

TPB Paper No. 10464

**For Consideration by
the Town Planning Board on 24.8.2018**

**Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for
Consideration of Representations and Comments Made on the
Draft Siu Ho Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-SHW/1**

**INFORMATION NOTE AND HEARING ARRANGEMENT
FOR CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND COMMENTS MADE ON
THE DRAFT SIU HO WAN OUTLINE ZONING PLAN NO. S/I-SHW/1**

1. Introduction

- 1.1 On 29.3.2018, the draft Siu Ho Wan Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-SHW/1 (the OZP) was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance). During the two-month public exhibition period of the draft OZP, a total of 144 representations were received. On 29.6.2018, the Town Planning Board (the Board) published the representations for three weeks for public comments. Upon expiry of the public inspection period on 20.7.2018, a total of 10 comments were received.
- 1.2 The list of representers/commenters and the summaries of the representations and comments are shown at **Annexes I, II and III respectively** for Members' reference. The location of the representation sites is shown on **Plan P-1**.

2. The Representations and Comments

- 2.1 Among the 144 representations received, one representation (**R1**) submitted by a green/concern group provides supporting views and the remaining (**R2 to R144**) (the majority of them are in form of joint submission or standard format) are adverse representations/representations providing views on various issues on a number of grounds. Their views can be summarised as follows:

Parties	Representation No.
<i>Supportive Representation/Representations providing views</i>	
Green/concern group (1)	R1
<i>Adverse Representations/Representations providing views</i>	
Member of District Council (1)	R120
Rural Committee/ Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives (2)	R140 to R141
Owners' Committee (1)	R4
Green/concern groups (4)	R2, R3, R5 and R138
Individuals - joint submission to R5 (110)	R6 to R108, R121 to R127*
Individuals – in standard format (8)	R109 to R116
Individuals (17)	R117 to R119, R128 to R137, R139, R142 to R144

**R121 to R127 also submitted individual representations in addition to the joint submission*

- (a) The supportive representation is submitted by a green/concern group (**R1**) supporting the urban design principles adopted for the proposed topside development of Siu Ho Wan railway depot as stated in the Explanatory Statement of the draft OZP. **R1** also raises concerns on cycling and pedestrian connectivity.
 - (b) A total of 143 adverse representations/representations providing views on the draft OZP. They are submitted by a member of Tseun Wan District Council (**R120**), Ma Wan Rural Committee/Indigenous Inhabitant Representatives (**R140 to R141**), an owner's committee (**R4**), four green/concern groups (**R2, R3, R5** and **R138**), 110 individuals in joint submission to **R5** (**R6 to R108, R121 to R127**), 8 individuals in standard letter (**R109 to R116**) and the remaining 17 individuals (**R117 to R119, R128 to R137, R139, R142 to R144**).
 - (c) Most of the representations (**R2 to R137, R139**) oppose/raise concerns/comments on the proposed topside development of Siu Ho Wan railway depot, and the major grounds include extensive development scale, unaffordable luxury private housing, overloading the carrying capacity of transport system and/or other infrastructure facilities, potential adverse environmental impacts and lack of public consultation. Some propose a reduction of scale of the proposed topside residential development, provision of affordable public housing as well as sufficient Government, Institution and Community (GIC) and commercial facilities, possible car free environment within the proposed topside development to reduce traffic impact, and a new railway line connecting to Hong Kong Island. **R143 to R144** object to reclamation for the development of low-density luxury private residential housing. On the other hand, **R138** opposes the draft OZP on the ground of underutilization of land resources in that the development density of the proposed topside development is too low, while **R142** considers that the split of public/private housing mix is not related to the draft OZP.
 - (d) **R139** also opposes the "Zoo" use in Column 2 of "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC") and "Green Belt" ("GB") zones. **R140 to R141** oppose the "Other Specified Uses" ("OU") annotated "Columbarium" zone on the grounds of adverse traffic, environmental and psychological impacts arising from the proposed columbarium development.
- 2.2 The 144 representations are summarized in **Annex II** and the representation sites are shown on **Plan P-1**.
- 2.3 Of the 10 comments received, **C1** submitted by MTR Corporation Limited provides comment on the representations **R2 to R138** regarding the feasibility of the proposed topside development of Siu Ho Wan railway depot. **C2** submitted by a green/concern group supports representation **R139** in opposing the "Zoo" use in Column 2 of "G/IC" and "GB" zones and reiterates its representation (i.e. **R3**) on the adverse cumulative traffic impact arising from the Lautau developments. **C3** and **C4** also share the same view of **R139** in opposing the "Zoo" use. **C4** further objects **R142** on the grounds

that public/private housing mix is related to plan making and supports **R138** in the provision of more public housing in the proposed topside development of Siu Ho Wan railway depot with due consideration on the carrying capacity of the transport system and environmental impacts. The remaining comments submitted by individuals (**C3, C5 to C10**) provide comments on issues related to representations on Siu Ho Wan railway depot (i.e. **R2 to R139**), including lack of provision of public housing and sufficient GIC/infrastructural facilities within the topside development/the planning area, unaffordable luxury private housing, potential adverse traffic and/or environmental impacts arising from the proposed developments and objection to reclamation within the Area. The comments are summarized in **Annex III**.

3. Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments

- 3.1 Under section 2A of the Ordinance, the Board is empowered to appoint a Representation Hearing Committee (RHC) from among its members to consider representations and comments, propose amendments to the Plan to meet/partially meet representations, consider further representations in respect of the proposed amendments, and consider whether to vary the proposed amendments upon consideration of any adverse further representations.
- 3.2 Since the draft OZP covering various proposed development sites in Siu Ho Wan has attracted much public interest in the wider community, it is recommended that the representations and comments should be considered by the full Board without the appointment of a RHC. The hearing could be accommodated in the Board's regular meeting and a separate hearing session would not be necessary. The arrangement would not delay the completion of the representation consideration process.
- 3.3 Under section 6B(6) of the Ordinance, the Board may determine whether the representations and the related comments shall be considered at the same meeting and whether they shall be considered individually or collectively. As the concerns of most representers and commenters are mainly related to the proposed topside development of Siu Ho Wan railway depot and proposed columbarium development on the OZP, the hearing of all representations and comments is suggested to be considered in one group.
- 3.4 In view of the number of representations and comments received and to ensure efficiency of the hearing, it is recommended to allot a maximum of 10 minutes presentation time to each representer/commenter in the hearing session.
- 3.5 Consideration of the representations and comments by the full Board under section 6B of the Ordinance is tentatively scheduled for October 2018.

4. Decision Sought

The Board is invited to consider whether to appoint a RHC for the consideration of the representations and comments as mentioned in paragraph 3.2 above; and whether the representations and comments should be considered in the manner as proposed in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.5 above.

5. Attachments

- Annex I** List of the Representers/Commenters
- Annex II** Summary of the Representations
- Annex III** Summary of the Comments
- Plan P-1** Location Plan of Representations Sites

**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
AUGUST 2018**