

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:10 a.m. on 4.10.2016.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting:

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Mr Michael W.L. Wong

Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairman

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Ms Janice W.M. Lai

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)
Environmental Protection Department
Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 3)
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan (a.m.)
Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam (p.m.)

Chief Engineer (Works)
Home Affairs Department
Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)
Transport Department
Mr K.C. Siu

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

3. The Secretary reported that the representations and comments in respect of the Tung Chung Valley (TCV) Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/I-TCV/1 was heard by the Town Planning Board (the Board) on 29.9.2016 and a letter from a professor of the University of Hong Kong, which was forwarded by Designing Hong Kong Limited expressing views on the TCV OZP, was received on 30.9.2016. As the letter was received out of time i.e. outside the statutory 2-month exhibition period which ended on 8.3.2016, Members agreed that it should be treated as not having been made.

Agenda Item 3

[Open meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-TCTC/21
(TPB Paper No. 10178)

[The item was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

4. The Secretary reported that the amendment items on the draft Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) OZP No. S/I-TCTC/21 (the draft TCTC OZP) involved zoning of sites for proposed public housing developments by the Housing Department (HD), which was the executive arm of the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA). The following Members had declared interests on this item for having affiliations/business dealings with HKHA, and/or representers or representer's representative, including Swire Properties Limited (Swire), which was the mother company of Coral Ching Limited (R1), Masterplan Limited (Masterplan) representing R5, The Conservancy Association (CA) (R24) and World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong (WWF) (R25) and/or having property interest in the area:

- | | |
|---|---|
| Mr H.F. Leung | - being a member of the Tender Committee of HKHA |
| Mr K.K. Ling
(as Director of Planning) | - being a member of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) and Building Committee of HKHA |
| Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam
(as Deputy Director of Lands) | - being an alternative member of HKHA |
| Mr Martin W.C Kwan
(as Chief Engineer (Works),
Home Affairs Department) | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and the Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| | - his close relative owning a property in TCTC |

- Dr C.H. Hau - having current business dealings with HKHA
- being the Vice-chairman of CA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu] having current business dealings with HKHA and
Mr Thomas O.S. Ho] Swire
- Ms Janice W.M. Lai - having current business dealings with HKHA and
her firm was a tenant of Swire
- Mr Patrick H.T. Lau - having current business dealings with HKHA and
past business dealings with Swire
- Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with HKHA and
Masterplan
- Mr Franklin Yu] having past business dealings with HKHA
Mr Dominic K.K. Lam]
- Mr K.K. Cheung - his firm having past business dealings with WWF
- Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon - his spouse being an employee of HD but not
involved in planning work
- Professor T.S. Liu - his close relative possibly owning a property in
Tung Chung

5. Members noted that Messrs H.F. Leung, Stephen L.H. Liu, Thomas O.S. Ho, Ivan C.S. Fu, Dominic K.K. Lam and Dr C.H. Hau had tendered their apologies for not being able to attend the current session of the meeting and Messrs Jeff Y.T. Lam and Franklin Yu had yet to arrive. Members noted that as the proposed public housing developments in the draft OZP were related to the housing policy in general rather than housing sites proposed by HKHA, a direct conflict of interest did not arise. The meeting agreed that Members

declaring interests associated with HKHA including Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Messrs Patrick H.T. Lau, Franklin Yu, K.K. Ling, Jeff Y.T. Lam and Martin W.C. Kwan should be allowed to stay in/join the meeting. Members considered that the interests of Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr K.K. Cheung in relation to Swire and/or WWF as well as that of Professor T.S. Liu were indirect and they should be allowed to stay in the meeting. Since the property of Mr Martin W.C. Kwan's close relative had no direct view to the amendment items of the draft TCTC OZP, Members also agreed that he should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam	-	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands (DPO/SKIs)
Ms Amy M.Y. Wu	-	Senior Town Planner/Islands (STP/Is)
Miss Vicki Y.Y. Au	-	Town Planner/Islands 2 (TP/Is 2)

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr David K.C. Lo - Chief Engineer/Islands

Mr Kenneth C.P. Wong - Senior Engineer 9 (Islands Division)

Ms Chelsey K.F. Yuen - Engineer 9 (Islands Division)

Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives

R1 - Coral Ching Limited

Lawson David & Sung Surveyors Ltd –

Ms Lee Mo Yi Cannis] Representer's representatives
Ms Chan Hiu Man Ketty]

R4 - 何悅昌

Mr Ho Yuet Cheong - Representer

R5 – The Hong Kong Water Sports Council

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representer's representatives
Mr Benson Poon]
Ms Amanda Yu]

R10 – Haster Wu

Ms Haster Wu - Representer

R13/C15 – Fung Siu Yin

C1- Fu Ka Ho Wright

C17- Wong Chun Kiu

Ms Ho Loy - Representer's and Commenters'
representative

R20 – Green Group’s Joint Submission

R22 – Green Power

Mr Cheng Luk Ki - Representers’ representative

R23 – The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society

Ms Woo Ming Chuan - Representer’s representative

R24 – CA

Mr Wick Leung] Representer’s representatives

Mr Ng Hei Man Roy]

R25 – WWF

Mr Tobi Lau] Representer’s Representatives

Mr Andrew Chan]

R26 - Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation

C2 - Chiu Sein Tuck

C3- Mr Tony Nip

Mr Chiu Sein Tuck] Representer’s Representatives and

Mr Tony Nip] Commenters

Ms Kam Yi Lam Karen]

C4 – Green Sense

Mr Mark C.K. Mak] Commenter’s representatives

Mr Tam Hoi Pong]

Mr Choi Ka Man Thomas]

Mr Wong Chun Yeung]

C13 – Wisdom Management Company Limited

Ms Poon Wai Ying] Commenter’s representatives

Dr Ching Siu Tong]

Ms Yuen Ka Ying]

Ms Chan Wing Shan]

Ms Wong Yuk Yin]
Mr Tsoi Shing Lam]
Ms Ang Bing Hun]

8. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedure of the hearing. He said that the representatives of PlanD would first brief Members on the background, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to make oral submissions. He said that to ensure the efficient operation of the meeting, each representer/commenter or their representatives would be allotted 10 minutes for their oral submission. The representers/commenters had been informed about the arrangement before the meeting. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted time was to expire and when the allotted time limit was up. After the oral submission, there would be a Question and Answer (Q&A) session in which Members could direct their questions to government representatives or representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the meeting on the day would be adjourned. After hearing all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

9. The Chairman also said that some representers/commenters had made submissions to two or three of the OZPs for Tung Chung and requested to make their oral submissions to the Board on the OZPs collectively. Given the land use planning of the three OZPs were inter-related, special arrangement would be made to allow those representers/commenters or their representatives to speak in the last meeting session on 4.10.2016.

10. The Chairman then invited Ms Amy M.Y. Wu, STP/Is, PlanD to brief Members on the background to the representations.

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Amy M.Y. Wu made the following main points as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10178 (the Paper):

Background

- (a) three stages of public engagement (PE) of the Tung Chung New Town Extension Study (the Tung Chung Study) were conducted from 2012 to 2014. The Board was briefed on 19.9.2014;
- (b) during the third stage of PE, more than 4,000 public comments were received. The draft Recommended Outline Development Plan (RODP) was revised taking into account those public comments;
- (c) an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report to assess the environmental impacts of the Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) was submitted under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) on 8.10.2015 for approval. The EIA Report was exhibited for public inspection from 4.12.2015 to 2.1.2016 and approved with conditions by DEP on 8.4.2016;
- (d) on 8.1.2016, three new/amended OZPs including Tung Chung Extension Area (TCE), TCTC and TCV (the three draft OZPs), which mainly incorporated land use proposals as recommended under the Tung Chung Study, were exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (e) funding application for the detailed design and construction works of the TCNTE project was approved by the Legislative Council (LegCo) on 27.5.2016;
- (f) the draft TCTC OZP covered a total area of about 341.66 ha (the Area), located on the northshore of Lantau Island to the southeast of the Hong Kong International Airport (HKIA) at Chek Lap Kok, to the south of TCE, and to the east of Tung Chung Bay and TCV. The Area connected with the TCE to its north and TCV to its west. The proposed amendments to the draft TCTC OZP were mainly to incorporate the land use proposals in the

RODP under the Tung Chung Study and to reflect latest development proposals and as-built developments in TCTC;

- (g) during the exhibition period of the draft TCTC OZP, a total of 28 representations and 81 comments on the representations were received;

Major Amendment Items

Adjustment of the Planning Scheme Area

(Amendment Items A1 to A3 and B1 to B3)

- (h) Amendment Item A1 involved extending the planning scheme boundary of the previous approved TCTC OZP No. S/I-TCTC/20 to include an area (about 138.05 ha) to the west and southwest of the existing TCTC to reflect existing developments and incorporate land use proposals under the Tung Chung Study. Item A1 covered the areas included (i) under the Tung Chung Study and (ii) those covering the existing developments to the southwest of the existing TCTC; and (iii) the slopes and river channel adjoining the Lantau North and Lantau North (Extension) Country Parks. The area under Item A1 covered major existing/proposed developments for various zonings;
- (i) those major existing/proposed housing developments included the existing Yat Tung Estate, a public housing development under construction in Area 39, two proposed public housing sites in Areas 42 and 46, and a proposed private housing site in Area 33 to the west of Yat Tung Estate. Chek Lap Kok San Tsuen and four villages, namely, Sheung Ling Pei Village, Ha Ling Pei, Wong Ka Wai and Lung Tseng Tau Village were also covered under the item;
- (j) Amendment Items A2 and A3 entailed the inclusion of several areas into the planning scheme boundary of the OZP. The former included areas (about 3.01 ha) to the southeast of the existing TCTC to tally with the existing Lantau North (Extension) Country Park boundary (Item A2), while the latter

covered the existing coastal areas (about 0.19 ha) to reflect the existing Tung Chung Development Pier, and the piers and breakwater at Ma Wan Chung area. Those sites were zoned either “Green Belt” (“GB”) or “Other Specified Uses” (“OU”) to reflect their existing natural states/existing pier/jetty uses and breakwater;

- (k) Amendment Items B1 to B3 involved excision of various areas from the OZP’s planning scheme boundary, including (i) sea area (about 8.38 ha), (ii) the areas (about 6.47 ha) of the existing Country Park area to tally with the existing Lantau North (Extension) Country Park boundary, and (iii) an area (about 37.28 ha) to the north of Ying Hei Road for incorporation within the new draft TCE OZP;

Rezoning of land previously covered by the approved TCTC OZP in line with the Tung Chung Study (Amendment Item C)

- (l) Amendment Item C covered an area (about 28.4 ha) to the north of Yu Tung Road and east of Chung Yan Road, reflecting the land use proposals under the Tung Chung Study including mainly the proposed town park, two proposed private housing sites in Areas 23 and 48 and the existing village cluster in the Ma Wan Chung area;

*Rezoning of the “CDA” sites to reflect as-built situation
(Amendment Items D1, D2, E1, E2, F1, F2, G1, G2, H1, H2 and J)*

- (m) as the various residential and commercial developments on the sites zoned “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) had been completed, to reflect the as-built developments and subject to the development restrictions as stipulated in the relevant lease conditions. The part of Area 14 which was occupied by the Tung Chung Railway Station was rezoned to “OU” annotation ‘Railway Station’ (“OU (Railway Station)”) to reflect the existing railway station, land status and as-built condition under Amendment Item J;

Public Consultation

- (n) consultations of the three draft OZPs with the Islands District Council (IsDC) and Tung Chung Rural Committee (TCRC) were conducted at their meetings on 1.2.2016 and 28.1.2016 respectively. For the draft TCTC OZP, members of IsDC mainly raised concerns/comments concerning early implementation of the town park, provision of cultural and recreational facilities, public market and parking facilities for Ma Wan Chung Village, the impact of “Conservation Area” (“CA”) and “GB” zonings on the value and development right of private land, provision of cycle track and pedestrian connection for the residents of Yat Tung Estate and improvement of Tung Chung Road;
- (o) members of TCRC also raised similar concerns on the lack of infrastructure such as roads, parking, drainage and sewerage facilities for the existing villages in Tung Chung, lack of water supply for agricultural activities, lack of commercial uses and local economy, and the deprivation of development right due to designation of conservation zonings, and requested for expansion of “Village Type Development” (“V”) zones;

