

**Minutes of 1017th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 17.8.2012**

Present

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

Chairman

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-Chairman

Professor S.C. Wong

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr. C.P. Lau

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Laurence L.J. Li

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Ms. Anita W.T. Ma

Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. H.W. Cheung

Dr. Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Lincoln L.H. Huang

Miss Janice W.M. Lai

Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms. Christina M. Lee

Mr. Stephen H.B. Yau

Director of Lands
Ms. Bernadette H.H. Linn

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection
Mr. Benny Y.K. Wong

Principal Assistant Secretary (Transport)
Transport and Housing Bureau
Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Assistant Director (2), Home Affairs Department
Mr. Eric K.S. Hui

Director of Planning
Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

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

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Professor Edwin H.W. Chan

Mr. Rock C.N. Chen

Professor P.P. Ho

Mr. Clarence W.C. Leung

Dr. W.K. Lo

Dr. W.K. Yau

Professor K.C. Chau

Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau

Mr. H.F. Leung

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/ Board
Ms. Christine K.C. Tse

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Miss H.Y. Chu (a.m.)
Mr. Edward W.M. Lo (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board
Mr. J.J. Austin (a.m.)
Ms. Johanna W.Y. Cheng (p.m.)

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting]

Confirmation of Minutes of the 1016th Meeting held on 27.7.2012

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

1. The minutes of the 1016th meeting held on 27.7.2012 were confirmed without amendments.

Agenda Item 2

Matters Arising

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

(i) Town Planning Appeal Abandoned

[Open Meeting]

Town Planning Appeal No. 4 of 2007 (4/07)

Proposed Development of the Red Cross Headquarters, Conference Hall and Meeting Rooms, Non-Government Organization Offices and Commercial Offices in “Government, Institution or Community (3)” Zone,

Lung Wui Road, Central, Hong Kong

(Application No. A/H24/5)

2. The Secretary reported that the appeal was lodged on 6.2.2007 by the appellant to the Appeal Board Panel (Town Planning) (the Appeal Board) against the Board’s decision to reject on review application No. A/H24/5 for the proposed development of the Red Cross Headquarters, conference hall and meeting rooms, non-government organization offices and commercial offices in the “Government, Institution or Community(3)” zone on the Central District (Extension) Outline Zoning Plan. On 7.8.2012, the appeal was abandoned by the appellant on his own accord. The abandonment was confirmed by the Appeal Board on 14.8.2012 in accordance with Regulation 7(1) of the Town Planning (Appeals) Regulations.

(ii) Appeal Statistics

3. The Secretary reported that as at 17.8.2012, 22 cases were yet to be heard by the Appeal Board. Details of the appeal statistics were as follows:

Allowed	:	28
Dismissed	:	123
Abandoned/Withdrawn/Invalid	:	160
Yet to be Heard	:	22
Decision Outstanding	:	1
<hr/>		
Total	:	334

Agenda Item 3

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments to the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/29

(TPB paper No. 9163)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Hearing for Group 1 (Representations R1 to R7 (part) and Comment C5)

4. The following Members declared interests in this item:

- Mr. Rock C.N. Chen - his father owned textile companies near Tai Hing Gardens Phases I and II.
- Dr. C. P Lau - owned a flat at Kwun Tsing Road.

5. Members agreed that while the interests of Mr. Rock C.N. Chen were direct and substantial, the interests of Dr. C.P. Lau were remote and indirect as the concerned property was far away from the representation sites for Group 1. Members agreed that Dr. C.P. Lau could stay at the meeting. Members noted that Mr. Rock C.N. Chen had tendered an apology for not attending the meeting and Dr. C.P. Lau had not yet arrived.

main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

- (a) on 23.3.2012, the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM/29, incorporating amendments mainly to reflect the recommendations of the Area Assessment 2009 of Industrial Land in the Territory (the Area Assessment 2009) by rezoning sites in Area 9 to the west of the West Rail Tuen Mun Station from “Industrial” (“I”) to various zones including “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”), to rezone sites in Area 44 and Area 56 from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group B)” zones respectively, to rezone a site in Area 41 from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “G/IC”, to incorporate a proposed road in Area 54, and to amend the Notes of the OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (b) during the two-month exhibition period, a total of 19 representations were received. On 1.6.2012, the representations were published for public comments and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, five public comments were received;
- (c) on 13.7.2012, the Board decided to consider the representations and comments in two groups. Group 1 was related to the rezoning of the industrial sites in Area 9 from “I” to various zones including “CDA”, “OU(B)” and “C(1)” (representations R1 to R7 (part) and comment C5), while Group 2 was related to the rezoning of “G/IC” sites in Area 44 and Area 56 and a “GB” site in Area 41 (representations R7 (part) to R19 and comments C1 to C4);

The Representations

- (d) the seven representations in Group 1 were submitted by MTR Corporation Ltd (MTR) (R1), the Tuen Mun District Council (TMDC) (R2), two District Councillors (R3, R4), TM Properties Investment Ltd. (R5), the Kowloon Motor Bus Co. (1933) Ltd. (KMB) (R6) and an individual (R7)(part);
- (e) representations R1 to R4 and R7 (part) opposed the rezoning of the industrial sites in Area 9;
- (f) although R5 and R6 indicated support for the proposed “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” zonings, R5 opposed the phasing arrangement, the site boundary and building height restriction of the “CDA(1)” zone while R6 opposed the planning intention and the building height restriction of the “CDA(2)” zone;

[Dr. C.P. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Grounds of Representations and Representers' Proposals

- (g) the grounds of representation and the representers' proposals were summarized as follows:

Intention of Rezoning

- (i) the bus depot use at Tuen Mun Town Lot (TMTL) 80 (within “CDA(1)” zone) had been terminated since end-2010 and had been leased for warehouse use. The Government had already allowed the bus company to use a site in Tuen Mun Area 16 for parking of buses through short-term tenancy (STT). The rezoning of the bus depot to “CDA(1)” would give the impression of ‘collusion between Government and business sector’; (R2 and R4)
- (ii) by rezoning the bus depot sites to other uses, the Government would lose the opportunity to obtain a higher premium for the two sites; (R2)

- (iii) for the “C(1)” and “OU(B)” zones, there was no such demand for business and commercial uses in the area and the rezoning of the sites would lead to misuse of scarce land resources; (R7)

Relocation of Existing Uses

- (iv) the details of how the existing bus depots would be relocated should be unveiled as over 100 on-street buses were parked overnight causing nuisance to the nearby residents. The bus company should park these buses in the bus depots; (R2, R3 and R7)
- (v) the future use of the bus depot sites should only be considered nearer the time when the franchise of the bus company was to expire; (R2)

Lack of Consultation

- (vi) the TMDC was not consulted before the amendments to the Tuen Mun OZP were gazetted; (R2)

Rail Noise

- (vii) noise from rail operations would be of concern to the future tenants of the “CDA(1)”, “CDA(2)” and “C(1)” zones as the proposed sites were close to the West Rail and the Light Rail; (R1)
- (viii) the project proponent of the “CDA(1)”, “CDA(2)” and “C(1)” sites should be requested to assess and evaluate the potential noise nuisances from rail operations to the future tenants and incorporate and implement adequate noise mitigation measures at the development in order to achieve the Environmental Protection Department (EPD)’s noise limit. The project proponent should be responsible for implementation of adequate noise mitigation measures, at its own cost, in the proposed development so as to provide a quality living environment to the future residents as well as fulfil the requirements stipulated in the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO); (R1)

- (ix) environmental assessment studies, including railway noise assessment, should be provided to MTR for comment; (R1)

“CDA(1)” site

- (x) the building height restriction of 100mPD for the “CDA(1)” zone would result in a monotonous townscape. The building height restriction for the “CDA(1)” zone should be relaxed to 140mPD for a distinct height profile of 156mPD-140mPD-120mPD-100mPD descending from the highest band of 156mPD at Century Gateway; (R5)
- (xi) the boundary of the “CDA(1)” zone which had incorporated a public toilet, vacant government land, Crown Data Centre (TMTL 79) and the ex-bus depot (TMTL 80) into a single CDA zone was opposed. As Crown Data Centre had undergone refurbishment in recent years and was under active use for IT related non-industrial use, redevelopment was not anticipated in the foreseeable future. On the other hand, the ex-bus depot was temporarily used for logistics purpose and was ready for redevelopment. Bundling the two lots together would create uncertainty that would jeopardise the timely implementation of any redevelopment scheme; (R5)
- (xii) phased development should be explicitly stated in the Notes of the “CDA(1)” zone and taken into account by the Board in the consideration of redevelopment proposal or planning application under the “CDA(1)” zone; (R5)
- (xiii) that part of the “CDA(1)” site which was previously zoned “O” should not be arbitrarily amended as this was intended to serve the local residents; (R7)

“CDA(2)” site

- (xiv) the building height restriction of 100mPD for the “CDA(2)” zone

would result in a monotonous townscape. The building height restriction for the “CDA(2)” zone should be relaxed to 120mPD for a distinct stepped height profile of 156mPD-140mPD-120mPD -100mPD descending westward from Century Gateway to the urban fringe. This would capitalise the locational advantage of the site to form a rail-based development node in the core area of Tuen Mun and create an interesting townscape; (R6)

(xv) as the “CDA(2)” zone covering the two bus depots at TMTL 81 and TMTL 82 fell within the 200m-radius and 300m-radius respectively of Tuen Mun Station, residential use should be permitted in the “CDA(2)” zone to reinforce the rail-based development approach, optimise land resources and allow for a balanced development mix that would complement the development at the “CDA(1)” site. Restricting the “CDA(2)” zone for commercial uses would lead to an oversupply of commercial floor space in Tuen Mun. Flexibility should be allowed in the “CDA(2)” zone; (R6)

(xvi) the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone should be amended to allow comprehensive commercial and residential development. Given that “Flat” use was already under Column 2 of this zone, a maximum domestic plot ratio of 5 should be incorporated in the Remarks of the Notes of the OZP; (R6)

The Comments

(h) there was one commenter (C5) in Group 1 submitted by Mr. Lam Tak Leung (a District Councillor). The commenter supported the “CDA” concept as the Central Business District (CBD) of Tuen Mun New Town was too small to cater for the population in Tuen Mun and the visitors from the Mainland, particularly upon the completion of the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge. The commenter urged for the early implementation of the plan;

[Ms. Anita W.T. Ma arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Government's Responses to the Representations and Representatives' Proposals

- (i) the Government's responses to the representations and the representatives' proposals were summarized as follows:

Intention of Rezoning

- (i) the rezoning of the "I" sites in Tuen Mun Area 9 was to take on the recommendations of the 2009 Area Assessment, which was to review the potential for changing industrial land to non-industrial uses so as to facilitate better utilisation of scarce land resources;
- (ii) as the statutory plan making process was a public consultation process that was open and transparent, there was no question of collusion between the Government and the business sector;
- (iii) the "C(1)" zone was to reflect the two planning applications approved by the RNTPC of the Board, while the "OU(B)" zone was to facilitate the transformation of the industrial area to general business uses;

Relocation of Existing Uses

- (iv) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) pointed out that the two existing bus depots (TMTL 81 and TMTL 82) were of vital importance to ensure the adequate provision of bus services in Tuen Mun. The bus operator would need to identify suitable sites to maintain the current standard of services, park all the buses and demonstrate that the normal operation of bus services would not be disrupted before any redevelopment proposal of the bus depots would be considered;
- (v) as the sites were zoned "CDA", any future development would require the submission of a planning application with a master

layout plan (MLP) to the Board, thus ensuring that the issue on the relocation of the bus depot would be properly addressed. TMDC would be consulted when processing the planning application;

Lack of Consultation

- (vi) in accordance with established procedures, the 2009 Area Assessment was undertaken by PlanD and vetted by concerned departments. The Board's consideration of the findings of the 2009 Area Assessment was conducted in an open and transparent manner, and the endorsed findings had been uploaded to the PlanD homepage. The further land use reviews were undertaken by PlanD to refine the zoning proposals taking into account departmental comments and the latest circumstances. The amended OZP was then gazetted under s.5 of the Ordinance for public inspection;

- (vii) in accordance with the current practice, the concerned DC would be consulted either before or during the exhibition of amendments to the OZP. For the case under concern, the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/29 was exhibited from 23.3.2012 to 23.5.2012 and the Planning and Development Working Group of TMDC and the full TMDC were consulted on 11.4.2012 and 8.5.2012 respectively;

Rail Noise

- (viii) the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) advised that rail noise was subject to statutory control under the Noise Control Ordinance (NCO) and rail noise impacts should be addressed in the design of the "CDA(1)" development to ensure that the railway noise levels would not exceed the limits of the NCO and the relevant standards of the HKPSG. In this connection, the future developer would be required to conduct a noise impact assessment (NIA) and to implement the mitigation measures recommended in the NIA;

- (ix) the developer(s) of the "CDA(1)" and "CDA(2)" sites would be

required to submit a planning application with an MLP together with *inter alia* an environmental assessment report on the possible environmental problems caused at the construction and operational stage of the development and the mitigation measures proposed. For the “C(1)” site, ‘Flat’ use would require planning permission from the Board and any environmental problems would need to be addressed in a similar way. Upon receipt of such application and assessment reports, they would be published for public comment under the provisions of the Ordinance;

Building Height Restriction of “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” sites

- (x) the building height restriction for the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” sites should be considered in the context of the overall building height profile for the Tuen Mun New Town, which was formulated after a comprehensive study taking into account such factors as the existing height profile, urban design and air ventilation considerations. The building height restrictions (BHRs) imposed on the OZP for the Tuen Mun New Town had gone through the statutory planning and representation hearing process and had been approved by CE in C on 3.5.2011. Any change to the BHRs imposed would need to be supported with strong justification;

- (xi) the current building height bands in the north-south direction at and adjacent to the representation sites were 85mPD to the south, 100mPD at the representation site and 120mPD to the north. A change in building height restrictions from 100mPD to 140mPD for the “CDA(1)” site and 120mPD for the “CDA(2)” site would have implications on the overall building height profile;

- (xii) the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” sites were 1.56 ha and 3.44 ha respectively. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape, PlanD (CTP/UD&L, PlanD) commented that if the proposed building height was to increase to 140mPD and/or 120mPD, the overall built form of the sites would be quite bulky from the visual

perspective. Moreover, a building height restriction of 100mPD was already sufficiently high to allow a development with varied building heights and adequate building gaps. Besides, the minor relaxation clause was provided under the Notes to provide flexibility to cater for developments with design and planning merits. There was no strong justification to relax the building height restrictions;

“CDA(1) site

(xiii) the inclusion of Crown Data Centre, the public toilet and the government land into the “CDA(1)” zone was to enhance comprehensiveness of the development and to make better use of the land resources in the long term;

(xiv) in accordance with Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 17 (TPB PG-No.17), if the developer could demonstrate with evidence that due effort had been made for site amalgamation but no agreement could be reached between landowners, the Board would consider allowing the phased development of a CDA site;

(xv) a small portion (about 0.027 ha) of TMTL 79 was previously zoned “O” on the OZP. The rezoning of the “O” portion to “CDA(1)” was mainly to rectify the zoning boundary to tally with the lot boundary of TMTL 79. After the rezoning, the overall provision of open space in Tuen Mun would still meet the HKPSG requirements;

“CDA(2)” site

(xvi) the “CDA(2)” site was located at the core of an industrial area surrounded by existing industrial buildings. Given that some of the industrial buildings were still in operation, residential development at the subject site would cause industrial/residential (I/R) interface problems. The intention to develop the “CDA(2)” site mainly for commercial use was to use the site as a buffer between the industrial area and the future residential development at the “CDA(1)” site; and

(xvii) 'Flat' use had been included in Column 2 of the Notes of the "CDA(2)" zone mainly to provide flexibility if the future development was able to suitably address the I/R interface problem. In this regard, an explicit expression of domestic plot ratio under the "CDA(2)" zone was considered inappropriate. For the sake of clarity, it was proposed to specify in the Explanatory Statement that the development intensity of any mixed development involving residential element would be subject to the maximum permissible level of 5/9.5 for domestic/non-domestic uses generally applicable to the New Town.

