

**Minutes of 995<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
Town Planning Board held on 28.10.2011**

**Present**

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

Chairman

Mr. K.Y. Leung

Mr. Walter K.L. Chan

Mr. B.W. Chan

Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan

Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan

Mr. Rock C.N. Chen

Mr. Y.K. Cheng

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong

Professor Paul K.S. Lam

Dr. James C.W. Lau

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Ms. Anita W.T. Ma

Professor S.C. Wong

Dr. W.K. Yau

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)  
Transport and Housing Bureau  
Miss Elsa Cheuk

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection  
Mr. Benny Wong

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department  
Mr. Frankie Chou

Director of Lands  
Miss Annie Tam

Director of Planning  
Mr. Jimmy Leung

Deputy Director of Planning/District  
Miss Ophelia Wong

Secretary

**Absent with Apologies**

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr. Felix W. Fong

Professor P.P. Ho

Dr. C.P. Lau

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Dr. W.K. Lo

Dr. Winnie S.M. Tang

Ms. Pansy L.P. Yau

Mr. Stephen M.W. Yip

**In Attendance**

Assistant Director of Planning/Board  
Miss H.Y. Chu

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Mr. J.J. Austin

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board  
Ms. Caroline T.Y. Tang

**Agenda Item 1**

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 994<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 14.10.2011

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 994<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 14.10.2011 were confirmed without amendments.

**Agenda Item 2**

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

- (i) [Closed Meeting]

2. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

- (ii) Amendments to the Confirmed Minutes of the 993<sup>rd</sup> Town Planning Board Meeting held on 30.9.2011

[Open Meeting]

3. The Secretary reported that there were typographical errors in the confirmed minutes of the 993<sup>rd</sup> Town Planning Board meeting held on 30.9.2011 concerning the review application No. A/I-CC/10. The errors were mainly related to the sale price of the niches mentioned by the applicant's representative. It was proposed that the confirmed minutes be amended to rectify the errors, and the proposed amendments were tabled at the meeting for Members' consideration. Members had no objection to the proposed amendments and noted that the amendments would be recorded in the form of an addendum to the confirmed minutes and that the concerned applicant would be informed of the amendments accordingly.

## General

### Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting]

West Kowloon Cultural District: Public Engagement Stage 3

(TPB Paper No. 8935)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

4. The following representatives of the West Kowloon Cultural District (WKCD) Authority and the Consultants were invited to the meeting at this point:

Hon. Ronald Arculli	]	
Professor Stephen Cheung	]	
Dr. Chan Man Wai	]	WKCD Authority
Mr. Derek Sun	]	
Ms. Helen Lung	]	
Mr. Alvin Chan	]	
Mr. Colin Ward	]	Foster+Partners
Mr. Kevin Chan	]	
Mr. Stephen Bingham	]	Mott MacDonald HK Ltd.
Mr. Eugene Dreyer	]	
Mr. Dickson Hui	]	LD Asia Limited
Mr. Lo Sing Wun	]	
Dr. Vincent Law	-	Public Policy Research Institute
Ms. Melanie Riach	-	TFP Farrells

[Mr. Raymond Y.M. Chan, Ms. Maggie M.K. Chan and Dr. W.K. Yau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

### Presentation Session

5. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited Hon. Ronald Arculli, Chairman of the Development Committee of the WKCD Authority, to present their proposal to the Town Planning Board (the Board).

6. Hon. Ronald Arculli thanked the Chairman and said that his team would brief Members on the Modified Conceptual Plan (MCP) and the proposed Development Plan (DP) for the WKCD exhibited under the Stage 3 Public Engagement (PE) exercise. He said that the MCP was based on Foster+Partners' "City Park" concept with the incorporation of the desirable features from the other two conceptual plans that formed part of the Stage 2 PE exercise.

7. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Colin Ward made the following main points on the MCP for the WKCD:

#### Main Features

- (a) the WKCD would host a rich mix of cultural, educational, leisure, residential and commercial activities that would interact with one another and enliven the everyday life of the city;
- (b) there would be 17 core arts and cultural venues within the WKCD, providing performing arts venues of different types and scales, museum and exhibition facilities as well as other arts and cultural facilities. The facilities to be provided included the Freespace, the Centre for Contemporary Performance, the Music Centre, the Xiqu Centre, the Medium Theatres, the Lyric Theatre, the Great Theatre, the Musical Theatre, the M+, the Mega Performance Venue, the Exhibition Centre, etc.;
- (c) the Great Park in the WKCD would bring the green countryside to the city centre for everyone to enjoy. Apart from being an ideal venue for outdoor activities, entertainment and dining, the park could also provide

venue for outdoor performances, sculpture displays and art activities;

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

- (d) the WKCD would reflect the DNA of urban Hong Kong which embraced the cultural richness of both East and West, and served as a haven for the city's traditions, memories, inspirations and aspirations;
- (e) the cultural facilities would be embedded in the city fabric. All visual arts, performance and educational offerings would be easily accessible to one another, adding a new dimension to Hong Kong;

[Professor Paul K.S. Lam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (f) the WKCD's primary artery, the Avenue, would be colonnaded with trees down its centre to create shade from the sun and rain. At ground level, visitors would be able to access many of the new cultural buildings as well as shops, restaurants, cafés, studios, workshops and educational facilities. Pedestrian-friendly streets would link up the northern and southern parts of the WKCD;
- (g) three main squares would be developed in the WKCD, namely the Xiqu Square, the Central Square and the Artist Square, which would provide places for people to relax and circulate among the various arts and cultural venues;

[Mr. Benny Wong arrived to join the meeting and Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

- (h) a series of squares, spaces, places and streets would provide further venues for cultural exchanges, street performances and general enjoyment by the public. These smaller internal spaces lined in-between the main cultural venues would allow informal performances, creating a cultural hotbed for the fusion of different performance arts;

[Mr. Laurence L.J. Li arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (i) retail and dining facilities would be introduced to the waterfront and the park. A small urban market would also be included in the WKCD to re-create the urban experience of old Hong Kong in the area. To bring life and vibrancy to the waterfront, a variety of facilities/activities were proposed/being considered such as viewing platforms, floating art pontoons, landing steps (providing a chance for people to touch the water), piers (taking people to the water), pavilions, kiosks, artworks, terraced dining areas, etc.;
- (j) as Victoria Harbour was a key landmark of Hong Kong, it was proposed that some water based activities should be brought to the parkland of the WKCD so as to enhance the connections between people and the harbour;
- (k) the garden bridge and the waterfront promenade would link up the Kowloon Park and the Great Park;

#### Connectivity and Traffic

- (l) the WKCD would be highly accessible through a totally integrated transportation network. Marine access would also be considered;
- (m) the WKCD would be well connected with the surroundings including Canton Road, the Kowloon Park, the Temple Street-Yau Ma Tei-Jordan area, the Mass Transit Railway stations (including Kowloon Station, West Kowloon Terminus, Austin Station, Jordan Station and Tsim Sha Tsui Station) and the bus stations (such as the cross-harbour bus stops and the public transport interchanges). Other than the provision of at-grade pedestrian linkages, a number of subways and footbridges would also be provided;

- (n) an environmentally friendly transport system would be introduced to the WKCD, which might include the provision of e-buses, travellers and people movers;
- (o) traffic would be kept below ground to make the district a place for people;

### Phasing

#### *Phase 1 (2014 to 2020)*

- (p) the WKCD would be developed in phases. The first batch of facilities to be commissioned around 2015 would include part of the Great Park, the Freespace and the Xiqu Centre. The other facilities to be commissioned in Phase 1 included the Music Centre, the Centre for Contemporary Performance, the Lyric Theatre, the Medium Theatre I, the Musical Theatre, the Mega Performance Venue plus Exhibition Centre and the M+ Phase 1. Other ancillary facilities including the Resident Company Centre, the Literary Arts Space, other creative learning facilities and a number of Arts Pavilions would also be constructed in Phase 1;

#### *Phase 2 (beyond 2020)*

- (q) the facilities to be commissioned in Phase 2 would include the Great Theatre, the Xiqu Small Theatre, the Medium Theatre II and the M+ Phase 2; and

#### *Temporary Uses*

- (r) in view of the long development timeframe, many sites in the WKCD would need to be put to temporary uses, e.g. temporary theatres, temporary markets, hoardings with artistic design, etc..

8. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Dickson Hui made the following main points on the proposed DP for the WKCD:

- (a) the proposed DP was generally in line with the development parameters stipulated in the draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K20/26, including a maximum plot ratio (PR) of 1.81 (with not more than 20% of the total PR for residential use), the provision of an open space of not less than 23 hectares and building height restrictions of 50mPD, 70mPD and 100mPD within the three sub-zones;
- (b) the Great Park and the waterfront promenade would be zoned as “Open Space (1)” (“O(1)”) and the Avenue comprising various squares would be zoned as “Open Space (2)” (“O(2)”). The “O” zone was intended primarily for the provision of a regional open space comprising the Great Park, waterfront promenade, piazzas and associated green connections for public enjoyment. Apart from the provision of various active and/or passive recreational uses, the regional open space would also accommodate ancillary arts, cultural and retail, dining and entertainment uses in creating a vibrant atmosphere for the whole WKCD. In this respect, the “O” zone would be subject to a maximum total gross floor area of 13,300m<sup>2</sup>;
- (c) the key cultural and arts venues would be zoned as “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Arts, Cultural, Entertainment and Commercial” (“OU(ACEC)”) along the waterfront while the inner area would mainly be zoned as “Other Specified Use” annotated “Mixed Uses” to support the development of the WKCD and to enhance the vibrancy of the WKCD;
- (d) no ‘Road’ would be reserved on the proposed DP since all the roads were proposed to be developed underground;
- (e) all zones would have a rich mix of uses so as to enhance the vibrancy of the WKCD;
- (f) in terms of building height, the building height restrictions stipulated in the OZP would be complied with;

- (g) accompanying the DP were a set of Notes (with Schedules of Uses) and Explanatory Statement as well as a number of plans to supplement and to guide the future development of the WKCD, such as Proposed Arts and Cultural Venue Plan, Proposed Urban Design Framework, Proposed Landscape Plan, Proposed Open Space Plan, Proposed Vehicular Access Points, and Proposed Pedestrian and Connectivity Plan; and

[Ms. Anna S.Y. Kwong returned to join the meeting and Miss Annie Tam arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

- (h) in order to solicit public views on the WKCD development, a one-month Stage 3 PE exercise (from 30 September 2011 to 30 October 2011) was launched. A press conference was held in September, a one-month exhibition and guided tours were organised in the Kowloon Park venue, a presentation was made to the Yau Tsim Mong District Council and a number of professional forums and discussion forums had been conducted. The public views and comments collected would be taken into account in finalising the DP. The finalised DP would be submitted to the Board for consideration by the end of 2011 and it was expected that the draft OZP would be approved by the Chief Executive in Council by the end of 2012.

### Question and Discussion Session

9. The Chairman thanked the WKCD team for giving the presentation and invited Members to give their views on the proposal. The following views and comments were expressed by Members:

#### Planning and Design

- (a) it should be ensured that the design and appearance of the residential developments in the northern part of the WKCD would blend in with the world class art and cultural venues within the WKCD;

- (b) iconic building(s) which would become the future landmark of Hong Kong and/or Victoria Harbour should be included in the WKCD;
- (c) in order to avoid possible light pollution to the surrounding areas, the lighting arrangement of the cultural venues/exhibition centres within the WKCD should be properly managed;
- (d) there were concerns that the relevant government regulations governing the operation of piers and ferries might not allow interesting design of ferry piers and landing steps at the waterfront;
- (e) schematic planting with selection of plant species to bloom at different times of the year should be undertaken for the WKCD;
- (f) more water features should be provided in the inner parts of the WKCD;

#### Proposed Uses/Facilities

- (g) the WKCD Authority should consider providing a floating theatre and a swimming pool along the waterfront, a facility for people to enjoy the under water view of Victoria Harbour, and a venue for graffiti artists in the WKCD;

#### Connectivity and Transport

- (h) as a large number of visitors would attend the cultural events at about the same time, traffic would be a major problem for the development of the WKCD. There should be a sufficient provision of car parking spaces. The use of public transport facilities should be encouraged and an efficient internal transport system should be developed;
- (i) there should be good connections between the WKCD and its neighbouring areas by the provision of footbridges and subways which should be functional and attractive;

### Phasing and Implementation

- (j) the Great Park should be properly managed and maintained;
- (k) there was concern that the budget of \$21.6 billion for the WKCD project was under-estimated. There was also concern that the construction of the underground road system in Phase 1 would constrain the design of the cultural venues to be developed in the later phase. More information on the construction phasing and development programme should be made available to the public;
- (l) sufficient funding should be provided to finance the WKCD development to make it a success; and

### Promotion

- (m) an open competition should be conducted with a view to selecting a more punchy and attractive name for the WKCD project.

