WHO) and the practices of other advanced countries/ economies in revising their air quality standards; to identify

additional emission control measures to improve air quality; and to consider an appropriate mechanism on future updating of the AQOs;

- (b) Since 1990, while the local emissions of air pollutants, such as sulphur dioxide, nitrogen oxides, respirable suspended particulates and volatile organic compounds had decreased considerably, the number of hours of poor visibility had increased. There was indication that the air quality of Hong Kong was affected by both regional and local activities. It was necessary to cooperate with the Mainland to combat the problem of reduced visibility as well as to continue the control on local emissions such as roadside emissions by vehicles;
- (c) Protection of public health, benchmarking against the WHO Guidelines and adoption of a staged approach in achieving WHO's highest standards were the guiding principles in setting the new AQOs for Hong Kong;
- (d) With reference to the WHO AQGs and Interim Targets (ITs), the proposed new AQOs for Hong Kong were as follows:
 - (i) adopting the concentration targets set out under WHO AQGs for sulphur dioxide (10-minute), nitrogen dioxide (1-hour and annual), carbon monoxide (1-hour and 8-hour) and lead (annual);
 - (ii) adopting the concentration targets set out under WHO IT1 for sulphur dioxide (24-hour), particulate matters (PM)2.5 (24-hour and annual) and ozone (8-hour); and
 - (iii) adopting the concentration targets set out under WHO IT2 for PM10 (24-hour and annual) with reference to WHO IT2;
- (e) The Review had recommended 36 emission control measures to be undertaken under three phases. Under Phase I, 19 emission control measures were proposed and they were grouped into four categories. The first category was emission capping and control which included

increasing the ratio of natural gas in local electricity generation to 50% and early retirement of aged and heavily polluting vehicles and the use of ultra low sulphur diesel for local vessels. The second category was transport management measures such as the establishment of low emission zones and bus route rationalisation. The third category was related to infrastructure development and planning such as expanding rail network and connecting cycle network to major public transport hubs. The fourth category was energy efficiency measures which included mandatory implementation of Building Energy Codes;

- (f) The Review recommended reviewing the AQOs not less than every five years so as to ascertain the extent to which the new AQOs had been achieved and the need and practicability of further tightening the AQOs;
- (g) According to the estimates of the consultant, implementation of the proposed Phase I emission control measures would bring about an anticipated benefit of \$1,228 million per year mainly due to improvement of public health and savings in energy costs. The benefit would be significantly higher than the estimated annual cost of about \$596 million; and
- (h) EPD was conducting a public consultation exercise from 23 July 2009 to 30 November 2009 to ascertain the public's acceptance of the recommendations of the Review and the associated implications. Views of the community would be sought on the pace of implementing the proposed measures and the price they were willing to pay for the measures, including higher electricity tariff, higher bus fares as well as adjustments in the way of life.

98. The Chairman then invited questions from Members.

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

99. Members raised the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed AQOs were territory wide or district wide targets taking into consideration that districts like Kwun Tong and Sham Shui Po might be more polluted;
- (b) whether reviewing the AQOs every five years was appropriate and was in line with international standard;
- (c) whether there was any breakdown of implementation cost for each proposed emission control measure so as to facilitate the public to comment on their willingness to bear such cost; and
- (d) the current cycle track network was not comprehensive and there was a need to work out a plan in conjunction with the Transport Department (TD).

100. Mr. Carlson K.S. Chan responded as follows:

- (a) The AQOs were territory wide targets. At present there were eleven general monitoring stations and three roadside stations collecting data in various districts. Taking sulphur dioxide (24-hour) as an example, the measurement of that pollutant in all the monitoring stations including roadside stations would be taken to check against the concentration target of 125 ug/m^3 , with number of exceedence allowed as 3;
- (b) Having a review every five years was the practice of US, from which the study had made reference. EU countries conducted the review on a need basis;
- (c) The consultation document attached to the Paper (i.e. Annex A) had provided cost estimates for each emission control measure. For instance, increasing the share of natural gas in domestic electricity generation from the current level of about 28% to 50% would result in an increase in electricity tariff by phases of at least 20% from the current level

(paragraph 6.7 of Annex A). The early retirement of aged or heavy polluting vehicles, including franchised buses, would also bring about an increase in bus fare of about 15% (paragraphs 6.8 to 6.9 of Annex A); and

- (d) EPD would work with TD and relevant departments to assess the cycling facilities including whether the connection to major transport hub could be further enhanced, and whether the provision of cycle parks was sufficient.