Major Grounds of Representations, Representers’ Proposals and Responses

- (p) among the 28 representations received, one was a supportive representation submitted by a company (R1) and 27 were adverse representations submitted by individuals (R2 to R4, R6 to R19 and R28), an organisation (R5) and green/concern groups (R20 to R27). As for the 81 comments, 78 were submitted by individuals, while the remaining three were submitted by a company (C13) and green/concern groups (C4 and C12) respectively;

Supportive Representation (R1)

(Amendment Items A1, C, D and D to J)

(i) while R1 generally supported the draft TCTC OZP and the rezoning of “CDA” sites to other zones to reflect the existing developments, it raised the following concerns:

- the proposed downzoning of Area 48 from “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) to “Residential (Group B)3” (“R(B)3”) (under Amendment Item C) (from plot ratio (PR) 5 to 2) violated the current policy objective to increase the supply of housing land;
- the proposed building height (BH) of 55mPD was in conflict with the stepped BH profile;
- the provision of community services and facilities should be strengthened to ensure that the entire TCNT was self-contained and sustainable for the local community;

(ii) proposals:

- Area 48 should be retained for “R(A)” development with a PR of 5 and a BH with reference to Yat Tung Estate of 130mPD;
- Area 43, which was located between two “R(A)” zones and along Tung Chung Road, should be rezoned from “GB” to “Government, Institution or Community (“G/IC”);

(iii) the responses to the above grounds and proposals were:

- noted the supportive views;
- Area 48 was located adjacent to Ma Wan Chung Village and at the foot of a knoll which was planned to be the

future town park. The site was proposed for residential use with a PR of 2 and BH of 55mPD under the Tung Chung Study taking into account various considerations, in particular land use compatibility and the stepped height profile from the inland decreasing towards the waterfront;

- the proposed increase in BH would create overshadowing effect on the adjacent village development in Ma Wan Chung. The proposed increase in development intensity would lead to population increase and demand for various infrastructure including traffic and sewerage provision etc. which had not been assessed in the Tung Chung Study;
- according to the approved EIA, the Fong Yuen area in Area 43 (under Amendment Item A1) was covered by wet abandoned agricultural land and provided habitats for wildlife, in particular the rare butterfly species and the endangered Romer's Tree Frog. The "GB" zone in which there was a general presumption against development was considered appropriate for the area;
- the provision of GIC facilities in the TCTNE were planned in a holistic manner to serve population of the whole new town and its extension in accordance with the requirements under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) and based on the advice of the relevant departments;

Adverse Representations (R2 to R28)

Privatization of open space, loss of vegetation and reduction of recreational spaces and cycle parking spaces (R6 to R16 and R21 to R28)

(Amendment Items C, D1, D2, E1, F1, F2, G1, H1 and R3)

- (iv) rezoning of open space or public space for development use would lead to the loss of vegetation/trees in the existing community and the surrounding “GB” zones, take away public and activity spaces, worsen the air pollution problem and give rise to construction pollution;
- (v) the open spaces should be retained and planned according to the needs of the residents. If rezoning of “O” was necessary, the sites should be used for small-scale public/elderly housing. A detailed plan for tree compensation and re-allocation of open space should be provided during and after the construction of the development projects;
- (vi) rezoning of the cycle parking areas under Amendment Items D2 and H1 would result in further privatization of public space and loss in cycle parking spaces;
- (vii) for the area under Amendment Item H1, the number of cycle parking spaces should be reduced, and planting for improving air quality and seating places for people waiting at the terminus should be provided;
- (viii) the area under Amendment Item J should be rezoned for provision of a cycle parking area to create a bicycle-friendly community. An overall cycling path plan should be provided;
- (ix) the responses to the above grounds were:
- Amendments Items E1, F1, G1, F2 and R3 only involved minor boundary adjustments of the concerned sites to tally with the lease boundaries and to reflect the as-built situation and existing land features. Those amendments would not affect the existing vegetation, open spaces and recreational spaces nor generate any impact on the

community, environment and air quality. Moreover, they would not affect the existing vegetation and trees in the area;

- the small strips of land under those amendment items were not feasible for housing development;
- the proposed rezoning of “O” under Item C would not affect the provision of the planned town park and there would be adequate provision of public open space (POS) in Tung Chung upon completion of TCNTE. Besides, according to the EIA report of the Tung Chung Study, the concerned vegetation within the sites zoned for residential use was mainly secondary woodland. Compensation woodland planting had been proposed under the EIA report;
- the rezoning under Amendment Item H1 was to reflect the as-built commercial development i.e. Citygate in accordance with the approved Master Layout Plan, and would not result in privatization of open space nor have any impact on the provision of cycle parking spaces, planting and seating places for people waiting at the terminus;
- Amendment Item D2 involved a minor boundary adjustment to reflect the existing road alignment and amenity area;
- Amendment Item J was to rezone the site currently occupied by the existing Tung Chung Railway Station to “OU (Railway Station)”. A comprehensive cycling network with adequate parking facilities had been proposed for the entire TCNT and its extension area;

Residential developments and “V” (R2, R3, R6, R7, R11 to R14, R21, R28) (Amendment Items A1 & C)

- (x) more housing sites to the west of Yat Tung Estate in Areas 32 and 33 should be provided;
- (xi) the rezoning of various sites for low-density residential and village developments under Amendment Item C would destroy the natural environment. Public housing developments should be provided instead;

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

- (xii) only areas with low ecological value and high accessibility should be optimized to accommodate development needs;
- (xiii) the delineation of the “V” zone should be confined to the existing building structures and approved Small Houses;
- (xiv) Proposals:
 - “R(A)” sites in Tung Chung Bay should be deleted (R27);
 - the “O” zone under Amendment Item A1 (covering Areas 26 and 35) should be rezoned to “R(A)” or “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) (R3);
 - the total area of the “V” zone should be extended by covering Wong Nei Uk Village as well as designating land to the west of Chek Lap Kok New Village and to the northeast of Ma Wan New Village currently zoned “GB” to “V” (R2);

(xv) the responses to the above grounds and proposals were:

- Areas 32 and 33 were located along the waterfront with a mudflat coastline. Sensitive treatment to preserve the coastal area and the natural character of Tung Chung Bay was required. Development should also be compatible with the surrounding low-rise village settlements of Ma Wan Chung Village and that intensive development should be avoided as far as possible;
- the development parameters of the two residential sites at PRs of 2 and 4 and BHs of 55mPD and 75mPD respectively under Amendment Item C had already taken the surrounding rural and natural environment into consideration;
- a public/private housing split of about 63:37 was currently adopted for the TCNTE, which was in line with the public/private housing split of 60:40 as recommended by the Long Term Housing Strategy Steering Committee. There were already public housing developments including Yat Tung Estate, and the planned public housing developments in Areas 27, 39, 42 and 46 in the Area;

Proposals

- as the proposed “R(A)” zones in Areas 42 and 46 in the Tung Chung Bay area were adjacent to Tung Chung Road and of low ecological value, these areas were considered appropriate for residential development;
- the proposed “O” zone in Area 26 was to reflect an existing children playground and the “O” zone in Area 32 was for a planned waterfront park;

- the boundaries of the “V” zones for the villages within the Area had been drawn up taking into account the existing building structures, the extent of village ‘environ’ (‘VE’), approved Small House applications, outstanding Small House application, building lots, local topography, site characteristics and estimated Small House demand;
- according to the Head of Geotechnical Engineering Officer (H(GEO)) of CEDD, the areas near Wong Nei Uk and Chek Lap Kok New Village were overlooked by steep natural terrain and Natural Terrain Hazard Studies (NTHS) were required for any Small House development. The area adjoining Wong Nei Uk in Area 24B was an existing sewage pumping station and the area to the north in Area 48 was located further away from the existing village cluster and was identified suitable for medium-density residential development. As for Chek Lap Kok Village, the existing “V” zone reflected the resite village;

Ecological conservation and environmental concerns (R18 to R27)

Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and Fong Yuen area

- (xvi) there were concerns on the followings:
- the conservation of Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and their riparian areas;
 - the residential developments (in particular the proposed high-rise residential developments zoned “R(A)” in Area 42 and Area 46) and village type developments would generate noise, sewage and light pollution, affect the natural landscape, hydrology and ecology of Tung Chung

Stream, threaten the inhabited wildlife, impact the water quality of Tung Chung Stream, block the breezeways/view corridors and worsen the air pollution and geotechnical risks;

The Wong Lung Hang area

- (xvii) whether the conservation measures on local habitats and areas of ecological value, e.g. Wong Lung Hang Stream, an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS), and its riparian area would be effective;
- (xviii) there was concern on the lack of land use control and enforcement power against eco-vandalism e.g. waste dumping, discharge of waste water, incompatible developments;
- (xix) the ecological impacts of implementation/ construction methods;
- (xx) conservation first before development' strategy should be adopted;
- (xxi) Proposals:
 - the Wong Lung Hang area should be excised from the draft TCTC OZP for incorporation into a new Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan or Country Park Extension;
 - the area covering 30m on either side of river courses, banks and tributaries of Tung Chung Stream and Wong Lung Hang, Tung Chung Stream estuary and Tung Chung Bay should be zoned "Site of Special Scientific Interest" ("SSSI");
- (xxii) the responses to the above grounds and proposals were:

Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and Fong Yuen area

- the Tung Chung Bay/Valley/Stream and their riparian areas mostly fell outside the draft OZP. Ecological surveys had been conducted in formulating the RODP under the Tung Chung Study which formed the basis of the draft OZPs covering the areas;
- Area 42 was designated as a high-density residential development as it was adjacent to existing built-up area and site under development (Area 39) and directly connected to Tung Chung Road. Area 46 was separated from the ecologically sensitive middle and southern sections of Fong Yuen by Shek Mun Kap Road. According to the approved EIA, there was no adverse ecological and environmental impact to the area arising from the proposed developments;

The Wong Lung Hang area

- Wong Lung Hang Stream was located to the south of the existing TCTC area and a large part of the Wong Lung Hang area was government land. The only access road to the area was a single-lane service road of the Water Supplies Department (WSD), i.e. Wong Lung Hang Road, with a gate restricting the vehicular access to the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream. Some private agricultural land could be found along the bank of the Wong Lung Hang Stream but was mainly separated from Wong Lung Hang Road by a vegetated slope. The area was considered not prone to environmental vandalism and with low development threat;

- notwithstanding the above, Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian area of 30m wide were already zoned “CA” to protect the stream from human activities, whereas the fringe of its riparian area, the surrounding area covered by dense vegetation and woodland, and area near the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park were zoned “GB” to preserve the habitats and natural environment of the area comprehensively;
- as to the concern on the lack of land use control and enforcement power against eco-vandalism e.g. waste dumping, discharge of waste water, incompatible developments, etc., “GB” and “CA zones had been designated on the draft OZP for the protection of the natural environment;
- no insurmountable problems had been identified and appropriate mitigation measures had been proposed;
- ‘conservation first before development’ strategy had been adopted by designating conservation zonings to the above areas;

Carrying capacity of Tung Chung

(R6, R7, R11, R12, R21, R22 and R27)

- (xxiii) there were concerns that the population increase in Tung Chung would overload the carrying capacity of the area such as air pollution and transport facilities;
- (xxiv) the ferry transport service provision should be strengthened;
- (xxv) a comprehensive plan for Lantau should be prepared;

(xxvi) the responses to the above grounds were:

- a comprehensive transport network had been planned to serve the TCNTE. According to the approved EIA Report for TCNTE, with the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the potential air quality impacts from the proposed reclamation and construction and operational phases of the developments would comply with the requirements under the EIAO;
- there were three existing piers in Tung Chung and there was existing ferry service provided between Tuen Mun, Tung Chung, Sha Lo Wan and Tai O at Tung Chung Development Pier. The Transport Department (TD) advised that the licensed ferry service would be strengthened, subject to passenger demand;
- a comprehensive planning strategy for Lantau was proposed by the Lantau Development Advisory Committee (LanDAC) in January 2016. The Government was considering the public views during the PE and targeted to announce the Blueprint for Lantau Development by the end of 2016;

Provision of sports/recreational and GIC facilities (R5, R21 and R27)