10. In response, Hon. Ronald Arculli, Mr. Colon Ward and Mr. Dickson Hui made the following main points:

### Planning and Design

- (a) on the design and appearance of the residential developments, the WKCD Authority had discussions with the Lands Department concerning the imposition of relevant conditions on the land grant, where appropriate, and the WKCD Authority would issue a set of design guidelines for the residential developments in the WKCD. Besides, all the residential developments to be built within the WKCD would require planning permission from the Board;
- (b) many iconic buildings would be built in the WKCD such as the M+, the Mega Performance Venue, the Xiqu Centre, the Great Theatre and the

Music Theatre. The design of the buildings would be the result of open competitions and some of them would likely become new landmarks for Victoria Harbour;

- (c) the lighting arrangement and the design of the ferry piers would be considered at the detailed design stage;
- (d) schematic planting would be considered in the detailed landscape design with a view to providing seasonal changes to the soft landscape in terms of sense, colour and scent. Besides, water features would be included in the landscape proposal;

#### Proposed Uses/Facilities

- (e) the proposed new facilities/ideas would be taken into consideration at the detailed design stage;

#### Connectivity and Transport

- (f) the WKCD would be conveniently linked to the territory's rail and public transport network and an efficient internal transport network would be developed to link people to various parts of the WKCD. The importance of providing sufficient transport facilities to bring people to the area from different parts of Hong Kong was acknowledged;
- (g) a comprehensive transport study with a 50-year timeframe had already been conducted by the Transport Consultant to assess the possible traffic impact of the WKCD. According to the study, in addition to the provision of the mass transit system, a total of 2,000 car parking spaces, drop-off areas of over 1,500m in length and other public transport facilities would also be provided. Regarding the internal transport arrangement for the WKCD, apart from the proposed underground road system, there would also be the provision of travellers along the northern boundary of the WKCD for dispersing audiences from various

venues;

- (h) the design of the footbridge and subway connections would be taken into account at the detailed design stage;

#### Phasing and Implementation

- (i) the WKCD Authority would probably contract out the management and maintenance of the park to outside contractors but would maintain the overall governance by a set of rules and regulations to be devised. The challenge of allowing people to enjoy and use the park while minimising the maintenance costs would not be under-estimated. More importantly, it would be a matter of education and self-discipline;
- (j) more details of the construction phasing and development programme would be worked out at a later stage. The WKCD Authority had been carrying out close discussion with the Government about the financial arrangement of the project. Moreover, the WKCD had undertaken detailed study of the underground road system and other infrastructure and had found that the development of these facilities would not affect the design of the cultural venues to be developed later; and

#### Promotion

- (k) it would take time for the WKCD Authority to build up the image of the WKCD and a consultant had already been engaged to improve the marketing of the WKCD.

11. Hon. Ronald Arculli thanked the supportive views of the Board in general. He said that the WKCD Authority would commence the WKCD development according to the programme and the WKCD would be developed as a pioneer of sustainability and state-of-the-art information and communication technology.

12. The Chairman concluded that Members generally appreciated the good work done by the WKCD team. He reminded Members that should they have further views/comments on the WKCD development, they could submit them directly to the WKCD Authority during the Stage 3 PE exercise. The Chairman thanked the representatives of WKCD Authority and the Consultants for attending the meeting. They all left the meeting at this point.

[Mr. Walter K.L. Chan and Mr. Rock C.N. Chen left the meeting at this point.]

[The meeting adjourned for a short break of 3 minutes.]