101. In respect of cost sharing by the public, a Member quoted an example of the Government subsidizing taxi owners switching taxis to run on LPG gas rather than on diesel. The Member suggested the Government to pay for the proposed emission control measures rather than asking the public to pay for them as air quality was a public good. Another Member quoted the practice in Huizhou where the money saved in implementing energy saving measures in public roads and buildings would be reimbursed to contractors / operators, and suggested the Government to devise similar ways to encourage the implementation by the trade and industry.

102. Mr. Carlson K.S. Chan replied that the Government had secured resources to kick-start some of the proposed measures like the implementation of district cooling system in Kai Tak, extension of cycle tracks, and pilot scheme for domestic ferries to change to use ultra low sulphur diesel. The consultation exercise was intended to gather public opinions on the aspect of cost sharing to implement the proposed emission control measures with a view to achieving the AQOs.

103. Another Member opined that in working out the AQOs and the proposed emission controls measures, the views of stakeholders should be sought and taken into account. In response, Mr. Carlson K.S. Chan said that the Central Policy Unit was commissioned to hold several focus group discussions with different stakeholders and academics on the recommendations of the Review including sharing of the cost of the proposed emission control measures. In addition, EPD had consulted individual members of the transport industry on the proposed measures. It was gathered that the stakeholders generally supported the AQOs, but they had expressed concern on measures which might affect their operation such as low emission zone. Those views would be taken into account

in formulating detailed action plan. Further consultation with relevant trade and industries would be carried out when the proposed detailed action plan had been worked out.

104. A Member suggested that the cost of the emission control measures to be borne by the community including the Government, power companies, transport operators and consumers should be made known to the public.

105. As Members had no further questions to raise, the Chairman thanked the representatives from EPD for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

[Messrs. Raymond Y.M. Chan and Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting, and Dr. C.N. Ng arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session Only)]

Consideration of Representations in Respect of the Draft Chek Lap Kok Outline Zoning Plan
No. S/I-CLK/11
(TPB Paper Nos. 8438 and 8447)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Group 1 (R1 to R209, R211 to R377, R380 to R525 and R528 to R785)

(TPB Paper No. 8438)

Presentation and Question Session

106. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Professor David Dudgeon | - Being a trustee of World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Hong Kong and a member of Mai Po Management Committee of WWF (Representer No. 785 (R785)) |
|-------------------------|---|

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung | - | Being a member of the Hong Kong Airport Authority |
| Mr. Fletch Chan | - | Being the Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) which was the responsible policy bureau for the proposed cross boundary facilities project planning on the subject OZP |

107. Members noted that Professor David Dudgeon, Messrs. Edmund K.H. Leung and Fletch Chan had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

108. As the subject cross boundary project was subject to Environmental Impact Assessment Ordinance (EIAO), Mr. Benny Wong, DDEP, declared interest that approval of EIA reports was under the ambit of the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP).

109. Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong had informed the Secretariat that he was a panel member for tunnel construction technique of the Hong Kong Zhuhai Macau Bridge (HZMB) (Pearl River territory section), which was not related to the planning and land issues of the project on the Hong Kong territory.

110. Members noted that the interests declared were indirect and that Mr. Benny Wong and Dr. Greg C.Y. Wong could stay in the meeting. Members noted that sufficient notice had been given to invite the representers to attend the hearing. However, other than representers No. 784 and 785 who had come to the meeting, the rest had either indicated that they would not attend the hearing or made no reply. The Board agreed to proceed with the hearing in their absence.

111. The following representatives from the government departments, and the representatives of the representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr. Alfred Lau District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands

(DPO/SKIs)

Miss Erica Wong Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is)

Highways Department (HyD)

Mr. Albert T.N. Cheng Project Manager (PM)/ HZMB HK

Mr. H.C. Tam Chief Engineer/ HZMB HK

Mr. K.M. BOK Chief Engineer/HKBCF

Mr. Simon K.C. Tsao Senior Engineer/HZMB

Mr. Alex Kong Ove Arup & Partners (OAP)

Mr. Samuel Kwan OAP

Representer No. 784 (R784) Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong

Mr. Alan Chan Representer's representative

R785 (WWF Hong Kong)

Dr. Alan Leung Representer's representative

112. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. He then invited Mr. Alfred Lau, DPO/SKIs, to brief Members on the background to the amendments and the representations.