10. Professor S.C. Wong indicated that he had to declare an interest as KMB, one of the representers, was also the sponsor of one of his research projects at Hong Kong University. As the donations were for the university's research projects for which Professor Wong had no direct pecuniary interest, Members agreed that the interest of Professor Wong was remote and indirect and that he should be allowed to stay at the meeting.

11. The Chairman then invited the representatives of the representers to elaborate on the representations.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Representations No. R5 and R6

12. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Dickson Hui made the following main points:

- (a) R5 and R6 supported the proposed "CDA(1)" and "CDA(2)" zoning. However, R5 did not agree to the boundary, the lack of phasing arrangement and the building height restrictions under the "CDA(1)" zone. R6 also did not agree to the planning intention and the building height restriction of the "CDA(2)" zone;

- (b) being adjacent to Tuen Mun station, the two CDA sites were centrally located in Tuen Mun New Town and was a focal point in the town core. The two CDA sites should be developed with an ample housing supply and a balanced development mix, an interesting urban design and good connections with the station and the surrounding areas such as the Town Park;
- (c) as the Crown Data Centre site was not under single ownership, it would cause uncertainty to the implementation of the “CDA(1)” zoning;
- (d) for the “CDA(2)” zone, the planning intention should be for ‘commercial and residential uses’ provided that the I/R interface problem could be addressed and a domestic plot ratio of 5 should be added to the Notes;
- (e) instead of one building height at 100mPD covering the entire town core, the building height for the “CDA(1)” site should be relaxed to 140mPD while that for the “CDA(2)” site should be relaxed to 120mPD; and
- (f) it should be specified in the Explanatory Statement and the Notes of the “CDA(1)” zone that phased development would be allowed.

[Mr. Eric K.S. Hui left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

13. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation and two physical models, Mr. Andy Leung presented a baseline scheme (based on the current OZP requirements) and a notional scheme (based on the representers’ proposed amendments) covering the two CDA sites and made the following main points:

- (a) in the baseline scheme, there would be about 500 flats in 6 residential blocks in the “CDA(1)” site and about 220,000m² of commercial GFA in 6 office towers on the “CDA(2)” site. The residential and commercial buildings on the sites would have a congested layout because of the imposition of the building height restriction of 100mPD;

- (b) as the amount of commercial floor space provided in the “CDA(2)” site was nearly equivalent to Pacific Place (Phases 1 to 3), it would flood the market and compete with the other “OU(B)” sites in Tuen Mun;
- (c) the building height profile of the baseline scheme was monotonous as all the buildings would be built to the maximum permissible height of 100mPD, replicating the situation in Tsim Sha Tsui East;
- (d) the design objective of the notional scheme was to provide a balanced mix of uses with more housing supply, similar to Tai Koo Shing and Sha Tin New Town Plaza. The scheme would also provide Tuen Mun with a new town core at Tuen Mun West Rail station as well as quality urban open space and streetscape;
- (e) by changing the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone from purely commercial use to a mix of commercial and residential uses, the notional scheme would increase the housing supply from about 500 flats to more than 1,500 flats and result in a more balanced mix as the amount of commercial floor space would be reduced;
- (f) a building height of 140mPD and 120mPD is proposed for the two CDA sites so that an interesting and aesthetically pleasing town core would be created, with building heights descending from Century Gateway at 156mPD to 140mPD to 120mPD to 100mPD. This would create a new town core image, similar to the height profile around the Ma On Shan station (descending from 150mPD to 130mPD to 120mPD) and the Wu Kai Sha station (descending from 185mPD to 130mPD to 120mPD);
- (g) the notional scheme with composite commercial/residential uses for the “CDA(2)” site would also result in reduced building footprint and less overall plot ratio. This would facilitate the provision of more open space and greening at ground level for public enjoyment;
- (h) the existing lorry parks at Kin Fung Circuit near the river channel were

proposed to be relocated to TMTL 80 upon its redevelopment so that a pedestrian link from Kin On Street to Tuen Mun station could be provided; and

- (i) an all-weather pedestrian connection at podium level would be provided linking up Tuen Mun station through the new town core with the current Tuen Mun city centre. Upon completion of the proposed development, a new landmark would be provided for Tuen Mun.

14. Mr. Dickson Hui continued with the presentation and made the following main points:

- (a) notwithstanding the response given in the TPB Paper that the flexibility to allow for domestic development in the “CDA(2)” zone subject to the solving of I/R interface problem would be set out in the Explanatory Statement, it was considered more appropriate to specify under the planning intention and in the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone that residential uses would be allowed if the I/R interface problem could be addressed;
- (b) although a stepped building height profile for Tuen Mun was stipulated on the OZP, a large area which was about eight times the size of Tsim Sha Tsui East was subject to a building height restriction of 100mPD. This would result in a flat building height profile and a monotonous skyline for a large part of Tuen Mun. In order to reflect the status of Tuen Mun station as a focal point, the building height for the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” zones should be allowed to exceed 100mPD so that taller buildings at the proposed town core would create a punctuation effect; and
- (c) even though TPB PG-17 provided for phased development within a CDA site, the conditions set out in TPB PG-17 were difficult to achieve as the applicant was required to demonstrate with evidence that no agreement between the various landowners could be reached. It was noted that the Crown Data Centre site and ex-bus depot site were physically distinct from one another and could be developed separately. Besides, Crown

Data Centre had been refurbished into a data centre which would not pose any environmental constraints on the redevelopment of the ex-bus depot site. In this regard, the provision to allow phased development should be specifically stated in the Notes for the “CDA(1)” zone.

15. As the representers’ representatives had finished their presentation, the Chairman invited questions from Members.

Land Use Mix and Industrial/Residential Interface

16. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the job opportunities that would be created by restricting the “CDA(2)” zone for commercial use, Mr. Dickson Hui said that a suitable land use mix for the “CDA(2)” zone would also create job opportunities. On the other hand, restricting the “CDA(2)” site for commercial use at a plot ratio of 9.5 would flood the market with commercial GFA and slow down the development pace of the surrounding “OU(B)” sites. Mr. Andy Leung supplemented that the implementation of the “CDA(2)” site would likely be delayed due to the low financial viability of a purely commercial development on such a large site.

[Mr. Eric K.S. Hui returned to join the meeting at this point.]

17. A Member enquired about the reason for restricting the “CDA(2)” zone to commercial uses. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan said that the “CDA(2)” site was currently occupied by two existing bus depots and was very close to other industrial buildings in the area. DEP was concerned that allowing residential uses at the “CDA(2)” site would cause I/R interface problems and did not support residential use at the site unless the bus depots were relocated. Residential development at the “CDA(1)” site, however, was considered acceptable as it was located further away from the existing industrial area.

18. Mr. Dickson Hui said that as two industrial buildings to the west of the “CDA(2)” site had already been wholly converted to ‘Shop and Services’ use, there was already a buffer and the “CDA(2)” site should be suitable for residential use. Moreover, he considered that the “CDA(2)” zone could be designed in such a way that non-sensitive uses were provided to buffer the residential uses against the industrial uses in the surrounding, as

demonstrated in their notional scheme.

19. A Member noted that there was a strong demand for residential development in Tuen Mun as many residents in public rental estates wanted to move into private residential flats and there was little demand for commercial floor space. In this regard, the planning intention for the “CDA(2)” zone to be for commercial use was not in line with the character and general objective of Tuen Mun as a satellite town. This Member considered that the I/R interface should not be an issue as the existing bus depots would need to be relocated before any development could commence on the site. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan said that as the two CDA zones covered three bus depot sites, the I/R interface problem would arise if one of the bus depots were to remain in operation while the other two depots were redeveloped. As there was also concern on buses being parked overnight on the streets in the vicinity, an overall strategy was required to deal with the parking of buses and the redevelopment of the bus depots. While the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone was for commercial uses, ‘Flat’ was included as a Column 2 use and it was considered that a certain proportion of residential development on the site could be permitted provided that the I/R interface problem was addressed.

20. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the timing to introduce residential use at the “CDA(2)” site, Mr. W.W. Chan considered that unless there was a firm commitment to relocate the bus depots within the “CDA(2)” site, residential use within the “CDA(2)” site should not be permitted.

21. A Member enquired about the strategic demand for commercial use in Tuen Mun and whether the I/R interface would be a problem in the long term. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan said that the rezoning proposal was based on the 2009 Area Assessment which considered that the bus depot sites could be changed to commercial use. Regarding the I/R interface problem, the “CDA(1)” site was further away from the existing industrial areas and should not cause any I/R interface problems in the long run. For the “CDA(2)” site, however, as it was very close to the existing industrial area and the lease for part of the site (TMTL 82) was a private treaty grant with a user restriction for bus depot, it would not be appropriate at this moment in time to allow residential uses at the site.

22. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr. Dickson Hui said that they agreed that

the I/R interface needed to be addressed and the representers' proposal was to set out in the planning intention of the "CDA(2)" zone that residential use would be permitted provided that the I/R interface problem was suitably addressed.

Building Height Restriction for the CDA Sites

23. A Member enquired whether it would be possible to have building height variations within the height restriction of 100mPD. In response, Mr. Andy Leung said that it was necessary to develop the office towers up to the maximum permitted building height of 100mPD in order to achieve the permitted gross floor area. It would be difficult to add variation to the building height of the commercial buildings as the site coverage of the buildings (currently at 50%) would need to be further increased if the building height were to be reduced. He said that by relaxing the building height, more open space could be provided at the ground floor and the site coverage of the office buildings could be reduced. The current building height restriction of 100mPD did not provide any flexibility for the future development to vary the building height and the opportunity for the provision of ground floor space and building setbacks would be lost. In this regard, the Board should address the issue now and should not wait until an application for minor relaxation of the building height was submitted.

24. Mr. Dickson Hui said that the Board should follow the example of the stepped building height concept around the Ma On Shan station and the Wu Kai Sha station.

[Mr. H.W. Cheung left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

25. A Member considered that the planned building height profile did not seem to have taken into account the presence of mountains to the east and west of Tuen Mun and questioned whether the building height restriction of 100mPD was appropriate. Another Member considered it reasonable to allow a taller building height at the town centre and to allow the building height to drop from 140mPD to 120mPD respectively for the two CDA sites. A third Member enquired about the reason for not supporting the relaxation of the building height restriction for the two CDA sites. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan said that an assessment had been conducted by PlanD which concluded that a 20-storey commercial development with a site coverage of 40-50% and a plot ratio of 9.5 could be accommodated

within the site even with a building height restriction of 100mPD. Regarding the general building height profile, the overall concept was to take the existing development on top of Tuen Mun station with a building height of 156mPD as the landmark and to introduce three height bands stepping downwards in the north to south direction from 120mPD to 100mPD to 85mPD. Mr. Chan said that there was scope to vary the building height within the development site by way of an application for minor relaxation of the building height. The Chairman noted that an application for minor relaxation of the building height could be submitted at the MLP stage under the minor relaxation clause.

26. Mr. Andy Leung said that although there was scope to vary the building height, it was not desirable as the resultant commercial towers would only be 16 to 17 storeys tall, taking into account the electrical and mechanical floors and the latest standard storey height of 4m to 4.5m. Moreover, commercial development might not be viable in view of the large amount of commercial GFA to be developed, and the bus depots would not be redeveloped, adversely affecting the proposed residential use at the “CDA(1)” site. He pointed out that the low usage of the existing depot for the parking of buses was due to its obsolete design.

27. In response to a Member’s enquiry, Mr. W.W. Chan said that the development on top of Tuen Mun station was allowed to be built up to 156mPD as the development needed to provide a public transport terminus on the ground floor and the site was intended to be a focal point for the new town core.

Phased Development of “CDA(1)”

28. In response to a Member’s enquiry on the integration with Crown Data Centre shown in the physical model, Mr. Andy Leung said that the proposal for the existing Crown Data Centre site was only a conceptual proposal to demonstrate how that site could be integrated with the redevelopment of the ex-bus depot site, should a comprehensive redevelopment scheme of the entire “CDA(1)” zone materialise.

Lorry parks at Kin Fung Circuit

29. In response to the same Member’s enquiry on the proposal concerning the lorry

parks, Mr. Andy Leung said that there were some existing lorry parks located at the northwest corner of Kin Fung Circuit which formed part of the “CDA(1)” zone. The proposal was to relocate these lorry parks into the basement of the future development, pedestrianise the existing Kin Fung Circuit and to provide a pedestrian linkage from Kin Fung Circuit to the eastern side of the Tuen Mun River Channel.

30. Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung also enquired about the reprovisioning of the lorry parks for public use in the notional scheme. In response, Mr. Andy Leung said that the representer had no objection to specify the reprovisioning of the lorry parks as a requirement of the scheme as the existing lorry parks were a nuisance and would need to be removed in order for Kin Fung Circuit to be pedestrianised.

Other Issues

31. The Chairman was concerned that the generous provision of ground floor open space shown in the notional scheme would be omitted by the developer at the MLP stage in view of the high value of ground floor shopping space. In response, Mr. Andy Leung said that the current proposal was to provide a building setback and to provide ground floor open space for public enjoyment. He confirmed that these proposals would be set out in the MLP to be submitted to the Board for consideration in future.

32. Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung stated that hotels instead of just offices as illustrated in the baseline scheme could be developed on the “CDA(2)” site. He further enquired about the number of jobs that would be generated and the GFA mix proposed by the representer. In response, Mr. Andy Leung said that they had not estimated the number of jobs that would be generated by the notional scheme. Regarding the GFA mix, he said that their current proposal was to provide a commercial GFA of about 20,000 m² on the “CDA(2)” site, which was compatible with the existing commercial GFA provided at Sha Tin New Town.

33. As Members had no further questions and the representers’ representatives had nothing to add, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed, the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board’s decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representatives of the representer and the PlanD representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the

meeting at this point.

34. The meeting was adjourned for a short break at this point.

Deliberation Session

35. The Chairman noted that there was a stepped height concept for the Tuen Mun area with building heights stepping down in the north to south direction and that the building plans for development on top of Tuen Mun station at 156mPD were approved before the building height restrictions were imposed on the OZP.

36. A Member considered that the building height profile for Tuen Mun should be in the form of a V-shape in order to reflect the mountains on both sides of the valley floor. Another Member disagreed and considered that an overall building height concept with taller buildings at the town centre and building height stepping down away from the centre was appropriate. Such building height concept should be reflected on the OZP.

[Mr. Eric K.S. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

37. A Member considered that as there was a mechanism to apply for minor relaxation of the building height restriction, the building height restriction of 100mPD for the two CDA sites should be maintained. This would allow the Board to consider the application for minor relaxation of the building height based on the merits of the proposed scheme.

38. The Vice-Chairman noted that while R5 and R6 requested the building height restriction for the two CDA sites to be relaxed to 140mPD and 120mPD, their proposals were for a predominantly residential development on the two sites. As a building height restriction of 100mPD would be more than adequate for a residential development and there was a mechanism for minor relaxation, there was no need to relax the building height restrictions. He was, however, concerned that all buildings would be built up to the maximum permitted height without any variation in height profile. He said that a mechanism should be provided to ensure good building design at the site. Taking the example of Science Park, he said that a single building height restriction for an area did not

necessarily result in a monotonous skyline as an interesting skyline could be created by innovative building design.