(xxvii) there were inadequate sports and recreational facilities and more GIC facilities should be provided in Tung Chung, including water sports at Tung Chung Bay and a local market for licensed hawkers;

(xxviii) proposal:

- a portion of “O” located immediately to the north of the “R(B)2” site in Area 33 should be rezoned to “OU(Water Sports Centre)” (R5);

(xxix) the responses to the above grounds and proposal were:

- the response to R1 on the provision of GIC facilities was relevant;
- the Director of Leisure & Cultural Services (DLCS) had no plans to develop water sports centre in Tung Chung. Tung Chung Bay was considered an ecologically sensitive area and the representer had not submitted assessments to demonstrate the technical feasibility and environmental acceptability of the proposed uses;
- there were existing and planned wet markets in the TCTC. The relevant bureaux and departments would take appropriate follow-up action during the detailed design and implementation stage of TCNTE;

Rezoning Area 6 from “G/IC” to “C(3)” under Amendment Item K (R6, R7 and R17)

(xxx) the rezoning of Area 6 from “G/IC” to “C(3)” was objected to as it would lead to traffic congestion at the road outside Exit A of Tung Chung MTR Station, where there would be insufficient space for a pick up and drop off area for the passengers, and the proposed building would have adverse impacts on visual, air ventilation and air quality of the area;

(xxxi) Area 6 should be retained as an open area. If development was necessary, the BH should not be higher than that of Citygate, and more non-building areas (NBA) should be reserved around the building;

(xxxii) the responses to the above grounds were:

- considering its prime location, proximity to the Tung Chung Railway Station, better utilization of land, and that the site was no longer required for government offices use, Area 6 was rezoned to “C(3)” for commercial uses and was subject to a maximum non-domestic PR of 5 and BH of 100mPD, which were in line with the development intensity and BHs of the surrounding developments such as Citygate;
- a Visual Appraisal (VA) and an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation (EE) for the proposed commercial development in Area 6 had been carried out. The VA had confirmed that the proposed development would not create visual incompatibility with the surrounding areas, while the EE concluded that as the future developments in Area 6 would have some impact on its surroundings under the prevailing winds, it was recommended that the future developer should refer to both the design guidelines of Building Disposition and Building Permeability in HKPSG and follow the building separation requirement in the Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines at the building design stage. Otherwise, a quantitative AVA study would be required to be conducted for minimising the impacts of the future development;
- a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) would be conducted under the Detailed Design & Construction Study of the Tung Chung Study to assess the traffic impact and recommend mitigation measures prior to the disposal of the site. A public transport interchange (PTI) would be re-provisioned on the ground floor of the future

commercial development;

Deprivation of development right (R4)

(Amendment Item A1)

(xxxiii) R4 objected to the inclusion of some private land into the “GB” and “CA” zones and requested for land resumption by the Government;

(xxxiv) the responses to the above ground were:

- DAFC advised that the representer’s lots at Wong Lung Hang were densely vegetated and located along the banks of Wong Lung Hang Stream, an EIS. The Stream was characterized by diverse freshwater fish species, with records of species of conservation importance. “CA” and “GB” zones were considered appropriate to reflect the existing habitat condition and provide buffer areas to the EIS. Since the private land was primarily demised for agricultural purpose under the block government lease and ‘Agricultural Use’ was always permitted within the “GB” and “CA” zones, there was no deprivation of the rights of the landowners;
- the Government currently had no prevailing policies for resuming private land for conservation use in Tung Chung;

Boundary Adjustments on the Planning Scheme Area under Amendment B2 (R6 to R10 and R28)

(xxxv) there was no clear justification for excising areas currently covered by the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park from the planning scheme area of the OZP;

(xxxvi) the response to the above views was:

- the amendment item involved only boundary adjustments to tally with the boundary of the Country Park. The excised areas would be under the control of Country and Marine Parks Authority;

Comments on Representations

- (q) the views of the 81 commenters and their proposals were similar to those of the representers and the responses to the representations made in the above paragraphs were relevant. With regard to C13's proposal to rezone Area 8 (near the junction of Yu Tung Road and Chung Yan Road) from "GB" to "G/IC" for a cycling hotel development, which was not related to any amendment item or representation, was noted;

PlanD's View

- (r) PlanD noted the supportive view of R1(part); and
- (s) PlanD did not support R2 to R28 and the remaining part of R1 and that the draft TCTC OZP should not be amended to meet the representations.

12. The Chairman then invited the representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

R1 - Coral Ching Limited

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Lee Mo Yi Cannis made the following main points:

- (a) Area 48 had long been designated as "R(A)" with a maximum PR of 5 since 1993. The "R(A)" zone in Area 48 should be retained for the

following reasons:

- rezoning Area 48 to “R(B)3” with a maximum PR of 2 on the draft TCTC OZP would result in a significant reduction of the gross floor area (GFA) of the future residential development by 60%. That was in violation of the current policy objective to increase the supply of housing land;
 - the BH of 55mPD for Area 48 was in conflict with the stepped height design concept for the area as the BHs in the areas to the east and further southwest of Area 48 i.e. Area 23 and Area 33 near Tung Chung Bay were 75mPD and 70mPD under “R(B)1” and “R(B)2” respectively, while the BH of the existing residential development to the further south of Area 48 i.e. Yat Tung Estate was 130mPD;
 - Area 48 was more suitable for a high-density development than the neighbouring Area 23, which was rezoned from “O” to “R(B)1” with a maximum PR of 4. Referring to Plan H-4a1 of the Paper, Area 48 was relatively flat in comparison with Area 23 which was on a sloping terrain. GIC facilities including Tung Chung Community Services Complex and The Evangelical Church of Hong Kong Tao Yan Lutheran Church Tao Yan Youth Camp were located within Area 23. By comparison, Area 48 was free from geotechnical constraint, relocation of GIC facilities as well as the tree compensation requirement set down by the Government for Area 23; and
 - the development right of the landowner (R1) should not be deprived;
- (b) R1 did not agree with PlanD’s response that “R(A)” zone for Area 48 would impact on the adjacent village development in Ma Wan Chung. Ma Wan Chung Village had in fact been co-existed with Yat Tung Village to its south, which was a high-density residential development, completed more than ten years ago. The commercial uses on the ground floor of the

future development in the “R(A)” zone would also help serve the existing developments in those villages; and

- (c) R1 had submitted a representation in respect of the TCV OZP, which stated that there was a general lack of “G/IC” sites on the TCV OZP covering the area to the east of Areas 42, 43 and 46. Both Areas 42 and 46 were zoned “R(A)” on the draft TCTC OZP for proposed public housing developments. Area 43, which was located between those two “R(A)” zones and along Tung Chung Road with connection to TCTC, should be rezoned from “GB” to “G/IC”, so as to strengthen the provision of community services and facilities at that part of TC and would better serve the future residents of the two public housing developments. Apart from creating local employment opportunities, it would help reduce overall traffic demand and residents’ reliance on public transport. It would also help ensure that TCNT was self-contained and sustainable.

R4 - 何悅昌

14. Mr Ho Yuet Cheong made the following main points:

- (a) as a villager, he had inherited his land from his ancestors. While he supported the Government in developing Lantau Island, he opposed the inclusion of his private land in “CA” and “GB” zones; and
- (b) the Government should consider acquiring private land/lots before developing the concerned areas.

R5 – The Hong Kong Water Sports Council (HKWSC)

15. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Ian Brownlee made the following main points:

- (a) the two objectives of HKWSC, which was established in 2012 by a number of National Sports Associations including the Hong Kong China

Rowing Association and Hong Kong Sailing Federation, were to (i) identify locations to expand and improve water sports facilities for training and competitions; and (ii) to provide opportunities for young people to learn water sports skills and enjoy organized team sports as part of personal and community development;

- (b) in the Policy Address 2015, the Chief Executive made specific reference to the promotion of water recreational and sports activities and a water-friendly culture in Hong Kong and that relevant bureau and departments would continue to identify locations to build new water sports centre. HKWSC had identified Kai Tak and Tseung Kwan O for their two proposed water sports centres and they were now at various stages of the development process e.g. a site in Tseung Kwan O had been zoned “OU(Water Sports Centre)” pending the processing of land grant and funding support from The Hong Kong Jockey Club;
- (c) a portion of the waterfront under the “O” zoning in Area 33 should be rezoned to “OU(Water Sports Centre)” for the following reasons:
- there were inadequate sports and recreational facilities in Tung Chung for young people and the proposed facilities in TCE were too far for residents in Tung Chung West and the Town Centre area. There was a need to provide well managed facilities for sports and recreational activities in view of the additional public housing in Areas 39, 42 and 46;
 - the waterfront should be designed as a place of interaction between land and water, and a place where people could move safely and easily between the two. Also, water sports provided great scope for public recreation without taking up much land area and should be included into the proposals at an early stage to facilitate implementation;

- Tung Chung Bay was an ideal location for use by small boats due to protected water and suitable water sports included dragon boats, rowing, canoeing, sailing of small boats, triathlon and water skiing. The decision not to proceed with reclamation in Tung Chung Bay provided an even greater expanse of water for sports and new recreational outlets for the residents in Tung Chung West and TCNT, especially the youth in the nearby Yat Tung Estate. They would also provide a balanced life-style and job opportunities for the local residents;

- the proposed rezoning of the subject site was in line with the Government's earlier proposal for a sports centre at the same site as shown on the draft RODP for third stage of PE of the Tung Chung Study. HKSWC supported the proposal and suggested that the use be widened to include water sports. However, the proposal was not carried through to the draft TCTC OZP and HKWSC was highly disappointed. The explanation for dropping the sports centre proposal was that a sports centre would be provided in Area 107, which however was located inland and would not be able to include water sports;

- there was already marine activity together with an informal pier at the shoreline alongside Area 33. A road and utility services would be provided near Area 33 by the Government, making it highly feasible for the water sports centre;

Departmental Responses

- the whole area of Lantau Island did not have any water sports centre. Referring to C5, it was recognised that a water sports centre was needed locally in Tung Chung. In the absence of a water sports centre, PlanD's response that the provision of GIC facilities including recreational facilities were planned in a holistic manner to serve the population of the whole TCNT was doubtful;

- while CEDD had commented that Tung Chung Bay was considered as an ecologically sensitive area in which there were abundant mudflats and mangroves along the coast, PlanD also stated that there was no technical assessment to demonstrate that the proposed water sports centre would not create adverse impacts on Tung Chung's ecology, environment and water quality. HKWSC considered that water sports involving naturally powered boats would have no significant impact on those aspects and according to the habitat map of the EIA report (2015), the subject site was regarded as partly covered by orchard and partly urbanised/disturbed/wasteland. The use of floating pontoons and special bridge system could help minimise impact on sea bed;
 - since LCSD had no plans to develop a water sports centre in Tung Chung, to meet community needs, HKWSC, which had much experience and knowledge in the planning and operational requirements for water sports, would develop and manage the proposed water sports centre in Area 33 and provide training and competition programme for the Tung Chung residents. Alternatively, the centre could be developed by LCSD; and
- (d) in view of the strong justifications provided, the Board should consider amending the draft TCTC OZP to provide a water sports centre at Area 33 for the benefits of the public.

R10 – Haster Wu

16. Ms Haster Wu made the following main points:

- (a) the existing Citygate and nearby residential developments were rezoned to commercial and residential uses under the draft TCTC OZP. Whether the respective private management companies of those sites and the adjoining sites would limit access or usage by the general public; and

- (b) the capacity of Tung Chung MTR Line had already been overloaded on a daily basis. The Government should adopt realistic projections on estimating whether the rail and road systems had the spare capacity to accommodate additional passengers before deciding on the appropriate planned population for the new town areas.