113. Mr. Alfred Lau, DPO/SKIs, said that an email dated 12.11.2009 from R526 and R527 withdrawing their representations, and four replacement pages (pages 1, 3, 13 and 14) of the Paper to reflect the withdrawal of R526 and R527 were tabled at the Meeting for Members' reference.

114. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Alfred Lau made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

- (a) The background of the proposed amendments which were related to the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) project - the site selection for the proposed Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF), Hong Kong Link Road (HKLR) and Tuen Mun-Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL) and related supporting facilities, and the proposed rezoning

of the natural coastline of Chek Lap Kok Island. The draft Chek Lap Kok OZP No. S/I-CLK/11 incorporating the proposed amendments was exhibited under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) on 12.6.2009;

- (b) During the statutory exhibition period, a total of 789 representations and no comments were received. Seven representations (R210, R378, R379, R526, R527, R786, and R787) were subsequently withdrawn. R789 was considered invalid. The 780 representations in Group 1 (R1 to R209, R211 to R377, R380 to R525 and R528 to R785) were concerned with the cross boundary facilities and the rezoning of the natural coastline of Chek Lap Kok Island;

Grounds of representations

- (c) Site selection of the HKBCF and alignment of the HKLR – the project would bring traffic pollution to the area, the proximity of the facilities to the existing and future residents of Tung Chung should be avoided, and the long security road should be reduced significantly;
- (d) Public engagement – there was no comprehensive assessment on all feasible alternatives for detailed public consideration including locating the BCF south-west and the link road north of and as part of the Airport Island. The proposal should include freight and passenger rail lines connecting to container port and Lok Ma Chau to avoid container trucks passing through urban areas. There was also a lack of engagement with Tung Chung residents;
- (e) Impacts on the Natural Coastline and Damage to the Natural Hillside – the natural shore was a partial compensation for the loss of headland and its coastline at Sha Lo Wan during the construction of the Airport. The proposed removal of the natural coastline would set a negative precedent on the reliability of the environmental mitigation measures and the Government's ability and willingness to respect them. Such proposal

would contravene the original planning intention for the “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone. The proposed amendments failed to minimize the impact on hydrodynamics, in particular on the area of waters between north and south of the proposed HKBCF and the water channel between the Airport and Lantau Island;

Representers’ proposals

- (f) The Representers proposed to reassess the overall scheme and further evaluate other alternative solutions; locate the HKBCF to the west of the Airport to avoid the reclamation of the “CPA”, “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) annotated “(Highways Maintenance Area)” and “OU (Amenity)”;
- adopt a viaduct option along the eastern coast to protect the water body along the “CPA” if HKBCF had to be located on the northeastern water of the Airport, and preserve the remaining natural features such as the natural coast on the eastern shore of Chek Lap Kok;

PlanD’s views

Site Selection of the HKBCF and Related Facilities

- (g) A site selection study had been conducted to identify a suitable location for HKBCF. The study had examined the merits of the current proposed location to the northeast of the Airport. The merits included facilitating integration with strategic road network and synergy with the Airport, having potential for further economic benefits and creating business and job opportunities to Tung Chung, and enabling merging with TM-CKLL Southern landfall reclamation and reducing dredging and construction of new seawall. The study had also considered the demerits of the suggested scheme of locating the HKBCF to the west of the Airport. They included loss of synergy effect, adverse impact on habitat of dolphin, adverse impact on tidal flow of Pearl River delta, large scale hillside cutting for HKLR and more reclamation for TM-CKLL Southern Landfall and tunnel along the northern shore of the Airport Island. As regards the

concern on proximity of HKBCF to Tung Chung, it should be noted that the HKLR and HKBCF were located about 700m and 2km respectively from the residential development at Tung Chung waterfront. Building height restrictions had also been stipulated for the HKBCF. The EIA study approved by the DEP on 23.10.2009 concluded that with the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures, the potential environmental impacts of HKBCF and related facilities would be acceptable;