### **Tuen Mun and Yuen Long District**

#### **Agenda Item 4**

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations to the  
Draft Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan No. S/YL-TT/15  
(TPB Paper No. 8937)

---

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

13. Members noted that the representations were related to a site at Au Tau for public rental housing (PRH) by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA) and the following Members had declared interests in this item:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Mr Jimmy Leung<br>as Director of Planning  | - being a member of the Building Committee (BC) and Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) of HKHA                                |
| Mr. Frankie Chou<br>as Assistant Director (2) of<br>the Home Affairs<br>Department | - being a representative of the Director of Home Affairs who was a member of the SPC and Subsidised Housing Committee of HKHA |
| Miss Annie Tam<br>as Director of Lands   | - being a member of HKHA  |
| Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong  | - being a member of HKHA  |

- Professor Edwin H.W. Chan - being a member of the BC of HKHA
- Dr. W.K. Lo - being a member of the BC of HKHA
- Mr. Stephen M.W. Yip - being a former member of HKHA
- Mr. Y.K. Cheng - spouse being Assistant Director  
(Development and Procurement), Housing  
Department

14. Members noted that Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong, Professor Edwin H.W. Chan, Dr. W.K. Lo and Mr. Stephen M.W. Yip had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the interests of Mr. Jimmy Leung, Mr. Frankie Chou, Miss Annie Tam and Mr. Y.K. Cheng were direct, Members agreed that they should be invited to withdraw from the meeting in this item.

[Mr. Jimmy Leung, Mr. Frankie Chou, Miss Annie Tam and Mr. Y.K. Cheng left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

#### Presentation and Question Session

15. The Chairman said that sufficient notice had been given to invite all the representers to attend the hearing, but they had either indicated not to attend the hearing or made no reply. As sufficient notice had been given to the representers, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in their absence.

16. The following representatives of the Planning Department (PlanD) were invited to the meeting at this point:

- Ms. Amy Cheung - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long  
(DPO/TMYL), PlanD
- Mr. Kepler Yuen - Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long  
(STP/TMYL), PlanD

17. The Chairman extended a welcome and invited the representatives of PlanD to brief Members on the representations.

18. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Kepler Yuen made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) on 8.4.2011, the draft Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/YL-TT/15 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance;
- (b) the amendments were related to the rezoning of the former Au Tau Departmental Quarters site from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) and “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) for a public rental housing (PRH) development with a maximum gross floor area of 52,000m<sup>2</sup>. To maintain a stepped building height profile on the site, two different height bands of 75mPD and 85mPD were stipulated and a maximum building height of three storeys was stipulated at the northern land parcel to accommodate a low-rise commercial centre. In order to define the limit of the development area and to protect the existing formed and natural slopes at the eastern and southern parts of the site, two sub-areas (Areas (a) and (b)) were designated within the “R(A)” zone. While the western part of the site, i.e. Area (a), was for development, the eastern and southern parts of the site, i.e. Area (b), would be maintained by the Housing Department (HD) as a landscape area with a landscape platform, trails, sitting-out area and shelters;
- (c) during the statutory exhibition period, three representations were received. On 17.6.2011, the three representations were published for public comments for three weeks and no comment was received;
- (d) on 30.9.2011, the Town Planning Board (the Board) decided to consider all the representations collectively;

## The Representations

- (e) R1 to R3 were submitted by the Shap Pat Heung Rural Committee, Designing Hong Kong Limited and Mr. Ng Wai Kwan (the representative of Shek Tong Tsuen Residents' Welfare Association) respectively. While R1 and R3 opposed the rezoning of the site to "R(A)" for PRH development, R2 supported the proposed PRH development;

## Grounds of Representations

### *Opposing*

- (f) the grounds of the representations put forth by R1 and R3 were mainly on the following aspects:
- (i) "wall effect" and air ventilation – the three 20-storey buildings to be erected in front of Yeung Uk Tsuen and Shek Tong Tsuen would block the view, sunlight and air ventilation and result in a "wall effect";
  - (ii) traffic impact, environmental impact and security problem – the proposed development would generate additional traffic causing traffic congestion and further deteriorate the air quality. The increase in population would affect the tranquility and public order of the villages nearby;
  - (iii) inadequate recreational facilities – there was currently a serious shortage of recreational facilities; and
  - (iv) lack of information – the villagers of Shek Tong Tsuen did not have any information about the construction of the public housing estate and the opposing views of the villagers had been ignored;