R20 - Green Group's Joint Submission

R22 – Green Power

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Cheng Luk Ki made the following main points:

- (a) he would present the views of nine green groups (the Group) on the TCTC OZP, including Designing Hong Kong Limited, Eco-Education & Resources Centre, Green Lantau Association, Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS), WWF, Hong Kong Outdoors, The CA, Green Power (R22) and Lantau Buffalo Association;
- (b) the Group had concerns on Amendment Item A1, involving (i) “R(A)2” and “R(A)3” zones near Tung Chung Stream in Areas 42 and 46 respectively within TCV; and (ii) “CA” and “GB” zones in the Wong Lung Hang area;

Tung Chung Stream/Bay

- (c) the natural and unpolluted state of Tung Chung Stream could be reflected by the minimal amount of E. Coli found in the water according to a survey conducted in 2015. Since many natural rivers in Hong Kong had already been channelized, emitting foul odour and becoming an urban blight affecting adversely the living quality of residents, Tung Chung Stream must be protected against channelization;

- (d) Tung Chung Stream currently had many rare and endangered species, including Beijiang Thick-lipped Barb, Philippine Neon Goby, Romer's tree frog, Chinese Horseshoe Crab and Seaweed Pipefish, etc. In fact, Tung Chung Stream was the second richest river in terms of freshwater species in Hong Kong, with a total of 23 species recorded and it was listed as an EIS by the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD). The mangroves on the intertidal mudflat at the Tung Chung Stream estuary was the largest on Lantau and was among one of the highest plant diversity sites. TCV and its coast were butterfly hotspots with five rare species, including Swallowtail and Peacock Royal and three very rare species (i.e. Sullied Sailor, Tiny Grass Blue and Oriental Striped Blue);

The Wong Lung Hang area

- (e) Wong Lung Hang Stream was also listed as an EIS by AFCD. The mangrove in the estuary of Wong Lung Hang Stream was the home of a very rare and local dragonfly species i.e. Mangrove Skimmer. Three rare species of dragonfly were also recorded in the Wong Lung Hang area, including Dancing Shallow-emerald, Orange-faced Sprite and Sapphire Flutterer;
- (f) while the upper part of Wong Lung Hang Stream remained natural and unpolluted, the lower part of it near Yat Tung Estate had been channelized and polluted with a much greater concentration of E. Coli;

Inclusion under DPA for effective enforcement

- (g) the ecologically degraded land areas in TCV indeed had increased from 4.8% in 2007 to about 13% in 2015. The enlarged degraded areas were noticeable from the aerial photographs taken in 2007 and 2015 respectively. The Group strongly urged that open storage and port back-up uses should be strictly prohibited in TCV and the Wong Lung Hang area. Moreover, traffic should be restricted in TCV and Tung Chung Bay so as to limit the number of construction trucks accessing the area. Noting that traffic to

the upper area of the Wong Lung Hang Stream was restricted by way of a gate provided by WSD, the effectiveness of which was doubtful, the Government should review and formulate the appropriate traffic restriction measures for the areas concerned;

- (h) in order to protect and preserve the ecology of Tung Chung Stream and the Wong Lung Hang area, those areas should be subject to enforcement power against incompatible developments, environmental vandalism and degradation. Hence, a DPA Plan was previously prepared and submitted by the Group, suggesting, inter alia, that both Tung Chung Stream and Wong Lung Hang Stream and their riparian areas be zoned "SSSI" and the surrounding areas of the riparian areas be zoned "CA" under the DPA Plan or as part of the country park;
- (i) if enforcement actions could not be taken in the Wong Lung Hang area, the Board should reject Amendment Item A1 or excise the Wong Lung Hang area from Amendment Item A1 and cover it under a new DPA Plan;

Developments in Areas 42 and 46

- (j) the Board should also take note of the following in considering whether residential developments should be allowed in Areas 42 and 46 in TCV:
 - Areas 42 and 46 were within the river basin of Tung Chung Stream. The proposed high-density residential developments in those two areas would affect the ecological balance, water quality and give rise to visual impact on Tung Chung Stream and Tung Chung Bay;
 - Tung Chung Stream was comparatively short and steep with an overall gradient of 1:4.9 as compared with those of other rivers of some 1:14 or 1:18. The average annual rainfall of its basin reached up to 2400 mm, one of the highest regions in Hong Kong. The 2008 heavy rain had led to landslide, blocking the trail along Nei Lak Shan. Taking into account the hydraulic and geotechnical

conditions of the area, the area was not suitable for dense and high-rise development. The existence of karst topography, marble caverns and Tung Chung Fault might result in high building construction cost and a detailed geotechnical investigation should be carried out. Uses compatible to the ecological, hydraulic and geotechnical conditions of TCV should be proposed instead of the high-rise residential developments;

- in the long run, early precautionary and preventive measures in land use planning for TCV was needed to decrease the threat posed by flooding, and sufficient 'permeable land use' should be designated by conserving vegetation and avoid covering large surface areas. Law enforcement on illegal dumping, vehicles access or other activities affecting drainage capacity of the stream should be strengthened; and
- (k) the Group supported resumption of private lands within the proposed conservation zones covering Tung Chung Stream and the Wong Lung Hang area for the sake of public interest and conservation. Members should consider reflecting the Group's view to the Government.

R23 – HKBWS

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Woo Ming Chuan made the following main points:

- (a) HKBWS objected to Amendment Item A1 of the draft TCTC OZP, which involved extending the planning scheme area of the previous OZP to include and designate various slopes and streams as "CA" and "GB" zones. The area under the amendment item was in fact encircled by and ecologically connected to the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park;
- (b) the ecological value and conservation importance of the "CA" and "GB" zonings were well recognised by the Board, as reflected in the Explanatory

Statement (ES) of the OZP, where the EIS status of Wong Lung Hang Stream, mature woodland and streams located within the zones and adjoining the country park were clearly stated;

- (c) PlanD could only take enforcement action against an unauthorised development (UD) within an area covered by a DPA Plan in accordance with the Ordinance. Not being covered by a DPA Plan, the current extension area under Amendment Item A1 was not subject to enforcement provisions. The need for obtaining planning permission for land filling, land excavation or diversion of stream as specified under the Notes of the current OZP would not protect the area from UDs. Pui O in South Lantau was one of few remaining buffalo fields left in Hong Kong and planning permission was required for land filling/excavation/diversion of stream within “CPA” under the South Lantau Coast OZP. Yet, the freshwater wetlands within the “CPA” zone were constantly being filled with construction waste. Wetlands, which were the habitat for buffalos and a variety of birds, amphibians and insects, had been destroyed. Wetlands located within new towns in the absence of a DPA Plan such as Lo Lau Uk and Wong Yue Tan were subject to similar destruction, despite being zoned “GB” on the Tai Po OZP with statutory provisions;
- (d) PlanD had responded that in view of restricted access and the large proportion of government land in the Wong Lung Hang area, the area was subject to low development threat, rendering the “CA” zoning appropriate. According to a land search, there were private lands within the subject “CA” and “GB” zones covering Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian area, including the upper part of the stream. The present road gate at Wong Lung Hang Road would not be effective in deterring development in the area;
- (e) unlike PlanD, other government departments including the Buildings Department (BD), EPD, the Lands Department (LandsD) and AFCD would not be able to take effective actions, as their statutory powers were not related to that particular type of UDs relating to land filling;

- (f) the responsibility to safeguard Hong Kong's countryside and protect its biodiversity lay with the Government and the Board. Members should be mindful of the following questions in considering the draft TCTC OZP, including (i) whether a statutory plan without effective enforcement policy was suitable for protecting the Wong Lung Hang area; (ii) whether lessons had been learnt in respect of South Lantau and other peripheral areas of new towns; and (iii) the justifications for following the same path leading to more ecological destruction; and

- (g) the Board was requested to reject Amendment Item A1. The "CA" and "GB" zones adjoining/close to the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park should be excised from the planning scheme area of the draft TCTC OZP and be covered by a new DPA Plan or incorporated into the boundary of the country park.

R24 – CA

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Wick Leung made the following main points:

- (a) in order to provide statutory protection to Wong Lung Hang Stream and its riparian areas, they should be excised from the draft TCTC OZP and be covered by a DPA Plan. Amendment Item A1 should be rejected by the Board;

- (b) Wong Lung Hang, being a EIS, had clear water, and was frequented by swimmers. It was questionable why the area was not covered by a DPA Plan, but instead an OZP, as the area would not be subject to enforcement actions against UDs by PlanD. Example of places not being covered by DPA Plans and had suffered from the lack of protection included Pui O and Lung Kwu Tan;

- (c) in view of the isolated nature of Pui O, it was an area considered not being subjected to high development pressure in the 1980s. The dumping of construction wastes on wetlands in Pui O in 2016 and inaction by the government departments had attracted much media attention. The wetlands in Lung Kwu Tan, over 8.5 ha in area, were destroyed under similar circumstances. The area was equivalent to 8.5 standard football fields;
- (d) the designation of conservation zonings such as “CA” and “GB” would not provide the area with sufficient protection and the Government was aware of such a fact. Undisturbed areas should be protected against future destruction;
- (e) given that there were on-going and pending projects in the area, including the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macau bridge (HKZMB), the third runway system at HKIA, various development proposals of LanDAC and those in Tung Chung West and TCV, alongside new road construction, a large amount of construction waste would be in need of disposal. The requirement for permits for using the construction waste treatment facility at Mui Wo, the high transportation costs associated with the landfills in Tuen Mun and the future increase in landfill charges by 2 to 3 folds (to be effective in April 2017) would result in more illegal dumping of construction waste in non-DPA covered areas throughout Lantau; and
- (f) the destruction to the countryside was getting worse. The Board should reject Amendment Item A for safeguarding the countryside and to achieve better town planning.

R25 – WWF

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

- (a) WWF had concerns on (i) the lack of DPA coverage for the ecologically important Wong Lung Hang Stream and (ii) the habitat of Romer's Tree Frog at Wong Nai Uk;

The Wong Lung Hang area

- (b) the Wong Lung Hang area was linked to the Lantau North (Extension) Country Park in terms of ecology and landscape. Tung Chung Stream together with 32 natural streams including Wong Lung Hang Stream and Tai Ho Stream were identified by the Government as EIS in 2005, which were natural streams and rivers with important ecological functions e.g. providing habitats for diverse/rare animal or plant communities. Beijiang Thick-lipped Barb, identified by AFCD as a freshwater fish species of conservation concern in Hong Kong, was found in Wong Lung Hang Stream, according to the approved EIA Report;
- (c) rare species including Lesser Spiny Frog, Romer's tree Frog and Hong Kong Newt were found in the neighbouring watercourse, woodland and shrubland of Wong Lung Hang Stream. Romer's Tree Frog, which was endemic to Hong Kong and was classified as 'endangered' by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), was subject to protection under the Wild Animals Protection Ordinance (Cap. 170). Lesser Spiny Frog and Hong Kong Newt were also classified as 'vulnerable' and 'near threatened' by the IUCN;
- (d) Wong Lung Hang Stream, its riparian areas and the valley were of significant ecological value and should be well protected. Without any DPA coverage, there would not be any planning enforcement against eco-vandalism on private lands. In the case of Pui O, where land filling/excavation and stream diversion within the "CPA" zone would require planning permission under the OZP, fly-tipping of construction waste and warehouses were found within woodland/adjoining villages. As illegal dumping at Wong Lung Hang Stream would cause serious impacts on the ecology and water quality of Wong Lung Hang and Tung

Chung Bay, the destruction of Pui O should not be repeated in Wong Lung Hang;

- (e) private lots were located in the areas surrounding Wong Lung Hang Stream, making it more susceptible to the destruction. The various development projects in Lantau would also subject the area to illegal dumping activities of construction waste;
- (f) it was recommended that the Wong Lung Hang Stream/area be excluded from the draft TCTC OZP, which should then be incorporated into a DPA Plan; and

Wong Nai Uk

- (g) population of Romer's Tree Frogs was found in the Wong Nai Uk area in 2012 and capturing and translocation of Romer's Tree Frogs were subsequently proposed by the Government. As the habitats for the frog fell into both public and private lands, there were concerns on the effectiveness of translocation by the private sector. Accordingly, an integrated and detailed release and habitat enhancement plan should be devised for Romer's Tree Frog for their protection.