Alignment of the HKLR

- (h) The proposal to locate the HKLR at the northern shore of the Airport Island put forward by some representers was considered not viable because of higher construction and energy cost, proximity to marine disposal site of contaminated mud, proximity to touch-down zones of the runway and extra cost for providing a long automated people mover to connect to the Airport Terminals. The current alignment for the HKLR along the Airport Channel could avoid significant adverse impact on the natural hillside and shoreline of Lantau Island, keep away from the contaminated mud disposal site north of the Airport and provide a road link for HKBCF/ TM-CLKL traffic to the Airport;

Public Engagement

- (i) Extensive public engagement had been carried out by HyD, and the public views collected were duly taken into account in the site selection process. Railway provision in HZMB was considered not viable from engineering, overall railway planning and financial viability viewpoints. If the HZMB were constructed in bridge-cum-tunnel form, it would not be possible to accommodate both the freight railway line and the road in the same alignment. Besides, Tsing Ma Bridge was not designed for freight rail loadings. Cargoes would need to be unloaded in Lantau Island before reloading onto trucks for transportation to Kwai Chung container ports which was inconvenient and inefficient. Traffic project also showed that

incorporating railway into the HZMB would not significantly increase the passenger flow volume, but would increase the project cost significantly;

Impacts on the Natural Coastline and Damage to the Natural Hillside

- (j) The project would only affect the existing coastline of the Airport Island, not the natural hillside and coastline of Lantau Island. According to the approved EIA report, that portion of existing coastline was of low ecological/landscape value and the HyD would furnish the seawall with natural rock materials for the existing species to re-establish in the new location. DEP had advised that the retention of the eastern coast of the Airport Island was mainly on programming and cost-saving considerations, rather than a mitigation measure for the removal of the Sha La Wan headland for construction of the Airport. The proposed reclamation was considered essential to protect the tunnel at the back of the portal area and for tunnel maintenance. Without this proposed reclamation, the HKBCF reclamation would need to be enlarged to accommodate the facilities;

Responses to the proposed viaduct for the HKBCF southwest reclamation and HKLR along the east coast of the Airport

- (k) The suggested viaduct scheme failed to provide a direct connection between HKBCF and the Airport Terminals as well as between TM-CLKL and the Airport Terminals. It would also require supporting columns within the water area causing maintenance and hygiene problems. Reclamation of the east coast of the Airport Island allowed for re-provision of habitats and provision of utility facilities; and
- (l) The Board was recommended not to uphold the representations on grounds as set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper.

115. The Chairman then invited the representatives of representers and commenters to elaborate on their submissions.

R784 (Association for Geoconservation, Hong Kong)

116. Mr. Alan Chan expressed concern on the adverse impact of the project on the natural coastline to the east of Chek Lap Kok. If reclamation had to take place along the coastline, the Government should recreate the shoreline by using natural rocks to alleviate the impact. He also considered that the section of the HKLR from Sham Wut to Sha Lo Wan was close to local residents, and an alternative alignment which would be further away from the residents should be worked out.

R785 (WWF Hong Kong)

117. With the aid of a Powerpoint, Dr. Alan Leung made the following main points:

- (a) The east coast of Chek Lap Kok had natural coastline with rocky and sandy beaches. It was zoned “CPA” on the former OZP, the planning intention of which was to protect the landscape and scenic values of the natural coastline. Any incompatible landuse affecting the coastline should be avoided;
- (b) According to the supplemental document of the Environmental Assessment Report for the Airport – New Airport Master Plan (NAMP) EIA-006/BC (October 1992), the natural shore to the east of Chek Lap Kok served as a partial compensation for the loss of the headland and its coastline at Sha Lo Wan during the construction of the Airport, which was also reckoned by the Environmental Impact Assessment Update for the NAMP (Feb 1998). That fact, however, was now ignored by the Government;
- (c) If the HKBCF had to be located on the northeastern water of the Airport, a viaduct option along the east coast of Chek Lap Kok, instead of a reclamation option to provide an at-grade road scheme should be adopted to protect the natural coastline of the CPA and its adjacent waterbody. It was also considered that the HKBCF should be linked up with the Chek

Lap Kok Island by means of a bridge, rather than by reclamation as such reclamation would cause the loss of marine habitats and negative impact on the water movement between the HKBCF and the Chek Lap Kok Island;

- (d) The Board should not accept a proposal without a comprehensive compensation plan for the loss of the existing natural coastal habitats including both hard shore and soft shore habitats of the “CPA”; and
- (e) In view of the above, he objected to the proposed location of the HKBCF, the proposed deletion of the “CPA” zone due to the adoption of reclamation instead of viaduct option for the HKLR at the east of the Airport, and the proposed linkage between HKBCF and the Chek Lap Kok Island by means of reclamation.