39. In response, the Chairman said that as the sites were zoned “CDA”, the Board would have control over the design, aesthetics and building height of the development through the MLP submission process. This view was echoed by a Member who considered that the development restrictions should not be amended at this stage and any proposal for relaxation of the restrictions could be considered at the MLP submission stage. At that stage, the Board would be able to consider in detail the planning gains and design merits based on a specific scheme. The representers’ proposals shown to the Board at the meeting were only notional schemes which were not binding, rather than concrete proposals forming part of an MLP.

40. This view was shared by another Member who remarked that should the building height restriction be relaxed to 120mPD and 140mPD as requested, the representer might submit another application for minor relaxation at the MLP submission stage to further increase the building height.

41. Regarding the proposal to allow residential use at the “CDA(2)” site, the Chairman noted that the Notes of the CDA zone did not preclude residential development on the site as ‘Flat’ was a Column 2 use. Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung considered that the discussion was a bit academic as an MLP would need to be submitted for the “CDA” sites anyway and issues such as the I/R interface and building height would need to be addressed holistically at the planning application stage. It would also be premature to change the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone based on a notional scheme.

42. On the issue of allowing phased development at the “CDA(1)” site, the Chairman noted that the planning intention of the CDA zone was for comprehensive development of the site and the relevant Town Planning Guidelines (TPB-PG No. 17) had already set out the circumstances under which a phased development of the CDA site would be permitted. As the mechanism for phased development was already in place, the Chairman considered it unnecessary to vary the Board’s practice by amending the Notes.

43. In response to a Member’s enquiry, the Secretary said that a Planning Brief

would be prepared to provide guidance on the development of the CDA site. The Planning Brief would set out the various design requirements and the type of government, institutional and community facilities that should be provided in the development. The relevant government departments would be consulted on the Planning Brief and it would be submitted to the Board for endorsement.

44. The Chairman concluded the discussion by saying that Members generally agreed to retaining the building height restriction of 100mPD for the two CDA sites and when there was a need to increase the building height, there was a provision for minor relaxation of the building height restrictions in the Notes. Members also generally agreed that the planning intention and the Notes of the “CDA(2)” zone should not be amended to include residential use as ‘Flat’ was already a Column 2 use. Members also agreed not to amend the Notes of the “CDA(1)” zone to allow phased development as the mechanism was already set out in the relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines.

45. Members agreed to note the views of R5 (part) and R6 (part) supporting the rezoning of the industrial sites in Area 9 and not to uphold the opposing representations of R1 to R4, R5 (part), R6 (part) and R7 (part). Members then went through the suggested reasons for not upholding the representations as detailed in paragraph 7.2 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate.

Representation No. R5 (part) and R6 (part)

46. After further deliberation, the Board noted the views of the above representations in support of the “CDA(1)” and “CDA(2)” zonings in Area 9.

Representation No. R1 to R4, R5 (part), R6 (part) and R7 (part)

47. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold representations R1 to R4, R5 (part), R6 (part) and R7 (part) and not to amend the OZP to meet the proposals made by the representations for the following reasons:

- (a) the rezoning exercise was to take on board the recommendations of the 2009 Area Assessment having regard to such factors as vacancy rate, ownership pattern, building age, and existing conditions, and environmental considerations. The detailed land use zonings had taken into account

departmental concerns and latest circumstances of the area; **(R2 to R4 and R7)**

- (b) “CDA” zone was an appropriate zoning for the representation site taking into account the planning intention of land use restructuring and upgrading the environment of the areas, the interim I/R interface problem, the requirement for provision of adequate supporting facilities; **(R1 to R4 and R7 (part))**
- (c) concerns on noise impact could be addressed and considered at the s.16 planning application submission stage. The submission of planning application with adequate technical assessments including noise impact assessment would be required for the representation site; **(R1)**
- (d) planning brief would be prepared to guide the development of the “CDA” sites and planning permission would be required to regulate the future design and layout by way of MLP submission. The applicants would be required to submit technical assessments and also development programme including, among others, site and timing for relocation of the existing bus depot and its related facilities. Such planning application would be published in accordance with the provision of the Ordinance for comment by the public; **(R1 to R4 and R7 (part))**
- (e) it was the intention to achieve comprehensive and integrated development under the “CDA” zone. Allowance for phased development had clearly been set out in the TPB PG-No. 17 and each case would be considered by the Board on its merits; **(R5)**
- (f) the building height restrictions for the two “CDA” sites were considered appropriate and there was no strong justification to relax the building height restrictions as proposed. The minor relaxation clause under the Notes of the “CDA” zone would provide the flexibility to cater for development with design and planning merits; **(R5 and R6)**

- (g) the “CDA(2)” site was currently occupied as bus depots and surrounded by existing industrial buildings. The planning intention of the site was primarily for commercial use and would serve as a buffer to the residential use to the east of Tsun Wen Road. As residential use of the site was not compatible with the adjacent development, revision of the planning intention of the “CDA(2)” zone for residential use or explicit expression of a maximum domestic plot ratio for the site was not appropriate; **(R6)**

- (h) the rezoning of a very minor portion of the “O” zone to “CDA(1)” was only for rectification of zoning boundary to tally with the existing lot boundary of TMTL 79; and **(R7 (part))**

- (i) “C(1)” zone was to reflect the s.16 planning applications approved by the RNTPC of the Board, while the “OU(B)” zone was to facilitate the transformation of the industrial area. **(R7)**

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

Agenda Item 3 (cont'd)

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments to the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/29

(TPB Paper No. 9164)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Hearing for Group 2 (Representations R7 (part) to R19 and Comments C1 to C4)

48. The following Members declared interests in this item:

- Mr. Rock C.N. Chen - his father owned textile companies near Tai Hing Gardens Phases I and II.
- Dr. C. P Lau - owned a flat at Kwun Tsing Road.

49. Members agreed that while the interests of Dr. C.P. Lau were direct and substantial as the property under concern had direct views on the representation sites for Group 2, the interests of Mr. Rock C.N. Chen were remote and indirect as the properties under concern were far away from the representation sites. Members agreed that Dr. C.P. Lau should withdraw the meeting. Members also noted that Mr. Rock C.N. Chen had tendered an apology for not attending the meeting.

[Dr. C.P. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Presentation and Question Session

50. As reasonable notice had been given to the representers and commenters to invite them to attend the hearing, Members agreed to proceed with the hearing in the absence of the other representers and commenters who had indicated that they would not attend or made no reply to the invitation to the hearing.

51. The following representatives from the Planning Department and from the representers were invited to the meeting at this point:

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr. W.W. Chan	District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long (DPO/TMYL)
Mr. C.C. Lau	Senior Town Planner/West

R10 and C4 (Yim Tin Sang and Kong Fung Yi, Tuen Mun District Councillors)

Mr. Yim Tin Sang	-	Representer
------------------	---	-------------

C1 (Cheung Hang Fai, Tuen Mun District Councillor)

Mr. Cheung Hang Fai	-	Commenter
---------------------	---	-----------

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

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

Background

- (a) on 23.3.2012, the draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/TM/29, incorporating amendments mainly to reflect the recommendations of the Area Assessment 2009 of Industrial Land in the Territory (the Area Assessment 2009) by rezoning sites in Area 9 to the west of the West Rail Tuen Mun Station from “Industrial” (“I”) to various zones including “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”), “Commercial (1)” (“C(1)”) and “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Business” (“OU(B)”), to rezone sites in Area 44 and Area 56 from “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) zone to “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and “Residential (Group B)” zones respectively, to rezone a site in Area 41 from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “G/IC”, to incorporate a proposed road in Area 54, and to amend the Notes of the OZP was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance);
- (b) during the two-month exhibition period, a total of 19 representations were received. On 1.6.2012, the representations were published for public comments and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, five public comments were received;
- (c) on 13.7.2012, the Board decided to consider the representations and comments in two groups. Group 1 was related to the rezoning of the industrial sites in Area 9 from “I” to various zones including “CDA”, “OU(B)” and “C(1)” (representations R1 to R7 (part) and comment C5), while Group 2 was related to the rezoning of “G/IC” sites in Area 44 and Area 56 and a “GB” site in Area 41 (representations R7 (part) to R19 and comments C1 to C4);

The Representations

- (d) there were 13 representations in Group 2 which were related to the rezoning of the “G/IC” and “GB” sites;
- (e) R8 was jointly submitted by a District Councillor (Chu Shun-nga), the Incorporated owners of Hanford Garden and the Owners’ Committee of Verdant Villa opposing the rezoning of the two “G/IC” sites at So Kwun Wat Road;
- (f) R7 (part) and R9 to R19 were submitted by Yim Tin Sang and Kong Fung Yi (two District Councillors), Owners’ Rights Association of Yuet Wu Villa, Association of Kwun Tung Wing and nine individuals opposing the rezoning of the “G/IC” site at Wu On Street to “R(A)”;
- (g) R7 (part) also opposed the rezoning of the “GB” site at the junction of Castle Peak Road/Hoi Wing Road to “G/IC”;

The Comments

- (h) there were 4 comments (C1 to C4) on the representations expressing the same views as representations R7 (part) and R9 to R19 in opposing the “R(A)” zone in Wu On Street. The comments were submitted by Cheung Hang Fai (District Councillor) (C1), Yim Tin Sang and Kong Fung Yi (two District Councillors) (C4) and two individuals;

Grounds of Representations and Representers’ Proposals

- (i) the grounds of the representations and comments were summarized as follows:

“R(B)” sites at So Kwun Wat Road

Housing need and Infrastructural provision (R8)

- (i) when considering residential development, PlanD should adopt a holistic approach and consider whether there were adequate infrastructure and facilities to support the planned development instead of relying on the sole reason of increasing housing land supply;

Traffic Impact (R8)

- (ii) the corresponding increase in buildings, facilities and population around Castle Peak Road would further aggravate the traffic load there. If the Government did not have measures to enhance the transport facilities in the district to tie in with the development, the existing residents would be adversely affected;

“GB” Zoning (R8)

- (iii) the sites zoned “GB” were small in area and were currently slopes and boundary walls of the adjoining residential site. The proposal would mislead the public to think that they were land for open space purposes;

“R(A)” site at Wu On Street

Intention of the Change in land Use (R14)

- (iv) the motivation for the change in land use was in doubt. According to the planning system, “R(A)” sites could be developed for various commercial uses upon application to the Board. The interest of property developers might override the interests of residents and community development;

Burden on Community/Recreational Facilities and Infrastructural Provision (R7(Part), R9 to R15, R17 to R19 and C1 to C4)

- (v) the residents of Yuet Wu Villa had purchased their flats on the understanding that low-rise community facilities would be built at the “G/IC” site rather than residential developments over 20 storeys in height. Residents felt cheated by the Government;

(vi) the community facilities provided to serve the residents of Tuen Mun Area 44 were nearly fully utilized. The rezoning would reduce the amount of recreational space, intensify the demand for public transport, community and medical facilities and aggravate the traffic congestion problem;

(vii) the site should be used for the provision of libraries, study rooms and integrated services centres for children, youths and elderly, which were lacking in the Tuen Mun Pier area with a population of about 100,000;

Privacy and Property Value (R11, R14 and R17)

(viii) the proposed development would infringe the privacy of residents of Yuet Wu Villa, affect the living quality and create psychological burden on the residents;

(ix) the development of the site would block the views of Yuet Wu Villa and the value of their properties would drop;

Environmental, Air Ventilation and Visual Quality Aspects (R9 to R15, R18 to R19 and C4)

(x) the increase in the number of vehicles would worsen the air quality of the area. There would be air and noise pollution during the construction period, causing severe nuisance to the residents;

(xi) the wall effect of the proposed “R(A)” development would affect air ventilation to Yuet Wu Villa, particularly the units at Blocks No. 13, 14 and 15;

Consultation (R9, R16 and R19)

(xii) the Government had not conducted public consultation for the residents of Tuen Mun;

“G/IC” site at Castle Peak Road/Hoi Wing Road (R7)

- (xiii) should the Light Rail system be extended to the Gold Coast, the site at Area 41 would be an important transport hub, connecting Pui To Station and Sam Shing Station;

Representers’ Proposals

- (j) R9, R10 and R14 proposed to retain the original “G/IC” zoning of the site at Wu On Street and to withdraw the zoning amendment; and
- (k) C1 to C3 proposed to provide community facilities and a 3-storey indoor recreation centre with facilities such as ice skating rink and bowling on the site at Wu On Street;

Government’s Responses to the Representations, Comments and Proposals

- (l) the Government’s responses to the representations, comments and proposals were summarized as follows:

“R(B)” sites at So Kwun Wat Road

Housing need and Infrastructural provision

- (i) rezoning “G/IC” sites to avoid under-utilization of sites long reserved but without specific development plans was one of the measures adopted by the Administration to make better use of land resources. As the representation sites were suitable for housing development and were not required for GIC development, it was considered appropriate to rezone the sites for residential use to meet the housing needs of the community;
- (ii) as the rezoned sites were small (about 0.41ha and 0.35ha) and were subject to a plot ratio restriction of 1.3, the proposed residential development (with less than 145 flats) would not

create significant adverse impact on traffic and infrastructural provisions;

Traffic Impact

- (iii) the Commissioner for Transport (C for T) commented that the trip generation and attraction from the proposed residential developments would not be too substantial and hence the proposed residential developments would not have adverse traffic impact on the adjacent road network, in particular Castle Peak Road;

“GB” Zoning

- (iv) only slopes at the fringe of the previous “G/IC” zones were rezoned to “GB”. The rezoning would help preserve the vegetated slopes and better reflect the existing site characteristics. It should be noted that there was a presumption against development under the “GB” zone;

“R(A)” site at Wu On Street

Planning Intention of the Change in Land Use

- (v) the site was zoned “R(A)” which was compatible with the zoning of the surrounding residential developments in the area. While commercial uses such as ‘Office’, ‘Eating Place’ and ‘Shop and Services’ were always permitted on the lowest three floors of the residential building, commercial uses above the lowest three floors would require planning permission from the Board;

Burden on Community/Recreational Facilities and Infrastructural Provision

- (vi) as there was no requirement for free-standing G/IC facilities on the site, upon review and departmental consultation, the site was rezoned for housing development;

- (vii) the planned provision of community and recreational facilities were adequate in Tuen Mun to meet the needs of the planned population according to the requirements stipulated in the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG). Departments consulted had confirmed that there was no need to reserve the site for community and recreational use. Only SWD indicated that a premises-based Day Care Centre for the Elderly (DE) should be incorporated in the residential development to serve the local and future residents in the neighbourhood of the Butterfly Bay area. This requirement could be incorporated when preparing the lease conditions for the site in due course;
- (viii) since only about 164 flats would be provided, C for T commented that the trip generation and attraction from the rezoning would not be too substantial and hence it would not have adverse traffic impact on Wu On Street or the adjacent road network. The site was currently well served by public transport including Light Rail Transit (LRT) services as well as franchised buses and Green Mini Buses (GMBs);

Privacy and Property Value

- (ix) the proposed development at this site would be separated from Yuet Wu Villa by Wu On Street. It would unlikely affect the living quality of the residents nearby;
- (x) land was a scarce resource and there was a need for increasing housing supply to meet the pressing socio-economic needs in Hong Kong. As the representation site was suitable for high-density housing development and was not required for GIC development, it was appropriate to rezone the site for residential use to meet the housing needs of the community;
- (xi) housing price was not a material planning consideration in the rezoning process. Besides, there was never any guarantee that

views of residents would not be blocked, in the light of the development pace of Hong Kong;