*Supportive*

- (g) R2 supported the PRH development without giving any reasons;

Representers' Proposals

- (h) the representers' proposals were summarised below:
- (i) R1 did not put forth any proposal but requested the Board to ensure that the impact on the local villagers was minimised;
  - (ii) R2 did not make any proposal; and
  - (iii) R3 proposed that the relevant government departments should note the concerns of the villagers and abort the PRH project;

Representations Not Related to Amendment Items

- (i) the representers also raised the following concerns which were not related to the amendment items:
- (i) R1 raised concerns on the need for small-scale electricity sub-station within the "Village Type Development" ("V") zone to obtain planning permission which took a long time to process and were often imposed with very harsh approval conditions. R1 requested that "Utility Installation for Private Project" providing electricity supply to New Territories Exempted House (NTEH) should be added to Column 1 of the Notes of the "V" zone so that such uses were always permitted; and
  - (ii) R2 urged the Board to ensure that the landscape of the adjacent land including Tai Tong was improved with strict planning control over open storage and by encouraging the rehabilitation and farming of agricultural land;

PlanD's Responses to the Representations and Representers' Proposals

*"Wall Effect" and Air Ventilation*

- (j) in recommending suitable building height restrictions for the representation site, PlanD had given due regard to the visual and air ventilation aspects. Various measures had been taken to minimise the impacts, including (i) staggering of heights of residential blocks to create a stepped building height profile; (ii) avoiding building development in the eastern and southern parts of the site to protect and retain the existing slopes; and (iii) locating the public housing blocks at strategically designed places to minimise the visual impact on the neighbouring villages. As demonstrated by the photomontages in the Visual Impact Assessment, the planned PRH development would not cause adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas;
- (k) compared with the ex-Au Tau Departmental Quarters, the Air Ventilation Assessment indicated that the overall air ventilation performance would be improved, even upon development of the planned PRH by the adoption of ground floor elevated block design, provision of larger building separations and incorporation of wind corridors with no podium in the planned PRH;

*Traffic Impact, Environmental Impact and Security Problem*

- (l) the technical assessments that were conducted indicated that the planned PRH development would not create adverse traffic and environmental impacts on the surrounding areas;
- (m) the planned PRH development would not generate noise pollution and the noise impact during the construction phase would be governed by relevant legislation;
- (n) as confirmed by the Commissioner of Police, the proposed PRH

development would unlikely create any security problem to the area;

*Inadequate Recreational Facilities*

- (o) the existing and planned provision of open space and recreational facilities for the area covered by the OZP had been assessed and was found to meet the requirements stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines after taking into account the estimated population growth to be brought by the planned PRH development. Besides, recreational facilities including basketball courts, table-tennis tables and landscape terraces would be provided in the planned PRH development and these facilities would also serve the nearby villagers;

*Lack of Information*

- (p) HD had consulted the Town Planning & Development Committee (TP&DC) of the Yuen Long District Council (YLDC) on several occasions between March 2009 and January 2010 and the TP&DC of YLDC had generally supported the proposed PRH development. On 29.6.2011, the Director of Housing had written to R3 to explain in detail the planned PRH development scheme and to respond to the villagers' concerns;

*Representers' proposals*

- (q) R3's proposal to abort the planned PRH project was not supported as the site was suitable for the planned PRH development and the relevant technical assessments had demonstrated that the planned PRH development would not create adverse impacts on the surrounding areas;

*Representations Not Related to Amendment Items (R1)*

- (r) it was considered appropriate to require electricity sub-stations to obtain planning permission from the Board in order to ensure that such

developments would not cause significant adverse impact on the surrounding areas;

- (s) the processing of a planning application within a two-month statutory time limit, which included the time required for departmental circulation and publication period for public inspection, was reasonable. Approval conditions were necessary to minimise the impacts and ensure fire safety in the village developments;

*Representations Not Related to Amendment Items (R2)*

- (t) on the designation of “Open Storage” (“OS”) zones, it should be noted that “OS” zones had been designated in appropriate areas on the statutory town plans, and the planning application system provided a mechanism to exercise planning control over open storage use within other zonings. For unauthorised open storage uses, they were subject to enforcement action by the Planning Authority; and
- (u) on encouraging agricultural rehabilitation, it should be noted that the policy of agricultural rehabilitation was not a matter under the purview of the Board.