118. As the presentations from the representatives of the representers and had been completed, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

119. Members asked the following questions :

- (a) how to minimise the ecological impact of the project which involved reclamation; and
- (b) whether the reclamation to the east of the Airport which was currently zoned “OU” annotated for “Highways Maintenance Area” and “Amenity Area” and the reclamation at the southwest of the HKBCF were required, and whether the natural coastline to the east Chek Lap Kok was preserved as a compensation to the loss of natural habitats due to the development of the Airport.

120. With the aid of some slides, Mr. Albert T.N. Cheng, PM of HZMB HK, informed Members that:

- (a) The EIA reports had fully assessed the ecological impact of the project on

the habitats of the nearby waters and the shores, and recommended appropriate mitigation measures. For instance, the HKBCF was proposed to be located to the northeast of Chek Lap Kok Island to avoid the vital habitat of the Chinese White Dolphin. The Government had also committed to designate the waters near the Brothers Island as a marine park such that the habitat of the dolphins could be protected by the relevant Ordinance; and

- (b) EPD advised that the retention of the eastern coast of Chek Lap Kok was not a mitigation measure for the removal of the Sha Lo Wan headland for the construction of the Airport. The existing coastline was of low ecological / landscape value. Apart from forming a sloping seawall at the sea frontage of the new reclamation with natural rock materials, HyD would consider if soft shore, as proposed by the representers, could also be created.

121. In respect of the necessity of the proposed reclamation, with the aid of some slides, Mr. Alex Kong of OAP, project consultant of HyD, supplemented that:

- (a) The strip of reclamation to the southwest of the HKBCF would embody a series of culverts to facilitate water movement between the HKBCF and the Chek Lap Kok Island. The EIA showed that the culverts would be adequate to prevent any adverse water quality-impacts; and
- (b) The proposed HKLR to the immediate north of Scenic Hill was in a bridge form in the original proposal which was objected by the residents of Tung Chung due to adverse visual impact. According to the current proposal, that section of HKLR would ascend gradually from a tunnel form in the Scenic Hill to an at grade road in approaching the HKBCF. In its vicinity, another proposed road linking the HKBCF and the Airport was also in ascending gradient. As such, the water bodies north of the Scenic Hill, which was zoned "OU" annotated "Highway Maintenance Area" and "Amenity Area" had to be reclaimed to protect the structure of the proposed ascending road alignments. The other piece of reclamation to

the further north of the Scenic Hill, which was zoned “OU (Amenity Area)”, was to accommodate a 60m-wide road alignment, which would be more appropriate in the form of an at-grade road rather than a low-level bridges taking account of local views, maintenance and hygiene considerations. Reclamation was also more favourable for tree planting along roadside for visual enhancement than bridge form.

122. In response to a Member’s query on technical feasibility of railway provision in HZMB, Mr. Albert T.N. Cheng said that an in-depth study had been carried out previously concluding that it was not viable because of the following reasons:

- (a) The railway planning for the Pearl River Delta (PRD) did not cover the catchment area of HZMB. If rail were provided to link the BCFs of HK and the mainland, it would be a transit rail only bringing little synergy and benefits;
- (b) The gradient profile of the HZMB posed engineering difficulty for a freight rail. If the HZMB were constructed in bridge-cum-tunnel form, it would not be possible to accommodate both the freight railway line and the road in the same alignment; and
- (c) Traffic projection showed that the incorporation of railway into the HZMB would not significantly increase the passenger flow volume but would increase the project cost significantly.

123. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed and that the Board would deliberate on the representations in the absence of the representers. The representers would be informed of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives of the representers as well as government department representatives for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

124. In respect of the eastern coast of Chek Lap Kok, a Member asked why EPD did not spell out the previous commitment to preserve the natural coast and set that as the design constraints. Mr. Benny Wong, DDEP, said he understood that in order to address the concern of the Tung Chung residents, the HZMB project faced various conflicting requirements and constraints. Judgement had to be exercised in considering which constraints should be accorded higher priority.

125. Members generally considered that the proposed location and configuration of the cross boundary facilities were appropriate in technical, environmental and engineering terms, and noted that the respective EIA reports had been approved with conditions by DEP under the EIAO.

Representations R1 to R209, R211 to R377, R380 to R525 and R528 to R785

126. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representations No. R1 to R209, R211 to R377, R380 to R525 and R528 to R785 for the following reasons:

- (a) The main purpose of the HKBCF was to provide facilities for cross-boundary cargo processing and passenger clearance. Together with the HZMB Main Bridge and the HKLR as well as the Tuen Mun Western Bypass (TMWB) and TM-CLKL, the proposed HKBCF site as shown on Chek Lap Kok OZP No. S/I-CLK/11 would enable the formation of a strategic road network linking Hong Kong, Zhuhai, Macao and Shenzhen, thereby further enhancing the transportation and aviation hub status of Hong Kong. The synergy effect would be considerable. With its proximity to the Hong Kong International Airport, the HKBCF would serve as a strategic multi-modal transportation hub, and air/land transit of passengers could easily switch to different modes of transport;
- (b) The present proposed location and configuration of the HKBCF and the Southern Landfall of TM-CLKL, and the alignment of the HKLR were considered appropriate in technical, environmental and engineering terms, as confirmed by a series of consultancy studies;

- (c) The HKLR and HKBCF were located about 700m and 2 km respectively from the residential developments at Tung Chung waterfront. Also, maximum building height restrictions had been stipulated on the Chek Lap Kok OZP to regulate the development height profile of the HKBCF. Furthermore, the environmental implications of the HKBCF, HKLR and TM-CLKL had already been assessed and the respective EIA studies concluded that with appropriate mitigation measures implemented, the potential environmental impacts would be acceptable. The respective EIA reports had been approved with conditions by DEP under the EIA Ordinance on 23.10.2009;
- (d) Extensive consultation and public engagement exercises had been conducted by HyD, and the alignment of HKLR amended to address the concern of some Tung Chung residents. The rationale of adopting the present proposals had also been fully explained to the residents and relevant stakeholders;
- (e) The representer's suggestion to locate the HKBCF and HKLR at the southwest and north of the Airport was not supported as there was inadequate information to demonstrate that such suggestion was technically and environmentally feasible and was better than the presently proposed location;
- (f) The representer's suggested viaduct option for the HKBCF southwest reclamation and HKLR along the east coast of the Airport was considered less favourable than reclamation as it would involve massive amount of columns which might trap rubbish underneath, jeopardise tree planting alongside for visual enhancement, and non provision of suitable habitat for ecological species to establish; and
- (g) Railway provision in HZMB had not been included in the territorial railway planning and development. The representer's suggestion was not consistent with the current infrastructure planning and also not viable from engineering and financial viability view points.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Group 2 (R788)

(TPB Paper No. 8447)

Presentation and Question Session

127. The following Members had declared interests on the item:

- | | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung | - Being a member of the Hong Kong Airport Authority |
| Mr. Fletch Chan | - Being the Principal Assistant Secretary for Transport and Housing Bureau (THB) which was the responsible policy bureau for the proposed cross boundary facilities project planning on the subject OZP |

128. Members noted that Messrs. Edmund K.H. Leung and Fletch Chan had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

129. Members also noted that the Group 2 representer (R788) had replied not to attend the hearing. The Board agreed to proceed with the hearing in R788's absence.

130. The following representatives from the government departments were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Mr. Alfred Lau | District Planning Officer/Sai Kung and Islands (DPO/SKIs) |
| Miss Erica Wong | Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is) |

Highways Department (HyD)

Mr. Albert T.N. Cheng	Project Manager/ HZMB HK
Mr. H.C. Tam	Chief Engineer/ HZMB HK
Mr K.M. BOK	Chief Engineer/HKBCF
Mr. Simon K.C. Tsao	Senior Engineer/HZMB
Mr. Alex Kong	Ove Arup & Partners (OAP)
Mr. Samuel Kwan	OAP

131. Mr. Alfred Lau, DPO/SKIs, said that an email dated 12.11.2009 from R788 stating that they would not attend the meeting and recapitulated the major grounds of representations and their proposals were tabled at the Meeting for Members' reference.