Environmental, Air Ventilation and Visual Quality Aspects

- (xii) with a building height of 85mPD which was commensurate with the surrounding developments, the future residential development on the site would not result in adverse environmental, air ventilation and visual impacts on its surroundings;
- (xiii) according to the findings of the air ventilation assessment (AVA) by expert evaluation (EE) for the Tuen Mun New Town (NTNW) conducted in 2009, the subject site was not located at a major air path. As the area to the north east of the subject site was generally open and the site was located close to the Tuen Mun River Channel and the waterfront, the prevailing winds would not be obstructed;
- (xiv) CTP/UD&L commented that the site was surrounded by open space (the LCSD open space to the east) and air paths (Wu On Street and Wu Hong Street). These air paths were expected to effectively mitigate possible air ventilation impacts and enable sufficient wind from the prevailing wind direction in the NE quadrant to enter the area and enhance the air ventilation;
- (xv) developments near the representation site were mainly low to medium-rise. High-rise residential developments nearby included Tuen Mun Wu Hong Police Quarters and Yuet Wu Villa. The building height of Yuet Wu Villa was generally about 85mPD, which was the same as the proposed site. As shown in the photomontages in Plans H-3d and H-3e of the Paper, the proposed development at the site was not incompatible with the surrounding area;
- (xvi) the proposed development at this site would be at a distance from

the adjacent developments, and was not expected to have adverse visual impacts on the nearby developments. The Chief Architect/Central Management Division 2 of Architectural Services Department (CA/CMD2, ArchSD) commented that the site was relatively small and would unlikely create wall effect;

Consultation

- (xvii) the statutory plan-making process, which involved the exhibition of OZP amendments for public inspection and the hearing of representations and comments received, was itself a public consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance. The Board would take into account the relevant planning consideration and the representations and comments received before making a decision;

- (xviii) under the current practice, the concerned District Council would be consulted either before or during the exhibition of the OZP amendments. For the case under concern, the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/29 was exhibited from 23.3.2012 to 23.5.2012 and the PDWG of TMDC and TMDC were consulted on 11.4.2012 and 8.5.2012 respectively;

“G/IC” Site at Castle Peak Road/Hoi Wing Road

- (xix) the Transport and Housing Bureau had decided not to proceed with the LRT proposed in the Tuen Mun East Area. There was no need to reserve the site for LRT related uses;

- (xx) the site had been used as a temporary government works area and did not form part of the adjoining “GB” site. The site was subject to traffic noise and was not suitable for housing development. However, it could be developed for G/IC uses which were less noise sensitive; and

- (xxi) the need for reserving the site for car parking purpose would be borne in mind in consultation with concerned departments in formulating the long-term use for the site. Suitable public consultation would be undertaken in due course should there be any long-term G/IC use identified for the site.

54. The Chairman then invited the representer and commenter to elaborate on their representations.

Representation No. R10 and Commenter C4

55. Mr. Yim Tin Sang made the following main points:

- (a) the Tuen Mun District Council had objected to the proposed rezoning of the site at Wu On Street to “R(A)”;
- (b) the provision of traffic infrastructure for the area was inadequate as the West Rail currently did not reach Tuen Mun Pier. Even upon the completion of the Tuen Mun Wu Hong Police Quarters nearby, no improvement in LRT services were made. In this regard, the newly proposed “R(A)” development would add burden to the traffic situation;
- (c) as the West Rail did not reach the Butterfly Bay area, there was inadequate provision of transport facilities linking the residents in this part of Tuen Mun with other areas in Hong Kong;
- (d) although the residents depended on buses serving the various residential estates in the area to reach places beyond Tuen Mun, a proper bus terminus had not been provided for the local residents;
- (e) the Wu Shan Road/Wu King Road junction was an accident black spot. The proposed residential development at Wu On Street would add traffic load onto this intersection and increase the likelihood of traffic accidents at the junction;

- (f) there was a lack of social facilities serving the elderly in the Butterfly Bay area. The proposed provision of a Day Care Centre for the Elderly was inadequate for the local population as other types of elderly services should also be provided. There was also a general lack of services for the handicapped and a lack of Integrated Family Services Centres;
- (g) the area was currently served by a mobile library which was totally inadequate for the local population. The nearest standard public library was the one at Tai Hing Estate;
- (h) there was a shortage of public car parking spaces to serve drivers coming to the Butterfly Bay area for recreational activities. Public car parking spaces should be provided at the Wu On Street site; and
- (i) in view of the above, the site should be reserved for the provision of government, institution or community (G/IC) facilities and a proper balance should be struck between housing development and the development of G/IC facilities to serve the local residents.

Commenter C1

56. Mr. Cheung Hang Fai made the following main points:

- (a) the sites in the vicinity of the “R(A)” site at Wu On Street were already developed. The development of the “R(A)” site would only add to the congestion;
- (b) the site should be retained for the provision of G/IC facilities to serve the local population living not only in Yuet Wu Villa but also Miami Beach Towers, Richland Gardens, Marina Garden, etc;
- (c) the proposed development on such a small site (0.23 ha) for private residential use would block existing views and cause air ventilation problems to its surroundings; and

- (d) the site should be developed for G/IC facilities to serve the local residents.

57. In response to the Chairman's enquiry on the existing provision of G/IC facilities in Tuen Mun, Mr. W.W. Chan referred to Annex VI of the Paper and said that the planned provision of G/IC facilities met the requirements as set out in the HKPSG. He pointed out that a public library was provided at Butterfly Estate, an indoor recreation centre was provided at Wu Hong Road and a public clinic was provided at Wu King Road. Relevant government departments had been consulted on whether there was any need to provide G/IC facility on the site, and they advised that the only G/IC facility required to be provided at the site was a Day Care Centre for the Elderly. In response to a Member's enquiry on the meaning of the term 'NA' in Annex VI of the Paper, Mr. W.W. Chan said that 'NA' meant that there was no set standard for the provision of the facility.

58. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. W.W. Chan said that in accordance with the HKPSG, three libraries were provided in the Tuen Mun area and this had met the minimum requirement as set out in the HKPSG. As there was already an existing library at Butterfly Estate, the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) considered that there was no need to provide additional library facilities at the Wu On Street site. However, mobile library facilities were provided to serve residents in the area. The same Member enquired about the traffic impact of the proposed development on the area. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan confirmed that as advised by C for T, the proposed development of about 124 flats at the site would not cause any substantial traffic impact.

59. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether other G/IC facilities could be provided at the Wu On Street site, Mr. W.W. Chan said that the relevant government departments had been consulted and the only requirement was for a Day Care Centre for the Elderly at this moment in time. Nevertheless, should any need for G/IC facilities be identified later, the requirement could be incorporated into the lease before the sale of the site.

60. A Member enquired whether the District Council had requested for any additional G/IC facilities to serve the local population. In response, Mr. Yim Tin Sang said that the District Council had consistently requested for the provision of additional library services to serve the population. However, unless the current planning standards

were revised, additional library facilities would not be provided as the current provision had already met the minimum requirements as set out in the HKPSG.

61. As Members had no further questions and the representer and commenter had nothing to add, the Chairman said that the hearing procedures had been completed, the Board would deliberate on the representations in their absence and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the representer, commenter and the PlanD representatives for attending the hearing. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

62. The Chairman noted that the housing sites proposed were small in size which could allow the participation of small developers. As there was a need to optimise the use of scarce land resources, G/IC sites with no specific development programme were proposed to be rezoned to meet the changing circumstances. Regarding the provision of G/IC facilities at the "R(A)" site at Wu On Street, he noted that the relevant government departments would be consulted on the draft lease conditions and any requirement for the provision of G/IC facilities at the site could be incorporated at that stage. He also noted that the only G/IC facility to be provided at the moment was a Day Care Centre for the Elderly.

63. For the "R(B)" sites at So Kwun Wat Road, the Chairman noted that the main concern of the representations was the adverse traffic impact of the future residential development on the sites. On this point, C for T indicated that the amount of trips generated by the residential development on these sites would not be substantial and they would not cause adverse traffic impact to the area. The Chairman also noted that the concern of the representation on the rezoning of the "GB" site to "G/IC" was not substantiated as the site was no longer required for LRT related uses. He concluded and Members agreed that the zoning amendments were appropriate and the representations should not be upheld.

64. Members then went through the reasons for not upholding representations R7 (part) to R19 as detailed in paragraph 6.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate.

Representation No. R7 (part) to R19

65. After further deliberation, the Board decided not to uphold representations R7 (part) to R19 and not to amend the OZP to meet the representations for the following reasons:

So Kwun Wat sites (R8)

- (a) rezoning “G/IC” sites to avoid under-utilization of sites long reserved but without specific development plans was one of the measures adopted by the Administration to expand land resources. As the representation sites were suitable for housing development and were not required for GIC development, it was considered appropriate to rezone the sites for residential use to meet the housing needs of the community;
- (b) the proposed residential development with development restriction of a maximum plot ratio of 1.3 and a maximum building height of 6 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) under the “R(B)” zone was considered appropriate to ensure that the future development at this site would be compatible with the surrounding area of medium-density residential developments;
- (c) the proposed rezoning to residential use with appropriate development restrictions would not result in adverse impacts on traffic and infrastructural provisions;
- (d) the rezoning of the slopes at the fringe of the previous “G/IC” zones would help preserve the vegetated slopes and better reflect existing site characteristics;

Wu On Street Site (R7 (part) and R9 to R19)

- (e) the previously planned community hall at the site had been implemented in the nearby Tuen Mun Area 44 Joint-user complex which was completed in 2011. The site was not required for free-standing G/IC facilities;
- (f) land was a scarce resource and there was a need for expediting housing

supply to meet the pressing socio-economic needs in Hong Kong. As the representation site was suitable for housing development, it was considered appropriate to rezone the site for residential use to meet the housing needs of the community;

- (g) a premises-based Day Care Centre for the Elderly would be incorporated as part of the residential development. The detailed requirement of the Day Care Centre for the Elderly would be worked out for incorporation into the lease conditions for the site;
- (h) the proposed rezoning to residential use with appropriate development restrictions would not result in adverse impacts on traffic, infrastructural provisions, environmental, air ventilation and visual aspects;
- (i) the planned provision of community and recreational facilities were adequate in Tuen Mun to meet the needs of the planned population according to the requirements stipulated in the HKPSG;
- (j) the statutory plan-making process was itself a public consultation process. The concerned DC would be consulted either before or during the exhibition of the OZP amendments according to the established practice; and

Site at the Junction of Castle Peak and Hoi Wing Road

- (k) there was no need to reserve the site for LRT related uses, nor was the site suitable for residential use. Suitable public consultation would be undertaken in due course should there be any long-term G/IC use identified for the site.

[Dr. C.P. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 4

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Review of Application No. A/YL-KTS/559

Temporary Open Storage of Machinery for a Period of 3 Years in “Agriculture” zone, Lot 299 RP (Part) in D.D. 113 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin South, Yuen Long

(TPB Paper No. 9156)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

66. The following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point.

Mr. W.W. Chan		District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long, PlanD
Mr. Raymond Leung)	Applicant’s representatives
Mr. Lam Tim Kit)	

67. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the review hearing. He then invited Mr. W.W. Chan to brief Members on the background of the application.

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

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for temporary open storage of machinery for a period of 3 years at the site which was zoned “Agriculture” (“AGR”) on the Kam Tin South Outline Zoning Plan (OZP);
- (b) the application was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 20.4.2012 and the reasons were:
 - (i) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, which was to retain and safeguard good agricultural land for agricultural purposes. This zone was also intended to

retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation. No strong planning justification had been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;

- (ii) the application did not comply with the TPB PG-No. 13E in that the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by residential structures/dwellings, a plant nursery and vacant/unused land; there was no previous approval granted at the site and there were adverse departmental comments and local objections against the application;
 - (iii) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental, landscape and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas; and
 - (iv) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area;
- (c) the application site was subject to enforcement action as the storage use currently found on the site was an unauthorized development (UD) under the Town Planning Ordinance. Enforcement Notice (EN) was issued to the concerned parties on 20.12.2011 requiring the discontinuance of the UD. Since the requirement of the statutory notice was not complied with upon expiry of the notice on 20.2.2012, prosecution action against the notice recipients was in progress;
- (d) the applicant had not submitted any written representation in support of the review application;
- (e) departmental comments – the departmental comments were summarized in paragraph 4 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as sensitive receivers, i.e. existing

residential structures, were located to the immediate north and south of the site and environmental nuisance was expected. The Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation (DAFC) did not support the application from the agricultural point of view as there were active agricultural activities including greenhouse farming immediately adjacent to the site. As greenhouse farming was becoming more popular, the rehabilitation potential of the site had increased. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape (CTP/UD&L) objected to the application as the use under application was incompatible with the existing landscape character and would cause undesirable impacts on the landscape quality of the area. The Chief Engineer/Mainland North, Drainage Services Department (CE/MN,DSD) requested the applicant to submit and implement a drainage proposal. The District Officer/Yuen Long, Home Affairs Department indicated that he had received a comment from a Yuen Long District Councillor which was the same as the public comment received during the statutory publication period;

- (f) public comments – four public comments were received. They were submitted by a Yuen Long District Councillor, a representative of the villagers of Ma On Kong Tsuen, a local resident and Designing Hong Kong Limited. All of them objected to or expressed concern on the application for the reasons that the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, it was a blight to the environment, it would cause environmental and traffic impacts, and it would cause flooding problems. One of the public comments suggested that a plan for quality landscaping and well designed interface with the public domain should be submitted to mitigate the blight if the application was approved; and
- (g) PlanD’s views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as stated in paragraph 6 of the Paper, which were summarized below:
 - (i) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the

“AGR” zone. No strong justification had been provided in the submission to justify a departure from the planning intention of the “AGR” zone, even on a temporary basis. DAFC did not support the application from the agricultural point of view as there were active agricultural activities adjoining the site and the site had potential for agricultural rehabilitation;

- (ii) the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses which comprised predominantly residential structures/dwellings, plant nursery and vacant/unused land. Residential structures were located to the immediate north and south of the site, with the nearest structure being about 10 metres away. The parking lot and open storage/storage yards to the further south of the site were suspected unauthorised development subject to enforcement action to be taken by the Planning Authority;
- (iii) the development did not comply with the Town Planning Board Guidelines for “Application for Open Storage and Port Back-up Uses” (TPB PG-No. 13E) in that no previous approval had been granted and there were adverse departmental comments and local objections to the proposal; and
- (iv) the approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone.

69. The Chairman then invited the applicant’s representatives to elaborate on the application.

70. Mr. Raymond Leung made the following main points:

- (a) the applicant noted that the site might not be suitable for the temporary open storage use under application. However, more time was needed for the applicant to find a suitable site to relocate the existing equipment stored at the application site; and

- (b) the applicant requested the Board to consider granting a short-term approval of six to twelve months to the applicant so that he could relocate his business.

71. In response to the Chairman's enquiry, Mr. Raymond Leung said that the business had been in operation at the application site for about one year. Another site had been found to relocate the business, but more time was needed to move the equipment on the application site.

72. Noting that the EN had been issued to the applicant since December 2011 but the open storage use had still continued on the site, the Chairman enquired how the applicant could guarantee that the business would be relocated in one year's time. In response, Mr. Raymond Leung said that the applicant had already identified a suitable relocation site, which was zoned "Industrial" and "Open Storage", and was currently negotiating with the landowner of the site on the rentals.

73. As the applicant's representatives had no further comment to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed and the Board would further deliberate on the application in their absence and inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's representatives and DPO/TMYL for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

74. The Chairman said that the applicant had asked for sympathetic consideration of the Board to grant a short-term approval of six months to one year for him to relocate the business. However, noting that the applicant had failed to relocate the business eight months after the EN was issued in December 2011, the Chairman considered that no sympathetic consideration should be given. Members agreed.