R26 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation (KFBGC)

C2 – Chiu Sein Tuck

C3 – Mr Tony Nip

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tony Nip made the following main points:

- (a) it was questionable why the draft TCTC OZP, covering mainly the town centre area, would have covered the natural environment of the Wong Lung Hang area, which was located far away from the town centre;

- (b) Wong Lung Hang Stream was an EIS with exceptionally good water quality and the polluted portion was only at the lower part of the stream. The riparian zones of the stream were well wooded with lush vegetation and were the habitats for many species of conservation importance. The Wong Lung Hang area could be regarded as an extension area of the adjoining country park as they shared similarity in landscape and ecology;
- (c) as early as 2012, green groups including KFBGC requested for the covering of the Wong Lung Hang area by a DPA Plan, upon learning that the Government would develop Tung Chung. In the subsequent years, the three stages of PE of the Tung Chung Study and the related EIA Report had not included the Wong Lung Hang area in detail. However, against that background, the draft TCTC OZP was suddenly extended to include the Wong Lung Hang area. Since that would repeat the grievous mistake of not covering areas with high conservation concern with a DPA Plan, such inclusion under the OZP was considered highly inappropriate and disappointing;
- (d) examples of areas not being covered or previously covered by a DPA Plan included TCV and the “CPA” zones in Tong Fuk and Pui O, which had been the dumping grounds of construction waste, despite the requirement for planning permission for land filling/excavation/stream diversion under the relevant OZP. The dumping area of construction waste in Tong Fuk had been converted into a covered car park, according to his recent site visit. A warehouse had also been erected at the “CPA” zone in Pui O;
- (e) a site visit was held at the “CPA” zone in Pui O in 2012, which was attended by green groups and the representatives from PlanD, LandsD, EPD, Home Affairs Department (HAD), Drainage Services Department (DSD) and AFCD. Due to the lack of DPA coverage for the subject “CPA”, nothing could be done by PlanD for the land filling activities nor erection of the warehouse and stream diversion, while other departments were not given the powers to deal with them effectively. According to another site visit in September 2016, additional dumping of construction

waste and more structures were identified. Hence, for those countryside areas without a DPA Plan, environmental destruction would continue;

- (f) upon incorporation of TCV into a DPA in 2015, PlanD had taken effective enforcement actions against illegal land filling activities and the concerned sites had also been reinstated as requested by PlanD;
- (g) PlanD's response that the area of Wong Lung Hang was not easily accessible was misleading. The gate at Wong Lung Hang Road did not restrict access to the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream, as it was located deep inside the valley area. The current road width was also sufficient for most vehicles to drive through. Wong Lung Hang Road was highly accessible to the public, and many cars were seen parking haphazardly along the road as people visited the Wong Lung Hang area for various outdoor activities including swimming at the stream. There were no steep slopes surrounding the road and stream including the riparian zones and a number of structures had already been built and one container was found in such area. Contrary to PlanD's response, there were many private land lots along Wong Lung Hang Stream; and
- (h) environmental consequences, eco-vandalism and destruction in areas within DPA Plans were blatantly obvious, on-going and well-documented. There were no sound justifications to include the Wong Lung Hang area into the draft OZP and not a DPA Plan. Members were requested to consider covering the Wong Lung Hang area with a DPA Plan and the appropriate way forward for protecting the area.

[The meeting was adjourned for a short break of 5 minutes.]

C13 – Wisdom Management Company Limited (WMCL)

22. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Poon Wai Ying made the following main points:

- (a) WMCL proposed to rezone Area 8 (near the junction of Yu Tung Road and Chung Yan Road) from “GB” to “G/IC” for the first cycling hotel development in Hong Kong. The proposed cycling hotel development was considered suitable for the following reasons:
- it would be complementary to the Government’s proposal for cycling tourism in Lantau by providing a cycle museum to show case the history and culture of cycling and a flagship store to cater for the needs of visitors;
 - it would help promote green tourism by becoming a unique tourist attraction for cycling with international cycling events. Being a tourist attraction, it would attract tourists to Lantau and that would boost economic development locally. A weekend bazaar would be held at the hotel, providing business opportunities for small business operators engaging in products of local and diverse characteristics;
 - with a site area of about 7,000m², it would consist of a proposed 17-storey hotel tower (including a 3-storey shopping arcade) with modern design at a plot ratio (PR) of 6, providing around 600 rooms (about 30-50m² per room). The proposed PR was the same as that of the nearby public housing site in Area 27;
 - it would be people-centred, creating local employment opportunities that were seriously lacking in the Tung Chung area, especially those of low skilled. It was estimated that 1,500 to 2000 jobs would be created, and priority would be given to the residents in Lantau/Tung Chung. 200 of such jobs would be reserved for local villagers. The local residents generally had low skills and the high transportation costs for travelling out of Tung Chung had contributed to low employment rate in the local area. The proposal would help address the mismatch between jobs and skills of the residents. The jobs created would also be

sustainable in the long-run given the nature of the hotel development;

- Tung Chung was lacking in recreational facilities. The proposed hotel would facilitate the development of a vibrant and harmonious community and promote healthy lifestyle by providing cycling parks and an open area at the hotel that would be open to the public for their enjoyment. Renting and repair of bicycles would also be provided by the hotel;
- it would serve as a rest station for cyclists during their long cycling journeys. Moreover, the catering and overnight accommodation for cyclists to be offered by the hotel would enhance the overall usage of cycling tracks and tourism in Lantau. It would add to the provision of cycling facilities in Lantau by providing additional cycling tracks and training grounds at the hotel, catering for all kinds of people, including the disabled; and
- the subject site was not located within a country park.

23. The Chairman said that as there were two remaining groups of representations yet to be heard and in view of the upcoming lunch break to be arranged at around 12:45 p.m., the first group (R13, C1, C15 and C17) involving 20 to 30 minutes of speaking time should proceed first before the second group (i.e. Green Sense) (C4 of TCTC OZP, R57 and C2 of TCE OZP, and R36 and C19 of TCV OZP) with speaking time of 120 minutes. Both groups agreed to the speaking arrangement.

R13/C15 – Fung Siu Yin

C1- Fu Ka Ho Wright

C17- Wong Chun Kiu

24. Ms Ho Loy made the following main points:

- (a) she apologised for recording the proceeding of the meeting earlier. With reference to her Facebook page, she said that she represented about 20 residents of Tung Chung, including those residing in Yat Tung Estate in TCTC and those in TCV;

TCV OZP

- (b) for the TCV OZP, she put forth the following concerns;
- the local residents strongly opposed the residential zoning of the wetland to the north of Shek Mun Kap for a low-density residential development on the TCV OZP. The wetland was located within the water catchment of two nearby streams. When she moved into the area 6 years ago, the wetland was at its natural and unpolluted state. However, land filling of construction waste took place at the wetland a year after and the area, known as “Ribbles”, which had a large tract of agricultural land, had been filled extensively to the size of about four football fields. The source of the waste was believed to be originated from the construction of North Lantau Hospital. As the Government did not provide sites for handling the construction waste and storage, the contractors had rented lands from private owners for such purposes during the construction stage. The improvement in accessibility of the area due to additional roads built by the contractors had a knock-on effect, which had led to the continuation of the land filling activities and the setting up of related uses such as car repair workshops and warehouses of construction materials in the neighbouring areas. Upon completion of the hospital, the area had become a works site associated with the public housing development project (third phase) in Tung Chung;
 - the various construction materials being dumped onto the area, including the area next to the streams, had pose a health hazard to

the local residents. Complaints had been lodged to the concerned government departments and little had been done. Only after two years when the complaint was lodged to LandsD had a portion of the materials been removed. Given the high conservation value of the area which had been justified by the various green groups, PlanD should take appropriate actions for protecting the area;

- the tree surveys conducted in the TCV for the EIA Report had not accurately reflected the actual data in terms of tree conditions and numbers due to stringent criteria adopted, which had excluded trees with diameter under 10 cm and those trees located within private lots that were not accessible. Over 10,000 mature trees in the local area were less than 10 cm in diameter as they were previously and densely planted by owners/private individuals in the hope of higher compensation return as the area was earmarked for development years ago. As such, the EIA study had not truly reflected the actual ecological value of the area;

- there were also doubts on the EIA's data concerning the water source and conditions of the water catchment area and the associated geology. The subject wetland had shallow underground water, resulting in high water contents for the soil. The landfill at the wetland, which was sandwiched between two streams to its east and west, had blocked the downstream flow of the western stream and led to the branching off of the stream forming another stream, albeit smaller in size. That had resulted in local flooding after rainstorms. In order not to affect the water quality and the ecology of the streams as a whole, special sewage disposal treatment would be required for any residential development in the area. Members should consider if there would be any innovative or feasible design options to address the issue;

The Tung Chung District

- Members should consider whether climate impact for the Tung Chung district had been properly assessed in the EIA, taking into account that the Tung Chung district had a planned population of about 22,000 and there was a need to safeguard the health of the future/existing residents. There was a difference of 4 to 6 degrees in celsius between the natural environment of TCV and the urban built environment including the various developments (e.g. Yat Tung Estate, Fu Tung Estate, Tung Chung Crescent, hotels and HKIA). The aforementioned tree planting around the wetland area had balanced out the air flows between the two areas and absorbed carbon dioxide from the urbanised environment. Tung Chung should take the lead in incorporating climate change in its planning for other cities to follow, including the complete preservation of the existing streams and valleys for maintaining the climate balance and /or phasing of developments to slow down population growth in the area and by fully assessing the impact on Tung Chung arising from the various on-going and future projects such as the HKZMB and the third runway system at HKIA. Suitable refuse treatment and collection in the area to reduce carbon emission should also be considered. Refuse collection had been problematic in the rural areas and many refuse items were placed outside the refuse collection point along roadside. Members should visit Ma Wan Village to see the problem being faced by the residents;

- the planning for Tung Chung should consider the additional population and refuse arising from its location, i.e. being at a border between Hong Kong and Zhuhai. Citygate had indeed been converted to a hotel and previous sports grounds for the local community had been replaced by residential developments without reprovisioning;

- sufficient GIC facilities and safe community spaces should be provided in Tung Chung, especially for children and the unemployed, to enhance their participation in the community and their sense of belonging, so as to ensure a lively community and community harmony. The residents of Tung Chung should be encouraged to access the greenery offered by the streams and valleys for enjoyment and educational purposes;
- the TCNT was originally developed to cater for the HKZMB and airport developments. However, the residents could not find jobs locally and depression was common amongst them. The planning in Tung Chung should give weight to enhancement in local employment;

[Dr. F.C. Chan left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- public transport's fares should be affordable to the local residents to facilitate their movements between areas and that the cycle tracks in Tung Chung were highly inaccessible and should be improved; and
- proper sewage collection and disposal should be considered under the OZP, so as to protect the ecology and environment. Members should diligently safeguard Tung Chung's natural environment against environmental destruction.

C4 – Green Sense

R57/C2 (TCE OZP) – Green Sense

R36/C19 (TCV OZP) – Green Sense

25. Mr Wong Chin Yeung made the following main points:

- (a) he was also a representer in respect of the two other OZPs for Tung Chung (i.e. R12 and R24 of TCE and TCV OZPs respectively);

(b) he concurred with the views of other green groups on the high ecological value of TCV and the need to address the problem of land filling in the area. As the issue had already been explained in detail by them, he would present his following views on Tung Chung West concerning the draft TCTC OZP from the perspective of a local resident:

- the local residents welcomed the Government's proposal of not proceeding with sea reclamation at Tung Chung West;
- schools for the disabled were to be provided in Tung Chung West, as told by the former Secretary of Education in 2004. The Government was urged for early implementation of the school development, so as to better serve the needs of the local community;
- the current GIC provision in TCNT was far from adequate in meeting the needs of the residents and that shortage problem had persisted for many years. It took the drowning incident of a primary school student at a local pier in 2003 to result in the eventual provision of a swimming pool in Tung Chung. To reduce the high living cost for the residents, a market offering affordable produce should be provided in Tung Chung. Whether the Housing Department could take up the management of the new shopping malls in Tung Chung to help keep shop rentals and retail prices at a reasonable level should be considered;
- the MTR station in Tung Chung West, which was scheduled for completion in 2009/2010, had yet to be completed. In view of the upcoming residential developments in the area, the MTR station should be ready for use at the earliest; and
- due to the small size of the planned town park, it would unlikely serve its function in providing a recreational outlet and open space for the residents;

TCE

- (c) the proposed sea reclamation of about 120 ha in TCE was too extensive. The Government was insincere in its effort of addressing the housing need, as only about one third of the future reclaimed site would be for public housing. An area of the site was also reserved for a yacht club, which posed questions as to whether the club would take up a greater portion of the site to facilitate its expansion in the future; and

Tourism

- (d) he supported green tourism involving cycling in Tung Chung as Lantau could be the landmark for cycling tourism, so as to make full use of its natural landscape and a cycling track should be created connecting the various areas of Lantau and HKIA, which could be regarded as a leisure facility itself. On the other hand, developing areas of conservation importance in Lantau would contravene the principles of sustainable development.