132. The Chairman invited Mr. Alfred Lau, DPO/SKIs, to brief Members on the background to the amendments and the representations.

- (a) Background of the proposed amendments as set out in paragraph 4 of the Paper;
- (b) The representation in Group 2 (R788) opined that the Chek Lap Kok OZP had not fully taken account of the requirements of air logistics development, one of the four pillars driving and sustaining the economy of Hong Kong. No comments were received;

Grounds of representation and Proposals

Flexible land use zonings to facilitate Air Logistics Development

- (c) To cater for evolution of freight forwarding and logistics industry and for increasing container vehicles delivering goods to the airport, the relevant user terms of the Notes for the Commercial" ("C"), "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Airport Service Area" and "OU" annotated "Business Park" zones should be expanded should be amended accordingly;

- (d) R788 requested for information on the breakdown of the proposed 5.59 ha “OU” annotated “Highways Maintenance Area” zone. Some of the areas within the “OU” zone were proposed for distribution centre and logistics development uses; and

Mitigation Measures for Deletion of “Coastal Protection Area” (“CPA”) zone

- (e) R788 requested to be informed of the mitigation measures for the rezoning of the “CPA” as the area was the coastline of the original Chek Lap Kok Island.

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

PlanD’s views

Matters not Related to Amendments to the Plan

- (f) As the Notes of the “C”, “OU(Airport Service Area)” and “OU(Business)” zones were not subjects of amendments, those parts of representation referring to these zonings were outside the scope of consideration of representations by the Board;
- (g) There was ample space at the Airport Island reserved for air logistics development. On the OZP, a total of 137.99 ha and 44.74 ha of land had been designated for “OU(Airport Service Area)” and “OU(Business Park)” zones respectively. In those two zones, various ‘Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility’ uses, including cargo handling facility, cargo working area, logistics centre and freight forwarding services centre uses, were always permitted. In addition, ‘Distribution Centre’ use was always permitted within the above two “OU” zones and the “C” zone;

Need for the “OU(Highways Maintenance Area)” zone

- (h) The new land created under the “OU” zone was required for the provision of backup area for operation and maintenance of the HKLR and to form protection for the tunnel and portal of HKLR. There was no strong justification for using the site for distribution centre / logistics centre uses.

Mitigation Measures for Deletion of “CPA” zone

- (i) According to the approved EIA report, the portion of the existing coastline was of low ecological/ landscape value. Environmentally sensitive design for the new sea frontage would be adopted to mitigate the loss of natural coast and to provide suitable habitat for the existing species to re-establish in the new location; and
- (j) The Board was recommended not to uphold the representation on grounds as set out in paragraph 7 of the Paper.

133. Members had no questions on the background to the amendments and the representation. The Chairman then thanked government representatives for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

134. Members agreed with PlanD’s assessments and views as set out in paragraphs 5 and 7 of the Paper in that there was ample space at the Airport Island for air logistics development, the reclamation to provide highways maintenance area was essential for operation and maintenance of the HKLR, and there was environmental sensitive design for the new sea frontage to mitigate loss of natural coast. Members considered that the representation should not be upheld.

Representations No. R788

135. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. R788 for the following reasons:

- (a) There was ample space at the Airport Island reserved for air logistics development. A total of 137.99 ha and 44.74 ha of land for “OU (Airport Service Area)” and “OU (Business Park)” zones respectively had been designated on the Chek Lap Kok OZP in which various ‘Cargo Handling and Forwarding Facility’ uses, including cargo handling facility, cargo working area, logistics centre and freight forwarding services centre uses were always permitted in those two zones. In addition, distribution centre use was always permitted;

- (b) The reclamation area proposed for highways maintenance area was essential for the provision of backup area for operation and maintenance of the HKLR and to form protection for the HKLR’s tunnel and its portal on the eastern coast of Chek Lap Kok. There was no strong planning justification for using the site for distribution centre and/or logistics centre uses; and

- (c) Environmentally sensitive design for the new sea frontage could be adopted to mitigate the loss of the natural coast so as to provide a suitable habitat for the existing species to re-establish in the new location. Greening could also be provided along the new seawall to enhance the environment.