75. In conclusion, the Chairman noted that Members generally considered that the application should not be supported as the development was not in line with the planning

intention of the “AGR” zone; it was not compatible with the surrounding land uses which comprised predominantly of residential structures/dwellings, plant nursery and vacant/unused land; it did not comply with TPB Guidelines No. 13E in that no previous approval had been granted and there were adverse departmental comments and local objections to the proposal; and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone.

76. After further deliberation, the Board decided to reject the application on review. Members then went through the reasons for rejection as stated in paragraph 7.1 of the Paper and considered that they were appropriate. The reasons were:

- (a) the development was not in line with the planning intention of the “AGR” zone which was to retain and safeguard good agricultural land for agricultural purposes. This zone was also intended to retain fallow arable land with good potential for rehabilitation. No strong planning justification had been given in the submission for a departure from the planning intention, even on a temporary basis;
- (b) the application did not comply with the TPB PG-No. 13E in that the development was not compatible with the surrounding land uses which were predominated by residential structures/dwellings, a plant nursery and vacant/unused land; there was no previous approval granted at the site and there were adverse departmental comments and local objections against the application;
- (c) the applicant failed to demonstrate that the development would not generate adverse environmental, landscape and drainage impacts on the surrounding areas; and
- (d) the approval of the application, even on a temporary basis, would set an undesirable precedent for similar applications within the “AGR” zone. The cumulative effect of approving such applications would result in a general degradation of the rural environment of the area.

Agenda Item 5

[Open Meeting]

Review of Application No. A/YL-KTS/562

Temporary Parking of Bus Chassis and New Coach with Ancillary Parts Assembly for a Period of 3 Years in “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” zone, Lots 566 (Part), 613 (Part) and 616RP (Part) in D.D. 106 and Adjoining Government Land, Kam Tin South, Yuen Long, New Territories

(TPB Paper No. 9157)

[The hearing was conducted in Cantonese.]

Presentation and Question Session

77. The following representative of the Planning Department (PlanD) and the applicant’s representatives were invited to the meeting at this point.

Mr. W.W. Chan		District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun & Yuen Long, PlanD
---------------	--	---

Mr. Raymond Leung)	Applicant’s representatives
Mr. Lam Tim Kit)	

78. The Chairman extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the review hearing. He then invited Mr. W.W. Chan to brief Members on the background of the application.

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

- (a) the applicant sought planning permission for temporary parking of bus chassis and new coach with ancillary parts assembly for a period of 3 years at the application site, which was zoned “Other Specified Uses” annotated “Rural Use” (“OU(RU)”) on the Kam Tin South Outline Zoning

Plan (OZP);

- (b) the application was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) on 4.5.2012 and the reasons were:
 - (i) the planning intention of the “OU(RU)” zone was for the preservation of the character of the rural area. Non-conforming and undesirable industrial-related uses such as the parking of bus chassis and new coach and workshop-related use at the site within the zone should be gradually phased out to help achieve the implementation of the planning intention to upgrade the environmental quality of the area. There had been material change in planning circumstances upon approval of a proposed residential development to the immediate north of the site which would act as a catalyst to realize the planning intention. The continuation of the temporary parking of bus chassis and new coach and workshop-related use at the site would jeopardize the compatible permanent uses hence the planning intention of the “OU(RU)” zone;
 - (ii) the surrounding land uses in the vicinity were predominated by residential structures/dwellings/development, agricultural land and vacant/unused land. The development would contradict with the existing and future residential land uses in the vicinity; and
 - (iii) the development would generate adverse environmental and landscape impacts;
- (c) the application site was subject to enforcement action as parking of vehicles and workshop uses currently found on the site was not covered by valid planning permission and constituted an unauthorized development under the Town Planning Ordinance. Enforcement action was in progress;
- (d) the applicant had not submitted any written representation in support of

the review application;

- (e) departmental comments – the departmental comments were summarized in paragraph 4 of the Paper. The Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) did not support the application as he considered that the relocation of the industrial-related uses in the vicinity was the best way to resolve the industrial/residential (I/R) interface problem, given that the surrounding land uses comprised predominantly of existing or planned residential development including the approved scheme No. A/YL-KTS/499. Moreover, there were sensitive receivers, i.e. existing residential structures located to the east and west (the nearest one about 10m away) and in the vicinity of the site, and environmental nuisance was expected. The Chief Town Planner/Urban Design & Landscape (CTP/UD&L) considered that the submitted landscape and tree proposal was not sufficient. In this regard, the requirement for the submission and implementation of a tree preservation proposal should be incorporated as an approval condition should approval be granted;
- (f) public comments – no public comment was received during the statutory publication period; and
- (g) PlanD's views – PlanD did not support the application based on the assessments as stated in paragraph 6 of the Paper, which were summarized below:
 - (i) the planning intention of the "OU(RU)" zone was for the preservation of the character of the rural area. Uses or developments compatible with the rural landscape, such as passive recreation uses and a selected range of rural uses, could be allowed on application to the Board, with a view to upgrading or improving the area or providing support to the local communities. Non-conforming and undesirable industrial-related uses such as the subject parking of bus chassis and new coach and workshop-related use within the zone should be gradually

phased out to help achieve the implementation of the planning intention to upgrade the environmental quality of the area;

- (ii) the surrounding land uses in the vicinity comprised predominantly residential structures/dwellings/development, agricultural land and vacant/unused land with scattered open storage/storage yards and workshops. A proposed development of ten houses located to the immediate north of the site under Application No. A/YL-KTS/499 was approved with conditions by the RNTPC on 17.6.2011. In granting approval to that application (A/YL-KTS/499), the RNTPC recognized the need to phase out the non-conforming uses in order to realize the planning intention of the “OU(RU)” zone, and that the approval of the application would act as a catalyst to help achieve an early implementation of the planning intention. In this regard, the RNTPC also considered that the non-conforming industrial-related uses at the site of the current application should not be continued/further approved;

- (iii) even though previous planning approval had been granted for the same use, the approval of application No. A/YL-KTS/499 had resulted in a material change in planning circumstances. The continuation of the temporary parking of bus chassis and new coach and workshop-related use at the site would jeopardize the compatible permanent uses hence the planning intention of the “OU(RU)” zone and contradict with existing and future residential land uses in the vicinity; and

- (iv) DEP did not support the application as he considered that the relocation of the industrial-related uses in the vicinity was the best way to resolve the I/R interface problem given the surrounding land uses comprised predominantly existing or planned residential development including the approved scheme No. A/YL-KTS/499. Moreover, there were sensitive receivers,

i.e. existing residential structures located to the east and west (the nearest one about 10m away) and in the vicinity of the site, and environmental nuisance was expected. From the landscape planning point of view, the submitted landscape and tree preservation proposal was also not satisfactory.

80. The Chairman then invited the applicant's representatives to elaborate on the application.

81. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation, Mr. Raymond Leung made the following main points:

- (a) out of the nine previous applications for temporary open storage of motor vehicles and temporary parking of bus chassis and new coach/workshop with ancillary office/part assembly at the application site, planning permission had been granted seven times;
- (b) the application site was the only site that was available in the area for the parking of coaches and for the assembly of parts for coaches. The current business had been operating at the application site for the last 10 years;
- (c) the applicant would require 12 to 18 months to identify an alternative site for the relocation of the current business;
- (d) there was no material change in the surroundings as the proposed residential development approved by the Board (A/YL-KTS/499) would not be completed in the next two years; and
- (e) the applicant requested the Board to consider granting a short-term approval of 12 to 18 months to the applicant on sympathetic ground so that he could relocate his business.

82. The Chairman enquired about the development programme of the proposed 10

houses approved under application No. A/YL-KTS/499. In response, Mr. W.W. Chan said that the applicant would need to submit building plans for the proposed 10 houses as they were not New Territories Exempted Houses. In this regard, building plans for the proposed development had not been submitted. Given that lease modification was also required, it was unlikely that the proposed houses would be completed in two years' time.

83. A Member noted that the current application was only submitted a few days before the previous planning approval lapsed. In response, Mr. Raymond Leung said that there was a delay in the submission of the planning application because of a last minute change in the agent. In response to another Member's enquiry on whether the current application was for a period of three years, he said that the applicant would request for an approval period of at least 18 months to facilitate the relocation of the business.

84. Noting that some of the previous planning approvals had been revoked due to non-compliance with the approval conditions, a Member enquired whether all the approval conditions had been complied with under the previous application. Mr. W.W. Chan replied in the affirmative but pointed out that the planning permission had already lapsed on 27.3.2012.

85. In response to a Member's enquiry on the number of coaches that could be assembled at the site and the time required to complete the assembly, Mr. Raymond Leung said that the assembly of parts for a coach would take about three months and not more than two to three coaches would be assembled at the application site at any one time. The same Member, however, noted from Plan R-4b that about seven coaches were being assembled on the site at the same time. In response to the enquiry of a Member on the number of orders for parts assembly that needed to be completed before the operation could be relocated, Mr. Raymond Leung said that he did not have the information in hand.

86. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether a relocation site had been identified, Mr. Raymond Leung said that the applicant was still searching for a suitable site that was large enough for the operation required. If a site could not be identified in Hong Kong, the operation would need to be relocated to the Mainland. He added that this was the only site in Hong Kong with an operation for the assembly of parts for coaches. In response to two Members' enquiries on the actions that were taken to find an alternative

location for the operation, Mr. Raymond Leung said that since March 2012, the applicant had approached several estate agents and the relevant consultants to identify sites that were suitable for industrial use and/or open storage use for the relocation of the business. The consultants had identified a site in San Tin and was currently negotiating the rentals with the landowner. The applicant had also made offers to rent a few other sites, but without success. In this regard, the applicant requested the Board to give sympathetic consideration to the current application and to grant approval for at least 18 months to facilitate the relocation of the current operation. In response to a Member's suggestion to relocate to an industrial estate, he said that suitable sites in the Yuen Long Industrial Estate were limited and the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation, responsible for the management of the Industrial Estate, was not keen in providing a site for the applicant's business operation.

87. In response to a Member's enquiry, Mr. Raymond Leung said that the current operation had about 20 permanent staff and specialist assembly workers would be hired on a contract basis for particular jobs.

88. As the applicant's representatives had no further comment to make and Members had no further question to raise, the Chairman informed them that the hearing procedures for the review had been completed. The Board would further deliberate on the application in their absence and would inform the applicant of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairman thanked the applicant's representatives and DPO/TMYL for attending the meeting. They left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

89. The Chairman noted that the planning intention of the "OU(RU)" zone was to gradually phase out non-conforming and undesirable industrial-related uses in order to upgrade the environmental quality of the area. Previous planning permissions had been granted for the same use on the site and the applicant had complied with all the approval conditions under the last application. Members would need to consider whether more time should be given to the applicant for the relocation of the existing business operation.

90. A Member considered that sympathetic consideration could be given on the

grounds that the application site had been used for the assembly of parts for coaches for the last 10 years, the applicant did make effort to comply with the approval conditions of the previous approvals, the application was submitted just before the lapse of the last planning permission, the applicant probably did not realize the change in the planning circumstances that a residential development under application No. A/YL-KTS/499 was approved by the Board, and the residential development would take more than two years to be completed. This view was echoed by another Member who considered that assistance should be given to enable this kind of industrial operation to continue to survive in Hong Kong.

91. A Member commented that the Hong Kong Science and Technology Parks Corporation would not welcome this kind of industrial operation into the Industrial Estate as it was not a proper assembly plant for coaches. As the assembly of parts would only take three months to be completed, this Member considered that a temporary approval of six to nine months should be more than enough for the applicant to clear the existing backlog of orders and to relocate the operation.

92. A Member considered that sympathetic consideration should not be given as the applicant could not provide any concrete evidence that he was actively seeking a site to relocate the operation. Allowing the applicant more time to relocate would not serve any purpose as the applicant would most likely continue to use the site for the assembly operations until he was forced to move. Another Member echoed this view and said that the current use would probably continue whether planning permission was granted or not.

93. The Vice-Chairman said that as the approved residential development would not be completed in the short run, there was no immediate need for the current operations to stop. He considered that there was no harm to give planning permission to the application for one year as it would not affect the approved residential development adjacent to the site. This view was supported by two Members.

94. In conclusion, the Chairman noted that Members generally agreed that planning permission should be granted for the application for a period of one year, which should be more than adequate for the current business operator to relocate.

95. After further deliberation, the Board decided to approve the application on a

temporary basis for a period of 1 year until 17.8.2013, instead of the period of 3 years sought, to allow time for the applicant to relocate the use to another suitable location, on the terms of the application as submitted to the Town Planning Board and subject to the following conditions:

- (a) no night-time operation between 7:00p.m. and 8:30a.m., as proposed by the applicant, was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (b) no operation on Sundays and public holidays, as proposed by the applicant, was allowed on the site during the planning approval period;
- (c) no vehicle maintenance, repairing, washing or paint spraying activities should be carried out on the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (d) no heavy goods vehicles exceeding 24 tonnes, including container tractors/trailers, as defined in the Road Traffic Ordinance were allowed to be parked/stored on or enter/exit the site at any time during the planning approval period;
- (e) no reversing of vehicles into or out from the site were allowed at any time during the planning approval period;
- (f) a proper vehicular access/run-in between the site and the public road should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (g) the existing drainage facilities on the site should be maintained at all times during the planning approval period;
- (h) the submission of the record of the existing drainage facilities on the site within **3** months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Drainage Services or of the Town Planning Board by 17.11.2012;

- (i) the submission and implementation of a tree preservation proposal within **6** months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board by 17.2.2013;
- (j) the submission and implementation of fire service installations proposal within **6** months from the date of planning approval to the satisfaction of the Director of Fire Services or of the Town Planning Board by 17.2.2013;
- (k) if any of the above planning conditions (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f) or (g) was not complied with during the planning approval period, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should be revoked immediately without further notice;
- (l) if any of the above planning conditions (h), (i) or (j) was not complied with by the specified date, the approval hereby given should cease to have effect and should on the same date be revoked without further notice; and
- (m) upon expiry of the planning permission, the reinstatement of the application site to an amenity area to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning or of the Town Planning Board.