26. Mr Choi Ka Man made the following main points:

- (a) he asked what the Board would consider as justifications in considering whether it would agree to or reject a government project. Whether such a project would be considered by the Board from a town planning perspective;
- (b) traffic congestion in Tung Chung was severe, especially during rush hours. The capacity of Tung Chung MTR Line had already been overloaded on a daily basis. Additional MTR stations to be provided in Tung Chung East and West would not resolve the problem if there were no increase in the number of trains. It was common knowledge that the Government would adopt favourable estimates on the capacity of infrastructure in order to proceed with major development projects. Pursuing the TCNT might lead

to more road construction and traffic congestion in Tung Chung when the spare capacity of the Tung Chung MTR Line was later found to be overestimated. That was considered unsustainable and would lead to more destruction to Lantau;

- (c) the planning for Lantau should be considered in an integrated manner, not in the form of three separate OZPs for Tung Chung;
- (d) there were no justifications for the proposed sea reclamations along the coastline of Lantau under the OZPs. The existence of brownfield sites in Hong Kong had been ignored and the natural coastlines of Hong Kong should be protected and preserved. The construction of HKZMB had already severely polluted the sea water and eliminated dolphins. Sea reclamation would destroy ecology and the reclamation proposal should be dropped;
- (e) the residents of Tung Chung needed to make long and expensive journeys from Tung Chung to other urban areas daily for work. Members should consider what had actually been planned for the residents as they had been ignored in the planning of Tung Chung, including transport planning which had been said to have taken into account the needs of the visitors, rather than the residents of Tung Chung. Placing residential developments near the HKIA was a planning error since the residents and visitors had to share the use of the limited infrastructure available;
- (f) the residents had suffered from poor living quality, isolation and they had little spare time. Poverty and social problems would continue to perpetuate in Tung Chung. They would not benefit from the various development proposals including the green tourism initiatives/cycling proposal and water sports facilities proposed by the representers. Yachts would in fact pollute the seawater due to their use of diesel oil; and
- (g) the Government should help the residents of Tung Chung by providing good town planning which would cater for their needs and promote local

economy. Town planning in Hong Kong should be for the Hong Kong citizens.

27. With the aid of a visualizer, Mr Tam Hoi Pong made the following main points:

(a) he would like to put forth the following planning visions/aspirations and queries for sharing with Members:

- Hong Kong did not possess sufficient spare capacity to accommodate additional population. The high population had led to the need to devise many development proposals to meet the related demands. In order not to forgo sites for GIC facilities and to address the concerns of green groups arising from sea reclamation and protection of the natural environment, the population of Hong Kong should be reduced by limiting the number of Mainlanders settling in Hong Kong. He asked if the Chairman could reflect his view to the senior government officials on the fundamental need to reduce population intake of Hong Kong;
- prioritisation in land use should be introduced, so as to eliminate unfairness to the minority group of the society or green groups whose views were often ignored;
- whether the current development mode should continue. The mode of development involving site clearance and erection of new buildings had all along been adopted at the expense of the environment and community ties. Besides the extraordinary high public expenditure requiring approval by LegCo, sea reclamation would also involve extraction of sea sands in another ocean elsewhere, thereby causing environmental damage to more than one ocean area;
- the reason for shelving the sea reclamation proposal near Ma Wan Chung Village after stage 2 of PE of the Tung Chung Study should be given, while the sea reclamation proposal for TCE was forged ahead

without any reduction in reclamation area. Whether different weights had been given to the public views collected on the proposals;

- whether TCE was suitable for more residential developments. The local residents of Tung Chung already needed to share their town including its shopping malls and roads with visitors from the Mainland. As a member of the Tsuen Wan DC with constituency in Ma Wan, he was aware that Wan Man residents were already suffering from the aircraft noise pollution. It could be envisaged that the future residents residing near the sea area upon reclamation in TCE would be subjected to more aircraft noise. Air pollution was another problem for TCE; and

- town planning in Hong Kong was disappointing and had not changed for the better. Whether Members could take more actions to achieve appropriate town planning and not follow the past development mode for the betterment of Hong Kong. Inappropriate developments and reclamation would cause irreversible damages to the environment, ecology and visual quality of the area. He considered that Members of the Board should be appointed through election and be full time and that the number of official representatives at the TPB meeting should be reduced, so as to enhance the Board's ability to fine-tune or improve development projects proposed by the Government.

28. The meeting was adjourned for a lunch break at 1:00 p.m.

[Professor S.C. Wong, Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon, Mr Edwin W.K. Chan and Mr Martin W.C. Kwan left this session of the hearing at this point.]

29. The meeting was resumed at 2:15 p.m.

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

Mr Michael W.L. Wong Chairman

Mr H.W. Cheung

Dr Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Patrick H.T. Lau

Ms Christina M. Lee

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Professor T.S. Liu

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Ken Y.K. Wong

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East)

Transport Department

Mr K.C. Siu

Deputy Director of Lands (General)
Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam

Director of Planning
Mr K.K. Ling

[Dr Wilton W.T. Fok, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr Jeff Y.T. Lam arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Presentation and Question Sessions (cont'd)

[Open Meeting]

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

Government Representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Donna Y.P. Tam - District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands
(DPO/SKIs)

Ms Amy M.Y. Wu - Senior Town Planner/Islands 2

Miss Vicki Y.Y. Au - Town Planner/Islands 2

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

Mr David K.C. Lo - Chief Engineer/Islands (CE/Is)

Mr Kenneth C.P. Wong - Senior Engineer 9 (Islands Division)

Ms Chelsey K.F. Yuen - Engineer 9 (Islands Division)

Representers, Commenters and Their Representatives

R1 – Coral Ching Limited

Ms Lee Mo Yi Cannis] Representer's representatives
Ms Chan Hiu Man Ketty]

R13/C15 – Fung Siu Yin

C1 – Wright Fu Ka Ho

C17 – Wong Chun Kiu

Ms Ho Loy - Representer's and Commenters' representative

R20 – Green Group's Joint Submission

R22 – Green Power

Mr Cheng Luk Ki - Representers' representative

R25 – World Wide Fund for Nature Hong Kong

Mr Andrew Chan - Representer's representative

R26 – Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation

C2 – Chiu Sein Tuck

C3 – Tony Nip

Mr Tony Nip - Commenter and Representer's/Commenter's
representative

Ms Kam, Karen Yi Lam - Representer's and Commenters' representative

C4 – Green Sense

Mr Tam Hoi Pong - Commenter's representative

32. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the representers/commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations/comments.

C4 – Green Sense (cont'd)

33. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tam Hoi Pong continued to make the following main points:

- (a) he disagreed with the setting of a maximum speaking time of 10 minutes for each representer or commenter by the Town Planning Board (the Board) and the requirement for obtaining authorisation from other representers and commenters in order to extend the speaking time;
- (b) he recapped the major views that he had presented during the a.m. session of the meeting, which included: (1) there was a need to formulate a population policy for Hong Kong, (2) fair land use proposals should be agreed by the community before they were submitted to the Board for consideration, (3) they objected to any white-elephant projects, such as reclamation, which were not people-oriented, (4) the Government was partial to some public views as reflected in its decision on the proposed reclamations in Tung Chung East and Tung Chung West, and (5) there should be no further increase in the population of Tung Chung as the district was already poor in living experience;
- (c) Green Sense had all along been concerned about town planning in Hong Kong and it wished Hong Kong could become a better place to live in. The current planning proposals for Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) on the three Outline Zoning Plans (OZPs) involved the development of Tung Chung Valley (TCV), the intensification of development in Tung Chung Town Centre Area (TCTC) and a large-scale reclamation in Tung Chung East for the Tung Chung Extension Area (TCE). The planned population of Tung Chung as a result of the development proposals would increase from 124,000 to 268,400, which was more than doubled. Such a drastic increase in the planned population of Tung Chung for accommodating the ever increasing population of Hong Kong was not sustainable as it could not be adequately supported by the existing and planned infrastructure. Hong Kong should restrict the number of immigrants;
- (d) Tung Chung might not be suitable for residential use as it was too far away from the main urban areas. Residents of Tung Chung generally had to face the traffic problem. While the Government might expect the

airport and Disneyland to provide job opportunities to the Tung Chung residents when it planned Tung Chung New Town at the outset, only about 6,000 people out of the existing population of about 80,000 were actually working in Lantau areas including the airport. Most residents still had to commute to work in the main urban areas, which exacerbated the traffic problem. The capacity of the MTR Tung Chung Line (TCL) could hardly be further increased as Tsing Ma Bridge could only allow a maximum train frequency of 4 minutes per train due to the need to share the track with the Airport Express Line;

- (e) although the target public-private housing ratio for Tung Chung was not indicated on the OZPs, he did not consider that all residential sites should be allocated for public housing development as it should have a reasonable mix of public and private housing in a new town. While the future increase in population would mainly be concentrated in the reclamation area of TCE where a new railway station was proposed, he wondered if it was necessary to double the planned population of Tung Chung which would require extensive land reclamation;
- (f) a paper considered by the Legislative Council (LegCo) in April 2016 revealed that TCL was already operating at 85% of its maximum capacity at the moment. He wondered why the Government would consider that TCL with enhancement measures could be able to support the transport demand of a doubled population size of Tung Chung. He also queried if the Government's consultant was carrying out the traffic impact assessment (TIA) in an impartial and independent manner;
- (g) while TPB Paper No. 10178 indicated that the Tuen Mun–Chek Lap Kok Link (TM-CLKL) to be completed in 2018 would provide an alternative route to the local population and ease the traffic flow of North Lantau Highway, he wondered if many Tung Chung residents would be working in Tuen Mun or the Northwest New Territories. While TM-CLKL might serve as an alternative route for Tung Chung residents to go to the urban areas during contingencies, it would not be the main route for the residents to travel to the urban areas;

- (h) apart from TCNTE, several large-scale development projects were proposed by the Government in North Lantau concurrently, including the development of the Siu Ho Wan Depot site, reclamation of Siu Ho Wan and reclamation of Sunny Bay. The green groups objected to such mega projects which would add development pressure on North Lantau;
- (i) the previous decisions of the Board relied heavily on the results of the statutory environmental impact assessment (EIA) reports considered by the Advisory Council on the Environment (ACE) under the EIA Ordinance. However, the system of ACE was less open than that of the Board under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO) as ACE would only consider written comments from the public and no oral submissions were allowed. Since the EIA reports were prepared and submitted by the project proponents, they might not be making an impartial conclusion on the actual impacts of the proposed projects. As such, the endorsement of an EIA report by ACE did not mean that the EIA report was flawless. The preamble of the TPO required the Board to promote the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the community but not to espouse the white-elephant projects proposed by the Government. The Board should make its independent judgment on the acceptability of a development proposal and should not rely solely on the recommendations of the Government or other public bodies;
- (j) there were a number of committed and planned reclamation works in the western waters of Hong Kong, including the reclamation for the artificial island of the Hong Kong Boundary Crossing Facilities (HKBCF) of the Hong Kong–Zhuhai–Macau Bridge (HZMB), the reclamation for the airport’s three-runway system, the subject reclamation for TCE and the proposed reclamations at Siu Ho Wan, Sunny Bay and Lung Kwu Tan. The reclamation works altogether would generate significant and cumulative adverse impacts on the marine ecology;
- (k) the Government proposed to set up the Brothers Islands Marine Park (BMP) to the east of the artificial island of HKBCF of HZMB some years

ago as a mitigation measure to minimise the impacts on Chinese White Dolphins (CWDs) due to the works of HZMB. However, the proposed BMP would become lying in the midst of three reclamation areas if the reclamations for Tung Chung and Siu Ho Wan were pursued;