19. As Members had no question to raise, the Chairman thanked the representatives of PlanD for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

20. The Chairman said that the zoning amendments were related to a PRH development which served the housing need of the community. Since the various impact assessments conducted had proven that the PRH development would not generate significant impact on the surrounding areas, the “R(A)” zoning was considered appropriate. Members agreed. Members then went through the reasons for not upholding R1 and R3 as detailed in paragraph 6.2 and Annex III of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate.

Representation No. R2

21. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive view of Representation No. R2.

Representation No. R1

22. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. R1 for the following reasons:

- (a) as demonstrated in the Visual Impact Assessment, the proposed public housing blocks had been strategically designed and placed to ensure minimal visual impact on the neighbouring villages. The planned public rental housing (PRH) development would not cause unacceptable adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas;
- (b) compared with the previous development on the representation site before demolition, it had been demonstrated by the Air Ventilation Assessment that the overall air ventilation performance would be improved by the adoption of ground floor elevated block design, larger building separations and the introduction of wind corridors with no podium in the planned PRH development. The planned PRH development would not cause adverse air ventilation impact on the local area;
- (c) it had been established through the Traffic Impact Assessment that the cumulative traffic impact from the planned PRH development would not create adverse traffic impact;
- (d) the planned PRH development would not generate noise pollution problem. The noise impact during construction stage would be governed by relevant legislation. The planned PRH development also would not create security problem; and

- (e) the existing and planned provision of open space and recreational facilities for the area covered by the Tai Tong Outline Zoning Plan could still meet the requirements stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines after taking into account the estimated population growth brought by the planned PRH development.

Representation No. R3

23. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold Representation No. R3 for the following reasons:

- (a) as demonstrated in the Visual Impact Assessment, the proposed public housing blocks had been strategically designed and placed to ensure minimal visual impact on the neighbouring villages. The planned public rental housing (PRH) development would not cause unacceptable adverse visual impact on the surrounding areas;
- (b) compared with the previous development on the representation site before demolition, it had been demonstrated by the Air Ventilation Assessment that the overall air ventilation performance would be improved by the adoption of ground floor elevated block design, larger building separations and the introduction of wind corridors with no podium in the planned PRH development. The planned PRH development would not cause adverse air ventilation impact on the local area; and
- (c) the planned PRH development would not generate noise pollution problem. The noise impact during construction stage would be governed by relevant legislation. The planned PRH development also would not create security problem.

[Mr. Jimmy Leung, Mr. Frankie Chou, Miss Annie Tam and Mr. Y.K. Cheng returned to join the meeting at this point.]

## General

### Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Revised Draft Town Planning Board Guidelines for  
Designation of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” Zone and  
Application for Development under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance  
(TPB Paper No. 8936)

---

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

24. The Chairman invited the following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD) to brief Members on the revised draft Town Planning Board Guidelines for Designation of “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Mixed Use” (“OU(MU)”) Zone and Application for Development under section 16 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the TPB Guidelines):

Mr. J.J. Austin - Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board, PlanD

25. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. J.J. Austin made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

#### Background

- (a) the purpose of the TPB Guidelines was to set out the planning intention and uses permissible in different types of buildings zoned “OU(MU)”, the main planning criteria for designating the “OU(MU)” zone, the main development restrictions and design requirements, and the considerations for assessing planning applications;
- (b) on 22.10.2010, the Town Planning Board (the Board) considered the draft TPB Guidelines and agreed that the relevant stakeholders should be consulted upon refining the explanation on Schedule III of the “OU(MU)” zone;