96. The Board also agreed to advise the applicant of the following:

- (a) prior planning permission should have been obtained before commencing the applied use at the application site;
- (b) to resolve any land issues relating to the development with the concerned owners of the application site;

- (c) shorter approval period was granted and shorter compliance periods were imposed accordingly to allow time to relocate the use to another suitable location with a view to gradually phasing out the non-conforming industrial-related uses within the “OU(RU)” zone. No renewal of this permission would be considered as the continuation of parking of bus chassis and new coach and workshop-related use at the site would contradict with the surrounding land uses including an approved residential development located to the immediate north of the site;

- (d) to note the District Lands Officer/Yuen Long’s (DLO/YL) comments that the site comprised Old Scheduled Agricultural Lots held under Block Government Lease which contained the restriction that no structure was allowed to be erected without prior approval of the government. The private land concerned was covered by Short Term Waiver (STW) No. 3043 permitting structures for temporary parking of bus chassis and new coaches and ancillary uses with BOA (built over area) not exceeding 895m² on Lot 566, 576m² on Lot 613 and 155.8m² on Lot 616 and all height not exceeding 5.1m. The government land concerned was covered by Short Term Tenancy (STT) No. 2010 for the same use with BOA not exceeding 29.25m² and height not exceeding 5.1m. The site was accessible over government land (GL) from Kam Sheung Road. Lands Department (LandsD) did not provide maintenance works on this GL nor guaranteed right of way. The lot owner and occupier of GL concerned would need to apply to LandsD to permit any additional/excessive structures to be erected to regularize any irregularities on the site. Such application would be considered by LandsD acting in the capacity as landlord at its sole discretion. If such application was approved, it would be subject to such terms and conditions, including among others payment of premium or fee, as may be imposed by LandsD;

- (e) to adopt environmental mitigation measures as set out in the “Code of Practice on Handling Environmental Aspects of Temporary Uses and

Open Storage Sites” issued by DEP to minimize any potential environmental nuisances;

- (f) to note the Director of Fire Services’ comments that in consideration of the design/nature of the proposed structures, FSIs were anticipated to be required. Therefore, the applicant was advised to submit relevant layout plans incorporated with the proposed FSIs to his department for approval. The layout plans should be drawn to scale and depicted with dimensions and nature of occupancy. The types of materials to be stored and the type of construction of the covered area for storage with ancillary workshop should be clarified. Besides, the location of where the proposed FSI to be installed should be clearly marked on the layout plans. Detailed fire safety requirements would be formulated upon receipt of formal submission of general building plans and referral from the relevant licensing authority. Should the applicant wish to apply for exemption from the provision of FSIs, the applicant was required to provide justifications to his department for consideration;
- (g) to note the Chief Town Planner/Urban Design and Landscape, planning Department’s comments that recent photos, species and health condition of the existing trees should be provided in the landscape/tree preservation proposal;
- (h) to note the Chief Building Surveyor/New Territories West, Building Department’s comments that if the existing structures were erected on leased land without approval of the Building Department (BD), they were unauthorized under the Buildings Ordinance (BO) and should not be designated for use under the application. Before any new building works are to be carried out on the site, prior approval and consent of the Building Authority (BA) should be obtained. Otherwise, they were Unauthorized Building Works (UBW). An Authorized Person (AP) should be appointed as the co-ordinator for the proposed building works in accordance with the BO. For UBW erected on leased land,

enforcement action might be taken by the BA to effect their removal in accordance with BD's enforcement policy against UBW as and when necessary. The granting of any planning approval should not be construed as an acceptance of any existing building works or UBW on the site under the BO. Temporary structures/containers used for parking / office / storage etc. were considered as temporary building that were subject to the control of the BO. Formal submission under the BO was required for any proposed new works, including the temporary structures. The applicant should observe the requirements on provision of emergency vehicular access (EVA) to all buildings under the Building (Planning) Regulation 41D; and

- (i) to note the Director of Electrical and Mechanical Services' comments that the applicant should approach the electricity supplier for the requisition of cable plans to find out whether there was any underground cable (and/or overhead line) within or in the vicinity of the site. Based on the cable plans obtained, if there was underground cable (and/or overhead line) within or in the vicinity of the site, the applicant and/or his contractors should liaise with the electricity supplier and, if necessary, ask the electricity supplier to divert the underground cable (and/or overhead line) away from the vicinity of the proposed structure prior to establishing any structure within the site. The "Code of Practice on Working near Electricity Supply Lines" established under the Electricity Supply Lines (Protection) Regulation should be observed by the applicant and his contractors when carrying out works in the vicinity of the electricity supply lines.

97. As per the Chairman's suggestion, Members proceeded to consider Agenda Items 7 to 14 on procedural matters before the lunch break.

Agenda Item 7

[Open Meeting]

Request for Deferral for Review of Application No. A/NE-TK/388

Proposed House (New Territories Exempted House – Small House) in “Agriculture” and “Green Belt” zones, Government Land in D.D. 15, Shan Liu Village, Tai Po

(TPB Paper No. 9158)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

98. The Secretary reported that on 1.8.2012, the applicant wrote to the Secretary of the Board and requested the Board to defer making a decision on the review application for two months in order to allow sufficient time for preparation and submission of supplementary information.

99. Members noted that the justifications for deferment met the criteria set out in the Town Planning Board Guidelines No. 33 in that the applicant needed more time to prepare documentation for the review, the deferment period was not indefinite, and that the deferment would not affect the interests of other relevant parties.

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

Agenda Item 8

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representation and Comment to the Draft South West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/27

(TPB Paper No. 9160)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

101. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 30.3.2012, the draft South

West Kowloon Outline Zoning Plan No. S/K20/27 was exhibited for public inspection under section 7 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, one representation was received. On 8.6.2012, the representation was published and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, one public comment was received. As there was only one representation and one comment, it was suggested that the representation and comment should be heard by the full Board, without resorting to the appointment of a Representation hearing Committee.

102. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the proposed hearing arrangement for the consideration of the representation and comment as detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper.

Agenda Item 9

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments to the Draft West Kowloon Cultural District Development Plan No. S/K20/WKCD/1

(TPB Paper No. 9161)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

103. The following Members had declared interests on this item:

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Mr. Roger K.H. Luk |) had business dealings with Wheelock Properties |
| Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau |) Ltd., which was one of the companies that |
| Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu |) formed the Austin Property Management Limited |
| |) that submitted representation R1. |
|
 | |
| Dr. Dominic K.K. Lam | - had business dealings with Wheelock Properties |
| | Ltd., which was one of the companies that |
| | formed the Austin Property Management Limited |
| | that submitted representation R1. He also had |
| | business dealings with CITIC Pacific Limited |
| | that owned the Western Harbour Tunnel Co. Ltd. |

that submitted representation R2.

104. As the item was procedural in nature and no deliberation was required, Members agreed that the above Members could stay at the meeting. Members noted that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau and Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

105. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 30.3.2012, the draft West Kowloon Cultural District Development Plan (the DP) No. S/K20/WKCD/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 10 representations were received. On 8.6.2012, the representations were published for public comments and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, three public comments were received. As the representations and comments were all related to the development concepts and design principles in the DP, and the planning of the West Kowloon Cultural District was of general public interest, it was recommended that the representations and comments should be heard collectively in one group by the full Board.

106. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the proposed hearing arrangement for the consideration of representations and comments as detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper.

Agenda Item 10

[Open Meeting]

Information Note and Hearing Arrangement for Consideration of Representations and Comments to the Draft Po Toi Islands Development Permission Area Plan No. DPA/I-PTI/1
(TPB Paper No. 9150)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

107. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 2.3.2012, the draft Po Toi Islands Development Permission Area Plan (DPA) No. DPA/I-PTI/1 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Town Planning Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 175 representations were received. Among them, two representations

(R130 and R134) were subsequently withdrawn. On 25.5.2012, the representations were published and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, 725 public comments were received. As the DPA Plan had attracted much public and local interest and the representations and comments were similar and inter-related in nature, it was suggested that the representations and comments should be heard collectively in one group by the full Board.

108. After deliberation, the Board agreed to the proposed hearing arrangement for the consideration of the representation and comment as detailed in paragraph 2 of the Paper.

Agenda Item 11

[Open Meeting]

Submission of the Draft Tsuen Wan West Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TWW/18A to the Chief Executive in Council for Approval Under Section 8 of the Town Planning Ordinance

(TPB Paper No. 9162)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

109. The following Members had declared interests in this:

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk)	had business dealings with Wheelock
Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau)	Properties Ltd., whose subsidiary
Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu)	company had submitted a
Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam)	representation

Professor P.P. Ho - being staff of the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK). The School of Architecture of CUHK was the consultant for the Air Ventilation Assessment study for the Tsuen Wan West Area

110. As the item was procedural in nature and no deliberation was required, Members agreed that the above Members could stay at the meeting. Members also noted

that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu and Professor P.P. Ho had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting.

111. The Secretary briefly introduced the Paper. On 9.12.2011, the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/18 was exhibited for public inspection under section 5 of the Ordinance. During the 2-month exhibition period, 17 representations were received. On 17.2.2012, the representations were published for public comments and, in the first three weeks of the publication period, no comment was received.

112. On 22.6.2012, after giving consideration to the representations, the Board decided not to propose any amendments to the draft OZP to meet the representations. As the plan-making process had been completed, the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP was ready for submission to the Chief Executive in Council (CE in C) for approval.

113. After deliberation, the Board agreed:

- (a) that the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/18A together with its Notes at Annex I and Annex II of the Paper were suitable for submission under section 8 of the Ordinance to the CE in C for approval;
- (b) to endorse the updated Explanatory Statement (ES) for the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/18A at Annex III of the Paper as an expression of the planning intention and objectives of the Board for various land-use zones on the draft OZP and issued under the name of the Board; and
- (c) that the updated ES for the draft Tsuen Wan West OZP No. S/TWW/18A was suitable for submission to CE in C together with the draft OZP.

Agenda Item 12

[Closed Meeting]

114. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 13

[Closed Meeting]

115. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

Agenda Item 14

[Closed Meeting]

116. This item was recorded under confidential cover.

117. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 12:55 p.m.

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

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

Mr. Thomas T.M. Chow

Chairman

Mr. Stanley Y.F. Wong

Vice-chairman

Prof. S.C. Wong

Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma

Professor Eddie C.M. Hui

Dr. C.P. Lau

Ms. Julia M.K. Lau

Mr. Roger K.H. Luk

Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan

Mr. H.W. Cheung

Dr. Wilton W.T. Fok

Mr. Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr. Lincoln L.H. Huang

Ms. Janice W.M. Lai

Mr. Stephen H.B. Yau

Deputy Director of Environmental Protection

Mr. Benny Y.K. Wong

Director of Lands

Ms. Bernadette Linn

Director of Planning

Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung

Principal Assistant Secretary, Transport and Housing Bureau

Miss Winnie M.W. Wong

Hong Kong District

Agenda Item 6

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Session only)]

Further Consideration of Representations No. R1 to R793, R795 to R1023, R1026 to R1046 and R1048 to R1068 and Comments No. C1 to C9 to the Draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H7/15
(TPB Paper No. 9159)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English.]

120. The following Members had declared interest on this item:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--|
| Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam |] | had business dealings with Ove Arup & Partners |
| Professor S.C. Wong |] | Hong Kong Ltd. (OAP) which was a consultant of |
| Mr. Ivan S.C. Fu |] | Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital (HKSH).
HKSH was one of the representers (R708) |
| Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau | - | being the Chairman of the Happy Valley Residents' Association which was one of the representers (R999) and had business dealings with OAP and MVA Hong Kong Ltd. which were the consultants of HKSH (R708) |
| Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan | - | her family member owned a flat in Happy Valley |
| Dr. Wilton W.T. Fok | - | his family member owned a flat at Blue Pool Road in Happy Valley |
| Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee | - | owned a flat at Link Road and a flat at Wun Sha Street |

Ms. Bernadette Linn - owned a flat at Broadwood Road
(D of Lands)

Miss Ophelia Y.S. Wong - owned a flat at Broadwood Road
(the Secretary)

121. Members noted that Professor S.C. Wong, Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam and Mr. Ivan S.C. Fu had no involvement in the HKSH project. Members noted that the properties owned by Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee, Ms. Bernadette Linn and the family member of Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan and Dr. Wilton Fok (that had very distant view of the HKSH) would not be affected by the HKSH project. Members agreed that the above Members should be allowed to stay and participate in the meeting. Members noted that Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan had not yet arrived to join the meeting; Mr. Maurice W.M. Lee and Mr. Dominic K.K. Lam had already left the meeting and Mr. Ivan C.S. Fu had tendered apologies for not attending the meeting. Members considered that Mr. Patrick H.T. Lau's interest as a representative of representer No. R999 was direct and noted that he had attended apologies for not attending the meeting.

122. As in the previous Board meetings to discuss the representation of HKSH, Members agreed that as the role of the Secretary was to provide information and advice on procedural matters and would not take part in decision-making, she could stay at the meeting.

123. The Chairman said that in the previous meeting held on 11.5.2012 (previous meeting), the Board further considered the 1064 representations relating to the HKSH site in respect of the draft Wong Nai Chung Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/H7/15. As some Members of the Board and some representers/commenters raised questions on the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) submitted by HKSH, the Board deferred a decision on the representations pending clarification from Transport Department (TD) on the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH. TD had submitted further information (TD's FI) on 6.6.2012 and 29.6.2012 respectively providing clarifications on the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH and their comments on the results of the sensitivity test conducted for the hospital traffic ingress route assignment prepared

by HKSH. This meeting was an extension of the previous meeting to further consider the representations.

124. Members noted that the following letters were tabled at the meeting:

Two letters enquiring whether the Chief Executive had agreed to extend the time limit for submission of the subject outline zoning plan for approval

- (a) a letter from S.K. Lam, Alfred Chan & Co. Solicitors & Notaries on behalf of R763 (Elite Eternal Limited) dated 10.8.2012;
- (b) a letter from Sky Oasis Limited (R709) dated 13.8.2012;

Four letters requesting for deferral of hearing

- (c) a letter from Yeung Lam Mee (R972) dated 10.8.2012;
- (d) a letter from the Happy Valley Residents' Association (R999) dated 10.8.2012;
- (e) a letter from Liu Yee Ling (R754) dated 10.8.2012;
- (f) a letter from The Incorporated Owners of San Francisco Towers (R958) dated 14.8.2012; and

Reply letters from the Board's Secretariat

- (g) the Board Secretariat's letters in reply to the above six letters dated 13.8.2012 to 15.8.2012.

125. The Chairman said that six letters as tabled were received from some representers prior to the meeting and the Secretary was asked to brief Members about those letters. The Secretary said that two of the letters (received from R709 and R763) enquired whether the Chief Executive (CE)'s agreement had been sought to extend the

time limit for submission of the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP (the Plan) for approval. The Secretary said that on 22.6.2012, the Board agreed to seek the CE's agreement, under section 8(2) of the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance), to extend the time limit for submission of the Plan to the CE in Council for approval for a period of six months i.e. from 26.7.2012 to 26.1.2013. The extension of the time limit was to allow sufficient time for the Board to complete the representation consideration process in respect of the Plan. On 9.7.2012, the CE approved the proposed extension of the time limit. This information was included in paragraph 1.7 of the TPB Paper No.9159 (the Paper) and the Board's Secretariat had replied to those two letters accordingly.

126. The Secretary said that the remaining four letters were received from some representers (R754, R958, R972 and R999) requesting for deferral of the hearing. The main ground of the deferral requests was that some of the representers and their representatives were not in Hong Kong due to the summer vacation or had medical appointment and could not attend the meeting. One of the representers also requested for a Chinese version of TD's FI.

127. The Secretary continued to inform Members that the Board's Secretariat had replied to those four letters indicating that according to the 'Town Planning Board Guidelines on Deferment of Decision on Representations, Comments, Further Representations and Applications made under the Town Planning Ordinance' (TPB PG-No. 33), request for deferral received not more than two weeks before the meeting would be submitted to the Board for consideration together with the relevant Paper on the representation at the scheduled meeting. The relevant parties and/or their representatives would be required to attend the Board's meeting and to explain to the Board the reasons for the proposed deferment. Should the Board consider that a deferment was not warranted, the hearing would proceed as scheduled.

128. The Chairman said that the Board would consider the deferral requests first. The government representatives as well as the representers and their representatives would be invited to the meeting so that all parties could express their views about the deferral requests for the Board's consideration.

129. The following government representatives were invited to the meeting at this

R969 – Tse, Joseph

R977 – Mr. Wong

R978 – Fum Ying

R979 – Mrs. Ng

R980 – Kellogg W. Ltd. Miss Young

R981 – Jiang Ting Pui

R1005 – Wong Man Yu

R1006 – Lung Yee Fong

R1007 – Lai, Cindy

R1019 – Mrs. Chu

R1023 – Miss Wan

R1048 – Mr. Lui

R1049 – Chan Shiu Tong

R1050 – Mrs. Tung

R1051 – Kwan Tai Yuen

R1052 – Tse, Joseph

R1053 – Chan K.

R1054 – Mr. Poon

R1055 – To Ming Fai

R1056 – Wong K.H.