- (l) the proposed reclamation for TCE involved an area of about 120 ha. The reclamation works would last for several years and a large number of works vessels would be required. According to previous cases, the sea area being affected by reclamation works could be the double of the area of the reclaimed land. The environmental conditions of the proposed BMP and the Tai Ho Stream Site of Special Scientific Interest nearby would very likely be affected by the reclamation of TCE. Although there were conditions in the environment permit of the TCNTE project requiring the works vessels to navigate along designated routes and at limited speed within the proposed BMP, there were numerous examples in the past in which the Government was lenient towards breaches of the conditions of the environmental permits;
- (m) for the past several months, the Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department could not record any dolphin in the waters of North Lantau. He doubted if the proposed BMP could serve its purpose of attracting the CWDs affected by the works of HZMB to return to the Hong Kong waters eventually. Before the effectiveness of the proposed BMP in conserving CWDs was ascertained, the Government should not consider any further developments in the waters of North Lantau;
- (n) the air quality in Tung Chung was very poor as it was affected by airborne pollutants from Guangdong Province and emissions from aircrafts, vessels and the Castle Peak Power Station in the north. Poor air quality could affect people's health and increase social cost including medical expenditure. As such, the plan for accommodating more people in Tung Chung was irresponsible. Although the EIA report indicated that the air quality upon completion of the TCNTE project was acceptable, the EIA report was not conducted in an impartial manner;

- (o) the proposed reclamation area of TCE would be subject to severe aircraft noise despite the area was not within the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) 25 contour of the airport under the Government's assessment. The northern part of the proposed reclamation area should be taken out, otherwise the future residential developments in that area would be subject to aircraft noise or they would have to close their windows and rely on air-conditioning all the time;
- (p) Hong Kong's current pressing demand for housing stemmed from the lack of a comprehensive population policy. The Board should recognise the fact that the carrying capacity of the environment was not without limit. Except the development of brownfield sites, it was not proper for the Government to take other means to increase the housing land supply in Hong Kong, such as rezoning green belts and open spaces for development, pursuing infill development within congested built-up areas and sacrificing the natural environment including the marine environment for development. Reclamation was irreversible and costly and should be avoided. The Board should not make its decision merely based on the rigid figures but should take into consideration the perception and opinions of the affected people;
- (q) in the EIA study on the cumulative impacts of the reclamation projects in the western waters of Hong Kong, the Government had only taken into account the proposed reclamations at Lung Kwu Tan, Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay but not the reclamation for TCE. It demonstrated that the assessment results of the cumulative impacts found by the Government were unreliable;
- (r) he proposed to reduce the proposed reclamation for TCE by half, in particular to forgo the northern part of the reclamation area since that area was subject to severe aircraft noise, close to the proposed BMP and was proposed mainly for marina club use. He also urged for the cancellation of the proposed reclamation at Siu Ho Wan.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

34. On the request of Ms Ho Loy (representative of R13, C1, C15 and C17), the Chairman agreed to allow her some more time to supplement her presentation made earlier in the a.m. session of the meeting.

R13/C15 – Fung Siu Yin

C1 – Wright Fu Ka Ho

C17 – Wong Chun Kiu

35. Ms Ho Loy made the following main points:

- (a) a heritage research on the local history of TCV and Wong Lung Hang area should be conducted as those two valleys had a long history of human habitation. The cultural heritage impact assessment included in the statutory EIA report for the TCNTE project had only assessed the impact of the project on the existing known built heritage items, and was considered inadequate. The accuracy of the broad brush tree survey covered in landscape and visual impact assessment of the EIA report was also questionable. The three OZPs could be subject to judicial review if those unqualified technical assessments were not rectified;
- (b) as Tung Chung was subject to severe air pollution, the Government should collect and analyse more data on air quality and examine how the planned developments in the district could be adjusted to minimise their exposure to air quality impact;
- (c) Members were invited to take a site visit to Tung Chung to better understand the current living conditions of the local residents, including their employment and education, the accessibility of the district and the physical conditions of the existing buildings;
- (d) Members might suggest the Government to freeze the further development of Tung Chung and hence the population growth until the current problems of the district as a result of the Government's planning failure had been resolved;

- (e) residents were facing great difficulties in living in Tung Chung as Tung Chung New Town was originally planned to support the operation of the airport. People generally considered that the living space and facilities provided in Tung Chung were not user-friendly and the local economy was unsustainable. The conventional form of development adopted in other new towns in Hong Kong might not be applicable to Tung Chung as Tung Chung was not supported by other neighbouring districts. The Board might advise the Buildings Department or CEDD to carry out a study on the suitable built form for Tung Chung to respond to people's needs;
- (f) the Government should critically review if there was still a need to set a target of accommodating a population of 220,000 in Tung Chung. If the population target could be relaxed, the development intensity of the new development sites could be reduced and people could have a more decent living environment to enjoy;
- (g) the residents of the public housing developments were of relatively lower income and more sensitive to transportation cost. It was important to provide a comprehensive network of cycle tracks in Tung Chung and upgrade the existing cycle tracks and parking facilities to enhance the accessibility of the lower-income people within the district and their integration with the community;
- (h) residents of Tung Chung had taken the initiatives to collect, recycle and re-use waste resources for protecting the environment. The planning of Tung Chung should respond to the residents' initiatives on waste management and provide the necessary self-contained waste collection and recycling facilities for the district;
- (i) as the reclamation works of TCE would straighten and spoil the coastline and damage the habitat of CWDs, she hoped that the Board would disagree with the proposed reclamation; and

- (j) the Government should only plan for new development in Tung Chung when it had remedied the current problems which were originated from the past planning failure. The public should be engaged in the planning process.

36. As the presentation from the government's representatives, and the representers/commenters/their representatives on the day had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the question-and-answer (Q&A) session. The Chairman briefed attendees that the Q&A session was for Members to raise questions on matters of concerns. Members would raise questions and the Chairman would invite the representers/commenters/their representatives and/or the government's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board, or for cross-examination between parties.

Proposed Water Sports Centre in Area 32

37. A Member asked whether R5's water sports centre proposal at Tung Chung Bay in Area 32 would be accepted if it was supported by relevant technical assessments. In response, Ms Donna Y.P. Tam, DPO/SKIs, said that any development at Tung Chung Bay should be compatible with its ecologically-sensitive environment. As the site for the proposed water sports centre was zoned "Open Space" on the TCTC OZP, any private development proposals for sports or recreational use at the site should obtain policy support from the Government on top of the relevant technical assessments. Since no technical assessments had been submitted by the project proponent, it was hard to say whether the proposed water sports centre development would be acceptable. In response to the Member's same question, Mr Tony Nip (C3) said that the area of Tung Chung Bay and Tung Chung Stream Estuary had high ecological value. Although the site for the proposed water sports centre was not a mangrove habitat or woodland, the activities of the proposed centre, such as sports and cleansing activities, might cause impacts on the natural environment. Without any details on the nature and scale of the proposed centre, he could not tell whether it would be acceptable.

Wong Lung Hang Area

38. A Member asked if consideration had been given to the green groups' proposal of

covering Wong Lung Hang area, which had high ecological and landscape value, by a Development Permission Area (DPA) Plan in order to safeguard the area against possible illegal dumping of construction waste. In response, Ms Tam said that the land use proposals recommended under the Tung Chung New Town Extension Study (the Tung Chung Study) were incorporated in the subject new OZPs for TCE and TCV and the amended OZP for TCTC. Wong Lung Hang area was located to the south of the existing town centre area and was not within the study area of the Tung Chung Study. There was some distance between Wong Lung Hang area and TCV. In the current round of amendment to the TCTC OZP, some built-up areas in the existing town centre and other areas at the fringe of the town centre, such as Wong Lung Hang area, which were not previously covered by the OZP or Country Park were included into the planning scheme area of the OZP for proper planning control. The environment of Wong Lung Hang area was largely natural and unspoiled. Although there were some private agricultural lots along the bank of Wong Lung Hang Stream, they were mainly separated from Wong Lung Hang Road by government land. The area was also far away from the recognised villages and was not subject to development threat. As such, no development was planned in the area.

39. Ms Tam continued to say that the designation of an area as a DPA had the effect of conferring the Planning Authority the statutory power to enforce any unauthorised development in that area. However, given that there was only one access road, i.e. Wong Lung Hang Road, which was a single-lane service road managed by the Water Supplies Department (WSD) leading to Wong Lung Hang area and that vehicular access to the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream would be restricted by the road gate erected by WSD, the possibility of carrying out unauthorised development or illegal dumping activities in the area was slim, and hence the designation of the area as a DPA might not be necessary. If there were unauthorised activities in Wong Lung Hang area, WSD might relocate their gate to the lower section of Wong Lung Hang Stream to stop vehicles from entering the area.

40. In response to the Member's same question above, Mr Tony Nip (C3) said that there had been changes in the study area of the Tung Chung Study over time. Although the Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden Corporation had repeatedly requested PlanD to designate Wong Lung Hang area as a DPA in every stage of the public engagement in order to allow PlanD to take enforcement action against any unauthorised development in the area, the area was not included in the study area of the Tung Chung Study. Nevertheless, PlanD had suddenly included Wong Lung Hang area in the planning scheme area of the amended TCTC

OZP despite it was far away from and not associated with the town centre area. In view of the remoteness of the area from the existing town centre, it would be more appropriate to designate the area as Country Park Extension than including it in the TCTC OZP. Although DPO/SKIs had pointed out that there was a road gate on Wong Lung Hang Road which could restrict vehicles from entering the upper area of Wong Lung Hang Stream, that gate was erected at a location near the upper area of the stream and vehicles could have access to most of the areas at the middle and lower sections of the stream where the private lots were located. Apart from carrying out dumping activities, the land owners could easily pave their land adjoining the road near the stream for car parking or open storage use. Such undesirable land use pattern was common in areas which were covered by OZP only but not DPA Plan, such as Tong Fuk and Pui O in South Lantau. He suspected if the relocation of WSD's gate to the lower area of Wong Lung Hang Stream as suggested by DPO/SKIs was feasible since it might be the private land owners of the concerned area who had requested WSD to put the gate at the current location in order to allow them to have vehicular access to their private land.

41. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Tam said that there were little agricultural activities in Wong Lung Hang area.

42. In response to a Member's question on whether Wong Lung Hang area could be designated as Country Park Extension as proposed by some representers, Ms Tam said that the incorporation of an area into Country Park was under the jurisdiction of the Country and Marine Parks Authority (CMPA) governed by the Country Parks Ordinance. While the inclusion of Wong Lung Hang area into the TCTC OZP would not preclude it from being designated as Country Park in future, CMPA had no current plan to designate the area as Country Park Extension.

43. In response to the same Member's question on the green groups' justifications for designating Wong Lung Hang area as Country Park Extension, Mr Tony Nip (C3) said that although it was the wish of the green groups to designate Wong Lung Hang area as Country Park Extension, the green groups noted that in other Country Park enclaves which had a more pressing need for designation as Country Park, CMPA had no plan to designate those areas as Country Park at all. As preparation of statutory plan for an area was under the Board's jurisdiction, he urged the Board to cover Wong Lung Hang area by a DPA Plan so that statutory planning enforcement action could be taken against any unauthorised development

in the area.

44. In response to a Member's question, Mr David K.C. Lo, CE/Is, said that the downstream area of Wong Lung Hang Stream was not subject to flooding risk as river training works had been carried out in that area before.

Tung Chung Stream and its Estuary

45. A Member asked whether the conservation of Tung Chung Bay was related to the two tributaries of Tung Chung Stream which was an Ecologically Important Stream (EIS). In response, Ms Tam said that the general planning intention of the TCV OZP was to conserve the high ecological value of TCV, including Tung Chung Stream. A sustainable drainage system comprising polders and stormwater attenuation and treatment ponds was proposed along the two tributaries of Tung Chung Stream to control the water quality of the stream and alleviate flooding risk. With the water quality of Tung Chung Stream being carefully controlled, the mudflat and mangrove at the estuary of Tung Chung Stream could be preserved. Since there would be no reclamation in Tung Chung Bay, the natural shoreline of the estuary was preserved. In response to the Member's same question, Mr Tony Nip (C3) said that the deletion of the originally proposed reclamation in Tung Chung Bay on the OZP was appreciated since there was an intrinsic relation between the ecologies of the streams and the estuary. Mangroves and mudflats were typical habitats at estuaries which were formed by alluvial deposits from streams. Some water species, such as white eel, had to live between streams and estuary in their life cycle. He drew Members' attention that Tai Ho, which was to the northeast of Tung Chung and where a new OZP for the area would soon be considered by the Board, also had a similar ecosystem consisting of an estuary and a stream like Tung Chung. Tai Ho Wan and Tai Ho Stream which was also an EIS were important habitats for horseshoe crabs. If Tai Ho Wan was affected by reclamation works, the ecologically sensitive habitats there would be at risk.