136. The Board also agreed to advise the representer R788 that the Notes of the “C”, “OU (Airport Service Area)” and “OU (Business Park)” zones were not subject of the proposed amendments and thus that part of the representation was not valid.

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral of Review of Application No. A/K7/92

Proposed Minor Relaxation of Building Height Restriction from 80mPD to 89.47mPD for Permitted Residential Use in "Residential (Group B)" zone, 170C, 170D, 170E and 170F Boundary Street, Ho Man Tin (KIL No. 3277 s.C, s.D, s.E & s.F)

(TPB Paper No. 8445)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

137. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. The review application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Board on 13.11.2009. On 21.10.2009, the applicant wrote to the Secretary requesting to defer the consideration of the review application for two months to allow time for the applicant to address Government departmental comments on the proposed development. The request was in compliance with the criteria for deferment as set out in the TPB Guidelines No. 33.

138. The Board agreed to defer consideration of the review application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Board agreed that the application should be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Items 8 to 10

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral for Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/273

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" zone, Lot No. 392 S.B in D.D. 28, Lung Mei Village, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 8439)

Request for Deferral for Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/274

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" zone, Lot No. 390 RP and Adjoining Government Land in D.D. 28, Lung Mei Village, Tai Po (TPB Paper No. 8439)

Request for Deferral for Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/279

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House - Small House) in "Green Belt" zone, Lot No. 390 S.A in D.D. 28, Lung Mei Village, Tai Po (TPB Paper No. 8439)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

139. The Secretary reported that the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) Hong Kong had submitted comments on the three section 16 applications. Professor David Dudgeon had declared an interest in those applications as he was a trustee of WWF and a member of Mai Po Management Committee of WWF. Members noted that Professor David Dudgeon had tendered apologies for not being able to attend the meeting.

140. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. The review applications were originally scheduled for consideration by the Board on 13.11.2009. On 21.10.2009, the applicants wrote to the Secretary requesting to defer the consideration of the review applications to allow time for preparation of a natural terrain hazard study. The request was in compliance with the criteria for deferment as set out in the TPB Guidelines No. 33.

141. The Board agreed to defer consideration of the review applications as requested by the applicants pending the submission of further information from the applicants. The Board agreed that the applications should be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicants. The Board also agreed to advise the applicants that two months were allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral for Review of Application No. A/YL-HT/634

Temporary Open Storage of Containers with Ancillary Office for a Period of 3 Years in "Open Storage", "Recreation" and "Village Type Development" zones, Lots 1103 RP, 1104 RP, 1105, 1106 (Part), 1107, 1109, 1110 (Part), 1130 RP(Part), 1131 (Part), 1132 (Part), 1138 (Part), 1139 RP(Part), 1139 S.A RP, 1140 (Part), 1141 RP, 1142, 1143 RP (Part), 1145 (Part), 1152 (Part), 1153 (Part), 1154 RP(Part), 1155 (Part), 1156, 1157 (Part), 1158 (Part), 1161 (Part), 1162 (Part), 1163 (Part), 1164 (Part), 1165, 1166, 1168 (Part), 1169 RP(Part), 1181 (Part), 1188 RP(Part), 1189 RP (Part), 1190(Part), 1191 (Part), 1192 (Part), 1193 (Part), 1194 (Part), 1195(Part) and 1196 (Part) in D.D.125 and Adjoining Government Land, Ha Tsuen, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 8446)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

142. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. The review application was originally scheduled for consideration by the Board on 13.11.2009. On 16 and 27.10.2009, the applicant wrote to the Secretary requesting to defer the consideration of the review application for two months to allow time for preparation of a drainage impact assessment. The request was in compliance with the criteria for deferment as set out in the TPB Guidelines No. 33.

143. The Board agreed to defer consideration of the review application as requested by the applicant pending the submission of further information from the applicant. The Board agreed that the application should be submitted to the Board for consideration within three months from the date of receipt of further information from the applicant. The Board agreed to advise the applicant that two months were allowed for preparation of submission of further information, and no further deferment would be granted unless under very special circumstances.

Agenda Item 12

144. The item was reported under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 13

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

145. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:30pm..