R1057 – Chan Yuk Lan

R1058 – Lau, Alex

R1059 – Fung King Cheong

R1060 – Ng, Ivan

Mr. Sum Kit Hang

Representers' representative

R971 – David John Forshaw

Mr. David John Forshaw

Representer

Mr. Cameron MacDonald

Representer's representative

R972 – Yeung Lam Mee

(Ms. Yeung Lam Mee)

134. Ms. Yeung Lam Mee said that when TD's FI was sent to her, she was not in Hong Kong and was not able to submit comments before the deadline on 30.7.2012. She could not understand TD's FI as it was a technical document with only an English version. The HKSH redevelopment had significant impacts on the interests, living environment and well-being of residents in Happy Valley. They should be given sufficient time to study TD's FI before they could tender fair comments for the Board's consideration.

R999 – Happy Valley Residents' Association

(Ms. Yeung Lam Mee – representer's representative)

135. Ms. Yeung Lam Mee said that the Happy Valley Residents' Association had requested the Board to defer the hearing as many residents were on summer holidays. Many of the residents left Hong Kong in end June / early July i.e. before TD's FI was sent to them. Hence, they could not provide comments for the Board's consideration nor attend the meeting. The HKSH redevelopment would have grave impacts on residents in Happy Valley and the Board should wait for the representers to return to Hong Kong before holding the hearing to ensure fairness and justice.

R708 – Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital (HKSH)

(Mr. Ian Brownlee – representer's representative)

136. Mr. Ian Brownlee said that the HKSH opposed to further deferment of the hearing. He said that the Board had already held three hearings in respect of the representations. The Board had requested the CE for extension of time limit for submission of the Plan for approval and was bound by the statutory time limit to complete the representation hearing and plan-making process. He said that the Board had conducted the hearings in accordance with normal procedures. Hence, he requested the Board to continue with the hearing.

137. The Chairman asked and none of the attendees indicated that they had further

views on the deferral requests. They were invited to leave the meeting room for the Board to deliberate on the deferral requests first.

[The government representatives, the representers and their representatives left the meeting room at this juncture.]

Deliberation Session

138. The Chairman said that the Board had to follow a statutory time frame to submit the Plan to the CE in Council for approval. As requested by the Chairman, the Secretary explained that the CE had agreed, as requested by the Board, to extend the statutory time limit for submission of the Plan for approval from 26.7.2012 to 26.1.2013. According to the Ordinance, there was provision for extension of the statutory time limit once only, hence the Board had to submit the Plan to the CE in Council for approval by 26.1.2013. Members were reminded that if the Board decided to amend the Plan to meet the representations at this meeting, the proposed further amendments would need to be subject to the further representation process which would take time. The time remained for completing the plan-making process before the extended statutory time limit was very tight.

139. The Chairman said that it was practically not possible to fix a hearing date that would suit all representers, especially in the current case when there were more than 1,000 representers. In any case, representers could nominate representatives to attend the hearing on their behalf.

140. The Chairman requested the Secretary to explain the Board's established practice with regard to providing Chinese translation of documents. The Secretary said that for representations submitted in Chinese, a Chinese version of the TPB Paper would be provided to the representers but the attachments, if submitted in English, would not be translated in view of the resource implications. However, the Paper would cover the major points in the attachments. If the representers had difficulty in understanding the English documents, they could approach the staff of PlanD who would explain the contents of the English attachments to them. The English version of TD's FI was sent to all representers and commenters on 9.7.2012 (i.e. more than one month before the meeting)

and there should be sufficient time for the representers to examine TD's FI and to seek the necessary assistance, if required.

141. The Chairman said that according to the relevant Town Planning Board Guidelines TPB PG-No. 33, the deferral request would not be entertained unless with the other parties consent and there were very strong reasons to do so.

[Miss Bonnie J.Y. Chan arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

142. The Chairman then asked Members to consider the deferral request should be acceded to. The main considerations were the requirement for the Board to submit the Plan to the CE in Council for approval within the extended statutory time limit by 26.1.2013, which might be quite tight in view of possible further representation procedures; the objection of R708 to further defer the hearing; and whether the reasons that representers were having holidays and not in Hong Kong were justified. After deliberation, all Members agreed that the deferral requests were not well justified and the hearing should not be deferred.

143. A Member asked if anything could be done to assist the representers who had difficulties in understanding English documents. The Chairman said that it was difficult to request outside parties to make bi-lingual submissions. Nevertheless, in the subject case, the Secretariat had offered to provide assistance to the representers should they intend to do so. The Secretary added that a summary of TD's FI was included in the TPB Paper and a Chinese version of the Paper was sent to the relevant representers/commenters on 10.8.2012.

Presentation and Question Session

144. The government representatives and the representers and their representatives were invited to return to the meeting room at this point. The Chairman informed the attendees that the Board had considered the views expressed by the attendees and had unanimously agreed not to accede to the deferral requests and to continue with the hearing. He said that according to TPB PG-No. 33, deferral request would not be entertained unless there was consent of other parties and there was no such consent from one of the

representers in this case. It was also not practical for the Board to fix a hearing date to match the availability of all concerned parties.

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

146. The Chairman said that the present meeting was a continuation of the previous meeting when the Board had deferred a decision on the 1064 representations relating to the HKSH site. At the previous meeting, as some Members of the Board and some representers /commenters had raised questions on the TIA submitted by HKSH, the Board deferred a decision on the representations pending clarification from TD on the assumptions adopted in the TIA. TD had submitted further information (FI) on 6.6.2012 and 29.6.2012 respectively providing clarifications on the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH and their comments on the results of the sensitivity test conducted for the hospital traffic ingress route assignment prepared by HKSH. The Chairman further said that the meeting was to mainly focus on traffic aspects, and in particular the clarifications on the assumptions adopted in the TIA.

147. The Chairman explained the procedures of the hearing and invited Mr. Louis Kau (DPO/HK) to make a presentation. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Louis Kau made the following main points as detailed in the Paper:

Background

The Site

- (a) the Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital site (the Site) had an area of about 9,770m². The existing hospital complex comprised four main buildings, i.e. the Phase 2 building (12 storeys above 1 basement floor) in the southern part, Phases 1 and 3 buildings (148mPD) in the middle portion, and the Central Block (6 storeys) and Li Shu Fan Block (8 storeys) in the northern portion of the Site;

- (b) on 30.9.2010, the draft Wong Nai Chung OZP No. S/H7/15 was gazetted, incorporating amendments to revise the BHRs for the part of the Site proposed for the Phases 3A and 4 buildings of the HKSH redevelopment from 12 storeys to 115mPD and 89mPD respectively. A BHR of 2-storey over the car park podium of the Phase 4 development along the Wong Nai Chung Road was stipulated to ensure the provision of a 27m setback as indicated in the scheme submitted by HKSH to the Board in 2010 (2010 Scheme);
- (c) a total of 1,068 representations and 9 comments were received:
- (i) 702 supporting representations (R1 to R706 except R253, R267, R294 and R325) submitted by members of the public and the Hong Kong Private Hospitals Association;
 - (ii) 362 adverse representations were received. One adverse representation (R708) submitted by HKSH proposed more lenient building height restrictions (BHRs). The remaining ones (R253, R325, R707, R709 to R1023 and R1026 to R1068) proposed more stringent BHRs; R996 to R1003 opposed the BHRs of the Site in general (but they supported the BHR of 2 storeys on the Site). These remaining adverse representations were submitted by local residents, individual companies, members of the public, various incorporated owners, Happy Valley Residents' Association and Wan Chai District Councillors;
 - (iii) 2 representations (R267 and R294) were submitted by members of the public and had not specified any view/ground;
 - (iv) 2 representations (R1024 and R1025) provided comments on the amendments and were submitted by a member of the public and Man Lam Christian Church, Hong Kong; and
 - (v) 9 comments (C1 to C9) were submitted by Designing Hong Kong Limited, local residents and members of the public;

The Board's meeting on 8.4.2011

- (d) on 8.4.2011, the Board considered all the representations/comments relating to the amended BHRs for the Site. The Board noted that the R794 and R1047 had withdrawn their representations before the meeting. After consideration of the representations and comments, the Board considered that part of both R1024 and R1025 which were related to the Man Lam Christian Church were invalid, and decided not to uphold the remaining part of those two representations;
- (e) the Board decided to defer a decision on the remaining 1064 representations relating to the Site pending further information/comments from HKSH and concerned government bureaux/departments concerning the TIA, geotechnical feasibility and proton therapy facility to be installed in the proposed redevelopment;

The Board's Meeting on 11.5.2012 (Previous Meeting)

- (f) between February and March 2012, HKSH made three submissions to the Board including supplementary submissions (containing various technical assessments), further supplementary submissions (containing a new conceptual design scheme (2012 Scheme)) and a supplementary traffic statement;
- (g) based on the 2012 Scheme, HKSH proposed to amend the boundary of the building height (BH) control sub-areas in the subject "G/IC" zone covering the Site (as shown in Drawing Ha-1 of the Paper). The proposed amendments involved extending the areas stipulated with BHRs of 89mPD and 115mPD and reducing the width of the setback area stipulated with BHR of 2 storeys. HKSH's 2010 Scheme proposed a varied setback from 27m to 31m along Wong Nai Chung Road, whilst the 2012 Scheme proposed a varied setback from 16m to 20m;
- (h) on 11.5.2012, the Board held its meeting to further consider the

representations and comments in light of the FI submitted by HKSH and the advice given by concerned government bureaux/departments on the geotechnical constraints and proton therapy machine as detailed in TPB Paper No. 9072 (paper considered in the previous meeting). At the meeting, some Members of the Board and some representers/commenters raised questions on the TIA submitted by HKSH, in particular the TIA assumption that all traffic from the north would use the Sports Road route (i.e. from Canal Road Flyover, Canal Road exit, Sports Road and Wong Nai Chung Road) to the new access of the hospital (referred to as route N2 in TD's FI);

- (i) in view of the concerns, the Board decided to defer a decision on the representations and comments. TD was requested to clarify the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH and to prepare several scenarios with different percentage splits of traffic coming from the north between the Sports Road route and the west racecourse route (i.e. from Canal Road Flyover, Wong Nai Chung Road, Shan Kwong Road and Village Road) to the existing access of the hospital (referred to as route N1 in TD's FI);

Legislative Council's Case Conference on 28.6.2012

- (j) on 11.6.2012, the Concern Group on Redevelopment of HKSH lodged their complaints to Legislative Council (Legco) about the TIA, arrangement of the ingress/egress traffic to the hospital, visual impact assessment (VIA), air ventilation, and the settlement proposal between the Board and HKSH;
- (k) on 28.6.2012, the Legco convened a case conference to follow up the complaints raised by the Concern Group on Redevelopment of HKSH. Councillors requested the Government to consider employing independent expert for the assessments;
- (l) regarding the request of the Legco, PlanD had responded on 16.8.2012

that for the case of the HKSH redevelopment, concerned government departments had provided their comments to the Board as well as responded and answered Members' questions. There was no particular reason to employ independent expert for undertaking the assessments;

Transport Department's Further Information

- (m) to address the Board's request, TD submitted two FIs. The FI submitted on 6.6.2012 was to provide clarification on the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH. The FI submitted on 29.6.2012 was to provide TD's comments on the results of the sensitivity test conducted for the hospital traffic ingress route assignment prepared by HKSH;
- (n) TD's FI were at Annexes IV(a) and IV(b) of the Paper and the main points were summarised below:
 - (i) TD submitted clarification on the assumption adopted in the TIA prepared by HKSH that all traffic travelling from the north to the hospital via the new ingress/egress would use route N2;
 - (ii) HKSH's traffic consultant indicated that the assumption was based on interviews and licence plate surveys and the fact that, if the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road was in place, route N2 would be the shortest route for traffic from the north travelling via Canal Road Flyover to the hospital using the new access. The distance of travelling from the north to the hospital via route N1 and route N2 were 2km and 1.5km respectively i.e. route N2 was about 25% shorter than route N1 in terms of distance. Depending on the time of the day the trip was taken, travelling time using route N2 would be shorter than route N1 by about 20% to 65%. TD considered that such an assumption was in line with the general practice of traffic assignment (in terms of route selection) in a typical traffic analysis/forecast and hence was justifiable;

- (iii) to address some Members' concern on the assumption that drivers would only choose route N2 to reach the hospital, HKSH had carried out a sensitivity test by assigning different percentage splits (i.e. 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100%) of vehicles travelling from the north using route N1 and route N2 to the hospital to assess the performance of the critical junction at Shan Kwong Road and Village Road. A copy of the sensitivity test report prepared by HKSH was enclosed in TD's FI submitted on 29.6.2012;
- (iv) based on the results of the sensitivity test, TD was of the view that:
- when more traffic chose to use route N2 instead of route N1, there should be less traffic at the local streets of Happy Valley, including the critical junction at Shan Kwong Road and Village Road;
 - if more than about 50% of hospital ingress traffic chose to use route N2, the performance of the critical junction concerned would be better than the reference case (without the proposed redevelopment and the new ingress/egress); and
 - even if no traffic was diverted from route N1 to route N2, the critical junction would still have ample capacity, under an acceptable level of about 11% and 17% during the peak hours at weekends and normal weekdays respectively;
- (o) based on the above, TD considered that the assumption adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH i.e. to assume all traffic coming from the north to the hospital via the new ingress/egress would use route N2, was justifiable. TD also considered that their previous comment of having no objection to the TIA submitted by HKSH was appropriate;

Comment Received on TD's FI

- (p) an administrative arrangement had been adopted to ensure that all representers and commenters would have an opportunity to comment on TD's FI, and such views would be submitted to the Board for consideration together with the FI. For this purpose, a copy of TD's FI had been deposited at the public enquiry counters of PlanD for public inspection. On 9.7.2012, the Secretary of the Board had also sent the hard copy of TD's FI to the remaining 1064 representers and commenters to invite their comments;
- (q) during the 3-week period for submission of comments which ended on 30.7.2012, one comment from a representer (R1027) was received. The comment was also deposited at the PECs of PlanD for public inspection. The comment was related to the issue of traffic management after the introduction of traffic lights on various junctions in front of HKSH. The representer proposed to install a closed-circuit television (CCTV) at the junction of Yik Yam Street and Shan Kwong Road, as many vehicles had disregarded the no-right turn signage on Shan Kwong Road and turned right into Yik Yam Street;
- (r) TD's responded that the purpose of installing CCTV was to monitor traffic condition rather than to spot illegal activities of drivers as proposed in the representer's comment. TD would request the police to step up enforcement action against those drivers making an illegal right turn at the concerned junction;

Visual Impact Assessment

Vantage Points at Happy Valley Recreation Ground, Bowen Road and Tram Terminus on Wong Nai Chung Road

- (s) the visual impacts of the HKSH redevelopment proposal had all along been assessed based on the views from the Happy Valley Recreation

Ground (i.e. the vantage point at the west side unless otherwise stated) and Bowen Road. Subsequently, at the request of the Board at its meeting on 3.9.2010, an additional vantage point at the tram terminus on Wong Nai Chung Road was included in the VIA. According to the 'Town Planning Board Guidelines on Submission of Visual Impact Assessment for Planning Applications to the Town Planning Board' (TPB PG-No. 41), these three vantage points were identified as key local vantage points as they were accessible by and popular to the public;