- (c) to address the Board's concern, paragraphs 3.2 and 6.3 of the draft TPB Guidelines had been amended to clearly state that Schedules I and II of the "OU(MU)" zone would apply to all development proposals (submission of building plans or lease modification applications) involving new development/ redevelopment/ wholesale conversion of a building on the site which were received after the site was rezoned to "OU(MU)" on the OZP. Upon completion of the development/ redevelopment/ wholesale conversion, any further partial conversion/ change of use within the building would need to follow Schedules I and II. On the other hand, Schedule III would apply to a building which had not undergone any redevelopment/ wholesale conversion after the concerned site was rezoned to "OU(MU)";
- (d) on 24.1.2011, the Planning Sub-Committee (PSC) of the Land and Development Advisory Committee (LDAC), which comprised representatives from the professional institutes, the Real Estate Developers Association (REDA) and relevant government departments, was briefed on the draft TPB Guidelines;
- (e) after incorporating the relevant comments collected from the PSC in the briefing, the revised draft TPB Guidelines was re-circulated to Members of the PSC on 15.6.2011 for their further consideration;

#### Comments on the Draft TPB Guidelines

- (f) the consultees generally supported the introduction of the "OU(MU)" zoning. Their main views were as follows:
  - (i) while some stakeholders were concerned that there was too detailed control on the building design, some stakeholders considered that the potential environmental nuisance caused by uses in mixed-use developments should be avoided as far as possible;

- (ii) some stakeholders considered that the “OU(MU)” zoning should not only confine to sites that were previously zoned “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”); and
- (iii) while some stakeholders considered that the uses to be included under Column 1 of the three user schedules should be expanded, others considered that the Column 1 uses should be carefully considered to prevent causing potential environmental nuisance;

PlanD’s responses

- (g) the PlanD’s responses were as follows::
  - (i) the “OU(MU)” zoning was intended to provide flexibility for mixed-use developments while maintaining appropriate planning control;
  - (ii) the building design requirements would provide a framework to ensure physical segregation between non-conforming uses within the zone, so as to minimise nuisance to sensitive uses; and
  - (iii) the “OU(MU)” zoning would be applied in suitable areas depending on the local circumstances and it would not be restricted to the rezoning of “C/R” sites;
- (h) REDA made some detailed comments and suggestions on the Column 1 and 2 uses for the “OU(MU)” zone, and PlanD’s responses were as follows:
  - (i) on the suggestion that agricultural use on the rooftop of a mixed-use development should be permitted as of right, it was considered that the growing of plants on rooftop of any development was regarded as a type of greening and was already

permitted as of right;

- (ii) on the suggestion that the studio, home-office use and clinics should be put under Column 1 for Schedule I (for non-residential building or non-residential portion of a building), it was noted that clinic was already a Column 1 use under Schedule I. As studio and home-office uses were residential in nature, it was considered more appropriate to put them under Column 2 of Schedule I;
  - (iii) on the suggestion that more commercial uses, such as adult entertainment, funeral facility and creative arts should be included in Column 1 of Schedule II (for residential building or residential portion of a building), it was considered inappropriate to incorporate these uses into Column 1 as these uses were not compatible with residential uses; and
  - (iv) on the suggestion that the car parking requirements should be reduced to encourage a lower usage of cars, it was considered that car parking requirements should follow the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and that any specific requirement for a particular development would be subject to the agreement of the Commissioner for Transport;
- (i) in response to the comments of some stakeholders, PlanD suggested to make the following amendments to the draft TPB Guidelines:
- (i) to add the words “under normal circumstances” after “worse case scenario” in paragraph 5.6; and
  - (ii) to add a sentence in paragraph 8.1 to remind the applicant of the need to demonstrate that no environmental pollution or nuisance would be generated by the proposed mixed-use development; and

- (j) it was also proposed that a remark should be added to the Explanatory Statement of the relevant OZP for the “OU(MU)” zone to explain the meaning of the term ‘an existing building before redevelopment/conversion’ used in Schedule III of the Notes of the “OU(MU)” zone.

26. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the drawing shown in Appendix II of the revised draft TPB Guidelines (Annex I of the Paper) and whether such a vertically mixed-use development would be implemented in reality, Mr. J.J. Austin said that the drawing was only an illustration of the concept of a ‘vertical’ mixed-use development.

27. After deliberation, Members agreed that the revised draft TPB Guidelines was suitable for promulgation.

28. The Chairman thanked the representative of PlanD for making the presentation.

### **Agenda Item 6**

[Open Meeting]

### **Any Other Business**

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

29. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 11:30 a.m..