46. In response to a Member's enquiry, Ms Tam said that the Government planned to de-channelise the existing man-made section at the lower part of Tung Chung Stream and develop the area as a river park.

Reclamation for Tung Chung Extension Area

47. A Member asked Mr Tam Hoi Pong (C4) how the water flow and quality of Tung Chung Bay could be improved if the reclamation area of TCE was reduced by half as suggested by him. In response, Mr Tam said that after the construction of the airport at Chek Lap Kok, the water current at Tung Chung Bay had been much weakened. The maintenance of a vivid tidal flow at Tung Chung Bay was important as it could periodically flush away the pollutants of the area, e.g. those from Ma Wan Chung. There was currently a distance of some 3km to 4km between the artificial island of HKBCF of HZMB and the shore of Tung Chung. However, after the reclamation of TCE, the shortest distance between the artificial island and the reclaimed area of TCE would be reduced significantly to about 250m only, and it would further weaken the tidal flow to Tung Chung Bay and lead to possible accumulation of pollutants in the bay. It appeared that the relevant departments had not conducted any studies to assess the impact of the reclamation on the tidal flow of Tung Chung Bay.

48. In response to a Member's question on whether the current reclamation scheme for TCE would be acceptable if the northern part of the reclamation area was not for marina club use, Mr Tam said that although he preferred having no reclamation in Tung Chung at all in order to protect the marine environment, he understood that the proposal for zero reclamation would not be accepted by the Government. As a compromise, he hoped that the extent of reclamation for TCE could be reduced by half. As the northern part of the reclamation area of TCE was mainly planned for marina club and medium-density residential developments, which were not the most essential uses for the development of Tung Chung, that part of the reclamation could be forgone in order to reduce the possible impact on the tidal flow of Tung Chung Bay. Even if the northern part of the reclamation area was not proposed for marina club use, he would still request for a reduction in the extent of reclamation. Although forgoing the northern part of the reclamation might lead to a 10% to 20% decrease in flat supply for the entire Tung Chung development, it was worthwhile for the sake of protecting the environment.

49. A Member asked if it was possible to relocate the northern part of the TCE reclamation area to the area east of Areas 137 and 138 in order to maintain the same area of reclaimed land but reducing the possible hydrodynamic impact on Tung Chung Bay. In response, Mr Lo said that the results of the hydrodynamic modelling carried out in the Tung

Chung Study indicated that no significant change in hydrodynamics and water quality was anticipated at the ecologically-sensitive receivers in the vicinity, including Tai Ho Wan and Tung Chung Bay, due to the proposed reclamation for TCE. However, if the reclamation area was relocated from the northern tip to the area east of Areas 137 and 138 at the location of Tai Ho Inlet that regulated the tidal flow to Tai Ho Wan, the water quality of Tai Ho Wan would be adversely affected. Mr Tam concurred with Mr Lo's view that the reclamation area could not be shifted to the east, where Tai Ho Inlet was located. In order to minimise the impact of reclamation on Tai Ho Wan, Mr Tam requested that, in addition to forgoing the northern part of the reclamation, the proposed reclamation area for TCE should be further set back westwards for about 50m to 100m from Tai Ho Inlet.

50. The same Member asked Mr Tam Hoi Pong if he would accept that some more reclamation could be carried out to the west of the proposed reclamation area of TCE in order to offset his proposed reduction of reclamation in the north and east. In response, Mr Tam said that the Government would unlikely accept reclamation to the west of the proposed reclamation area since that area was within the NEF 25 contour of the airport where developments generally would not be permissible unless additional noise mitigation measures were implemented. Moreover, the new reclamation proposed would necessitate another round of EIA process under the EIA Ordinance.

51. In response to a Member's question, Mr Lo said that the existing navigation channel for vessels was taken as a given constraint and would not be affected by the proposed reclamation of TCE. Due to shallow water depth in the area immediately adjacent to the existing navigation channel, dredging of marine mud would be required if the area concerned was to be made accessible to vessels. Therefore, due care had been exercised in determining the proposed reclamation extent to avoid encroachment onto the channel.

52. Noting that an eco-shoreline was intended to be formed after the reclamation of TCE, a Member asked if protection of the habitat of horseshoe crabs was one of the considerations when designing the eco-shoreline. In response, Mr Lo said that the habitat of horseshoe crabs was mainly located within Tai Ho Wan, the tidal flow to which was through Tai Ho Inlet. As the water body of Tai Ho Wan was largely separated from that outside Tai Ho Inlet, the reclamation of TCE would not affect the habitat of horseshoe crabs at Tai Ho Wan. In response to the Chairman's question, Mr Nip said that while the juvenile horseshoe crabs would live in the mudflat within Tai Ho Wan, the adults would migrate to the deep

water outside Tai Ho Wan and hence would be vulnerable to the water pollution due to reclamation works. Mr Tam supplemented that as the extent of reclamation was very close to Tai Ho Inlet, the polluted water due to reclamation works would flux into Tai Ho Wan through the inlet during high tides and pollute the water of Tai Ho Wan. Therefore, he urged the reclamation area be set back westwards from Tai Ho Inlet.

Geology of Tung Chung Valley

53. A Member asked if TCV was of the karst topography and if there were two faults in TCV as pointed out by a representer. In response, Mr Lo said that according to the geotechnical and natural terrain hazard assessments carried out in the Tung Chung Study, there were no insurmountable geotechnical problems for the new development areas in TCNTE. The geology of TCV was generally overlain by a layer of superficial deposits and completely decomposed rock. Suitable types of foundation could be employed to tackle with the local ground conditions of individual sites.

Environmental Impact Assessment

54. In response to a Member's question on EIA, Mr Lo said that the TCNTE project was regarded as a committed project under the Cumulative EIA (CEIA) Study for the Three Potential Nearshore Reclamation Sites in the Western Waters of Hong Kong covering the three identified potential reclamation sites at Lung Kwu Tan, Siu Ho Wan and Sunny Bay. As such, any potential environmental impacts that might arise from TCNTE had already been taken into account in the CEIA. In response to the Member's same question, Mr Tam said that although the EIA report for TCNTE had already been approved by the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) on the advice of ACE and the funding for the TCNTE project had been approved by the LegCo, the Board should not be bounded by the decision of DEP on the EIA report and should decide on itself whether the development proposals for Tung Chung should be adjusted and the extent of reclamation be reduced.

Waste Management

55. In response to a Member's question on whether there were any measures to help the collection and recycling of domestic waste and food waste in the planning of the new development areas in Tung Chung, Ms Tam said that while the three OZPs were mainly to

designate the appropriate land use zonings for the development of Tung Chung, if considered necessary, specific requirements for waste collection and recycling could be incorporated in the building design of the new developments when implementing the land use proposals on the OZPs.

Traffic Impact

56. In response to a Member's question on whether the traffic impact of HZMB had been taken into account in the planning of TCNTE, Ms Tam said that the TIA carried out in the Tung Chung Study had already examined the impact of the additional traffic flows arising from the commissioning of HZMB and the proposed new developments in TCNTE on the planned road and railway networks, and various mitigation measures for the traffic impacts had been proposed in the TIA.

Transport Services and Connectivity

57. A Member asked whether Tung Chung could be developed as a water traffic hub to serve West Lantau (e.g. Tai O) and Tuen Mun areas, and if water channels could be developed in the town centre area to facilitate the use of water transport by the local people. In response, Ms Tam said that there were three existing piers in Tung Chung, including two smaller piers at Ma Wan Chung and the larger Tung Chung Development Pier at Tung Chung Waterfront Road. The latter was providing licensed ferry services plying between Tuen Mun, Tung Chung, Sha Lo Wan and Tai O at the moment. The Transport Department would keep monitoring the passenger demand to decide if the licensed ferry services should be strengthened. As regards connectivity, comprehensive road, pedestrian and cycling networks had been designed for TCNTE and incorporated in the three OZPs to facilitate people movements between all the key public and transport facilities and activity nodes within the district.

58. Noting that a presenter had pointed out that the Tsing Ma Bridge section of TCL was subject to a constraint of a maximum train frequency of 4 minutes per train, a Member asked if that would be the obstacle for increasing the carrying capacity of TCL to accommodate more population in Tung Chung. In response, Mr Lo said that railway transport was planned as the backbone of the passenger transport system in TCNTE and two new MTR stations were proposed to serve the population at Tung Chung East and West.

Although the Tsing Ma Bridge section of TCL was a shared-track section which only allowed the passage of one train in each direction at a time, the busiest sections of TCL were Olympic Station and Kowloon Station. According to the statistics in 2013, the patronage of TCL from Tung Chung to Tsing Yi was about 5,800 passengers per hour per direction (pphd) during the morning peak, while the maximum capacity was 17,800 pphpd at the frequency of 10 trains per hour. In 2036, it was expected that the patronage would be increased to about 19,500 pphpd. To meet the increase in railway transport demand, the maximum carrying capacity of TCL could be enhanced by upgrading the signalling system and construction of an overrun tunnel at Hong Kong Station. With modification of existing infrastructure by the MTRCL for increasing the train frequency to 16 trains per hour, the capacity of TCL from Tung Chung to Tsing Yi could be increased to 31,300 pphpd and it could serve the forecasted patronage of 2036.

59. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr Lo said that the proposed long-term enhancement works for TCL were agreed by MTRCL.

60. In response to a Member's question on whether the roadside landscape areas in Tung Chung would block the pedestrian linkages between the various development areas within the district, Ms Tam said that comprehensive networks of pedestrian walkways and cycle tracks were planned under the Tung Chung Study to promote convenient pedestrian and cycle movements within Tung Chung. In TCE, in order to provide a continuous pedestrian thoroughfare all the way from the railway station to the waterfront, the section of road running across the central open space would be constructed as a depressed road underneath the open space. As part of a comprehensive circulation strategy, linear parks were proposed to perform as both open space amenities and pedestrian routes. The walkway and cycling networks would be provided along the waterfront promenade and the linear park system, and would be connected with the existing town centre area.

Government, Institution or Community (GIC) Uses

61. A Member asked Ms Lee Mo Yi Cannis (representative of R1) why they would propose to rezone the land in Area 43 from "Green Belt" ("GB") to "Government, Institution or Community" ("G/IC"). In response, Ms Lee said that most of the "G/IC" zones designated on the TCTC and TCV OZPs were located near public housing developments and transport nodes. As the land in Area 43 was located between two high-density proposed

public housing sites of Areas 42 and 46 and was abutting the major road of Tung Chung Road, it could be used for development of GIC facilities to serve the local residents so that they did not need to travel a long distance to use the services in the “G/IC” sites in the town centre.

62. In response to the same Member’s enquiry on the land status of Area 43, Ms Tam said that the land zoned “GB” in Area 43 comprised both government and private land.

63. In response to the same Member’s question on whether facilities such as schools for the mentally handicapped and landfill for disposal of construction waste had been planned in Tung Chung, Ms Tam said that “G/IC” zones were designated in various parts of Tung Chung for the provision of GIC facilities to serve the district and some of the GIC facilities would also be provided in the public housing estates, for example, the public housing development in Area 42 to the north of Area 43. As regards provision of landfill, since TCV was an environmentally-sensitive area, it was not suitable for landfill development. The disposal of construction waste generated from the new developments in Tung Chung had been assessed in the EIA for TCNTE. The contractors of the development sites had to follow the statutory requirements for construction waste disposal.

64. A Member asked if it was a requirement for “G/IC” sites to be designated within 500m from residential zones. In response, Ms Tam said that there was no requirement for “G/IC” sites to be located within a certain distance from a residential zone under the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines. However, in the course of land use planning, “G/IC” sites would generally be designated in areas which were easily accessible by the public and they were usually close to residential zones. Apart from “G/IC” zones, it was also common for GIC facilities to be provided within public housing estates to serve the residents.

65. As Members had no more question to raise, the Chairman said that the hearing on the day was completed. He thanked the government’s representatives as well as the representers, commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence on another day and would inform them of the Board’s decision in due course. They left the meeting at this point.

66. There being no other business, the meeting was closed at 4:50 p.m.