- (t) the visual impacts of the HKSH redevelopment proposal from these three vantage points were illustrated in Plans Ha-8 to Ha-10 in the Paper. When compared with the situation of the 12-storey BHR on the previous OZP No. S/H7/14, the restrictions as stipulated on the Site in the OZP (i.e. BHR of 89mPD and 115mPD as well as a 27m setback along Wong Nai Chung Road with BHR of 2 storey) (OZP compliant scheme) would not have a major adverse impact for views from the Happy Valley Recreation Ground, but the view from Bowen Road would be partly affected. However, there would be a significant visual enhancement for the view from the tram terminus at Wong Nai Chung Road with the 27m setback. Hence the overall visual impact of the OZP compliant scheme was considered to be partly enhanced and partly adverse;
- (u) when comparing the OZP compliant scheme (with 27m setback along Wong Nai Chung Road) and HKSH's 2012 Scheme (with a minimum setback of 16m along Wong Nai Chung Road), the visual impacts from the vantage point at Bowen Road and Happy Valley Recreation Ground were similar. For the vantage point at the tram terminus on Wong Nai Chung Road, the visual impact of HKSH's 2012 Scheme was more significant than the OZP compliant scheme. The reduction in setback in HKSH 2012 Scheme would aggravate the overbearing impact of the proposed redevelopment on the local area and reduce the visual openness along Wong Nai Chung Road;

Additional Viewing Point within Happy Valley Recreation Ground

- (v) at the previous meeting, a representer (R1000) pointed out that no photomontage had been prepared showing the visual impacts of HKSH's redevelopment proposal in front of the proposed HKSH redevelopment. The same representer subsequently sent two emails on 15.5.2012 and 28.5.2012 to the Board, expressing his concern that the VIA presented by PlanD was flawed in that the tourists' view to the Happy Valley Racecourse from tourist spots (such as Stubbs Road around Tung Shan Terrace and Bowen Road) would be adversely affected by the Phases 3A & 4 of the HKSH redevelopment. The representer considered that Happy Valley Racecourse was a special landmark of Hong Kong that should be protected according to TPB PG-No. 41. Moreover, the representer considered that the overall visual impact of the HKSH redevelopment proposal should be concluded in accordance with the range of threshold as provided in the TPB PG-No. 41;

- (w) noting there were concerns at the previous meeting that there was no photomontage showing the visual impacts from the front of the proposed development (i.e. view from the northeast towards HKSH), an additional viewpoint was identified. The southern entrance of the Happy Valley Recreation Ground was considered to be a suitable local view point in front of the HKSH site, which was easily accessible by public. However, due to the on-going construction works, it was not accessible at this time. A view point at the footpath in the southeast of the Happy Valley Recreation Ground was selected as an alternative;

- (x) as shown in Plan Ha-11 of the Paper, when compared with the situation of the 12-storey BHR in the previous OZP No. S/H7/14, the OZP compliant scheme would have adverse visual impact from this viewing point. The OZP compliant scheme and HKSH's 2012 Scheme would have similar visual impacts from this viewing point;

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau and Dr. C.P. Lau left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Planning Considerations and Assessment

- (y) the planning considerations and assessment were set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper and summarised below:

Visual Impact

- (i) the major difference between the OZP compliant scheme and HKSH's 2012 Scheme was the changes in the visual impacts due to the reduction of the setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m. The Metro Planning Committee (MPC) agreed to the BHRs of 89mPD, 115mPD and the 27m setback (subjected to BHR of 2 storey) for the Site after due consideration of the compatibility of the BHRs with the existing stepped BH profile for the adjoining areas and the visual impacts from public viewpoints;
- (ii) at the previous meeting, Members generally accepted the maximum BHs of 115mPD and 89mPD on the Site. However, Members noted that the 27m setback was important in mitigating the visual impact at Wong Nai Chung Road and was taken as a planning gain to justify the proposal. Strong justifications should be provided for any proposal which would undermine the provision of such planning gain;
- (iii) the visual impact should be properly weighed against the geotechnical constraints and design requirements of the hospital as set out in paragraph 6.6 of TPB Paper No. 9072 and considered by the Board at the previous meeting;

Traffic Impact Assessment

- (iv) as stated in the FI, TD considered the concerned assumption

adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH, i.e. to assume all traffic coming from the north to the hospital via the new access would use route N2 was justifiable. TD also considered that their previous comment of having no objection to the TIA submitted by HKSH was appropriate;

- (z) Members agreed at the previous meeting to amend the Notes of the “G/IC” zone for the Site to restrict the HKSH redevelopment to a maximum of 800 beds and not more than 15% of the non-domestic GFA of the development should be for clinic uses. This was to take into account TD’s view that the TIA would be acceptable as long as the assumptions for the trip generation rate adopted in the TIA remained unchanged;

PlanD’s Views

- (aa) after considering TD’s comments on the TIA and the further assessment on the visual impact of the proposed redevelopment of HKSH as set out in paragraph 6 of the Paper; and there was no change in planning circumstances since the Board’s consideration of the representations/comments at its previous meeting on 11.5.2012, the planning assessments and considerations as stated in paragraphs 6.8 to 6.12 of TPB Paper No. 9072 were still valid; and
- (bb) PlanD’s views were:
 - (i) to note support of R1 to R703 (except R253, R267, R294 and R325) to the BHRs on the Site; support of R704 (part) to R706 (part) to the BHRs of 89mPD and 115mPD; and support of R996 (part) to R1003 (part) to the BHR of 2 storeys;
 - (ii) to note R267 and R294 that had not specified any view/ground;
 - (iii) not to uphold R253, R325, R707, R709 to R793, R795 to R995,

R1004 to R1023, R1026 to R1046, and R1048 to R1068, and the remaining parts of R704 to R706 and R996 to R1003; and

(iv) for R708:

- if the Board, after considering the technical constraints of the Site and the design requirements of the hospital as mentioned in paragraph 6.12 of TPB Paper No. 9072, considered that the Plan should be amended to meet HKSH's representation, the boundary of the areas stipulated with BHRs of the 115mPD, 89mPD and 2 storeys should be adjusted on the basis of HKSH's 2012 Scheme; or
- alternatively, should the Board consider that the visual impact in relation to the reduced setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m was unacceptable, the Plan should not be amended to meet the representation.

148. The Chairman then invited the representers and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and reminded them to focus on the traffic aspects.

R649 – Dr. Tam Ka Fai

(Ms. Carol Kwok - representer's representative)

149. Ms. Carol Kwok read out the statement of Dr. Tam Ka Fai covering the following main points:

- (a) Dr. Tam was a gynaecologist and was well aware that it was very important for patients to arrive at the hospital and receive treatment in a timely manner. Hence, as doctors, they were also very concerned about the traffic condition in the area;
- (b) doctors would try their best to provide timely treatment to patients. However, from Dr. Tam's experience, there were cases where there was

no room available in HKSH and doctors had to refer patients to other hospitals which had created anxieties for patients. Dr. Tam supported the HKSH redevelopment so that more hospital beds would be available to serve those in need of medical treatment; and

- (c) the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road proposed in the HKSH redevelopment would help divert some existing hospital traffic and improve the traffic conditions.

R682 – Tang, William

(Ms. Anna Lee - presenter's representative)

150. Ms. Anna Lee read out the statement of Dr. Billy Chiu (R682's representative) covering the following main points:

- (a) Dr. Billy Chiu was the Resident Medical Officer Specialist in Family Medicine and the Assistant Director of Resident Medical Services (Training) at HKSH. He was also teaching family medicine in the University of Hong Kong (HKU);
- (b) HKSH was an important hospital providing training to doctors. From 1998, HKSH had collaborated with the School of Medicine of HKU to provide training for student doctors. The one to two-week training programme would cover out-patient operations as well as some medical treatments not available in public hospitals;
- (c) the specialist training programme in family medicine in HKSH was set up in 2001 and he was one of the graduates. Training in medical practice as well as how to communicate with patients were very important for medical students. HKSH was a private hospital providing such training opportunities; and
- (d) there was currently insufficient space in HKSH to provide training opportunities and that had affected expansion of the training programme.

With the HKSH redevelopment, there would be increased training opportunities that would benefit doctors as well as patients.

[Prof. C.M. Hui left the meeting at this point.]

151. In response to a Member, the Chairman reminded the representers that their presentations should be more focused on the traffic aspects as the hearing was a continuation of the previous meeting and was for the Board to give further consideration to the representations primarily in light of TD's FI submitted.

R708 - Hong Kong Sanatorium and Hospital

(Mr Ian Brownlee]	
Dr. Chan Woon Tong)]	
Mr. Fred Brown]	
Mr. Chapman Lam]	
Ms. Anna Lee]	
Ms. Adrienne Li]	
Ms. Carol Kwok]	representer's representatives
Mr. Kelvin Ip]	
Mr. Kenneth Ip]	
Mr. Alan Pun]	
Mr. Chan Kin Keung)]	

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

- (a) the HKSH had progressively resolved the outstanding matters regarding its redevelopment at the previous Board meetings. It was hoped that the Board could make a decision at this meeting so that the HKSH could proceed with its redevelopment on the Site;
- (b) he said that amendments to the BHRs on the Site in respect of the subject OZP No. S/H7/15 arose from a settlement proposal of a judicial review that HKSH lodged against the Board's decision not to uphold its

representation (in respect of the previous OZP No. S/H7/14). The key principle of the settlement proposal was that the HKSH redevelopment should be allowed to achieve the permitted development intensity on the Site; and

- (c) the proposal to restrict the maximum number of beds in the HKSH redevelopment to 800 beds and the maximum proportion of gross floor area (GFA) for clinic uses to 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital was acceptable to HKSH.

153. The Chairman reminded Mr. Ian Brownlee to focus on the traffic aspects as the other matters were already deliberated in previous meetings. In response to Mr. Ian Brownlee's question of whether it was necessary to elaborate on the visual aspects, the Chairman said that it was not necessary as the topic was fully covered in the previous meetings and Members had studied the papers and minutes of the previous meetings which had covered the visual aspects.

154. Mr. Ian Brownlee continued with the presentation and made the following main points:

- (a) TD had accepted the clarifications on the assumptions adopted in the TIA as well as the new ingress/egress for the HKSH redevelopment. The team would not make a presentation on this aspect but the traffic consultants were present to answer any questions;
- (b) it was mentioned in paragraph 135 of the minutes of the previous meeting on 11.5.2012 that Members had considered whether it was necessary to require submission of a master layout plan (MLP) for the HKSH redevelopment to the Board for approval. The hospital considered that submission of a MLP was not necessary for the following reasons:
 - (i) the Board had determined the bulk and form of the building through a series of detailed BHRs on the Site, which had

- pre-determined the design of the building;
- (ii) the number of beds and the proportion of GFA for clinic uses would be stated in the Notes of the Plan;
 - (iii) the internal transport arrangements would be subject to approval by TD during the submission of general building plan (GBP). The normal approval process for many complicated projects, that did not require section 16 planning applications, should be applicable to the HKSH redevelopment; and
 - (iv) the façade of the building was a subjective matter in aesthetic terms and was technical in terms of the use of materials. This was not an adequate reason for the Board to require submission of a MLP for the HKSH redevelopment;
- (c) HKSH requested for some adjustment to the boundaries of the BH control sub-areas in the “G/IC” zone on the Site as submitted in their 2012 Scheme and shown on Drawing Ha-1 of the Paper. It was technically not feasible for the proposed redevelopment to maintain a setback of 27m along Wong Nai Chung Road.

155. Dr. Chan Woon Tong made the following main points:

- (a) he had originally prepared to make a presentation on the need for redevelopment of the hospital but he would now focus on the traffic aspects;
- (b) the HKSH had been established in Happy Valley for 90 years and residents in Happy Valley were their neighbours. As a hospital operator, he was also very concerned about the local traffic conditions as it was important to ensure that patients and doctors could arrive at the hospital in a timely manner for receiving or providing treatment respectively;
- (c) they had therefore, tried to incorporate traffic improvement measures in the proposed redevelopment, which included a new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road, an increase in pick-up/drop-off areas as well as

an increase in car parking spaces; and

- (d) with the aid of a video showing the existing traffic conditions around the HKSH and Happy Valley, Dr. Chan Woon Tong made the following main points:
- (i) the video recorded the traffic conditions in Happy Valley on four days (30.7.2012, 31.7.2012, 3.8.2012 and 4.8.2012) in two peak periods (8:00am to 10:00am and 6:00pm to 8:00pm) on each of those days;
 - (ii) the cameras were set at four locations – two cameras on Village Road close to HKSH, one camera at a distance of 50m further south on Village Road and another camera at the southern Village Road / Shan Kwong Road junction;
 - (iii) the video clips taken around 9:00am to 10:00am on 30.7.2012 showed that the traffic going to the hospital would queue up on the left lane of Village Road. Cars would be able to get into the hospital only after the first or second green light. Traffic that was not accessing the hospital would use the right lane of Village Road to turn either right into Shan Kwong Road or go straight to exit Happy Valley. There were only occasional obstructions on the right lane due to the right-turning traffic;
 - (iv) he said that on a few occasions in a year, such as on a rainy day or when there was a traffic accident, there might be more severe traffic congestion in the area as some representers had captured on videos that were shown in the previous meeting;
 - (v) the videos clips taken on the other three days in the morning peak showed similar traffic conditions, which were not congested and rather smooth. He said that with the traffic improvement measures in the proposed redevelopment, the traffic condition would be improved as compared to the current situation;
 - (vi) video clips taken during the night time peak period showed that traffic was similarly smooth. In fact, in the evening peak period, visitors normally went to the hospital by taxis and there was less

queuing up on Village Road. Drivers were able to use the left lane on Village Road to exit the Happy Valley area; and
(vii) the southern Village Road / Shan Kwong Road junction was further away from HKSH and the video clips showed that traffic at that junction was smooth.

[Dr. C.P. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point.]

R751 – Lau Ching Fong, R752 – Wong Chi Yin, R753 – Wong Lai Ping,
R754 – Liu Yee Ling, R779 – Wong Mun Ling, Cynthia, R828 – Chiu Kin Man
R882 – Hung Yiu Kwong, R885 – Lee Wang Tak, Paul, R875 – Chan Ying Wai, David
R886 – Luk Yuet Kuen, R928 – Chan Hon Ming, R948 – Lee Wing Sum, Wendy
(Ms. Liu Yee Ling)

156. Ms. Liu Yee Ling made the following main points:

- (a) Happy Valley was currently one of the districts in Hong Kong that experienced very high temperatures, but that was not the case in the past. The high-rise Phase 3 development of the HKSH had blocked wind flow in the area. Such situation would be further aggravated if more high-rise buildings were to be built on the Site;
- (b) she highlighted the comments of one of the representers whom she represented, indicating that residents used to enjoy very good quality living environment. However, the residents were now forced to suffer from very hot temperature due to the HKSH development;
- (c) if the HKSH was concerned about the well-being of the residents in Happy Valley, the HKSH should develop on the hospital site in Wong Chuk Hang instead of redeveloping on the Site; and
- (d) the comments of the other representers whom she represented was tabled at the meeting.

157. The Chairman again reminded the representers to concentrate on the traffic aspects in their presentations.

R958 – The Incorporated Owners of San Francisco Towers

(Mr. Ho Yip Chor – representer’s representative)

158. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Ho Yip Chor made the following main points:

- (a) the Government already had a pre-determined stance of agreeing with the HKSH redevelopment scheme with 800 beds;

Traffic Impact from the Phase 3A Tower for Clinic Uses

- (b) for the Phase 3A and 4 redevelopment, HKSH proposed to build one hospital tower with 400 single-bed wards and another tower for clinic uses. At the meeting held in 2010, some stakeholders pointed out that the TIA submitted by HKSH had not assessed the traffic generated by the clinic uses. Realising this deficiency in the TIA, the Government proposed to impose a maximum proportion of GFA for clinic uses at 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital on the Site;
- (c) he doubted why the Government had not requested HKSH to re-submit a TIA to include an assessment of traffic generated by the proposed clinic uses. He said that the Government might be worried that the re-assessment would demonstrate that the traffic impact would be unacceptable;
- (d) there was no information about the absolute amount of GFA for clinic uses and the number of clinics that would be accommodated. He also queried whether some floor space within that clinic tower would be used for non-medical uses such as eating places and cafeteria. Members should carefully scrutinise the uses that would be proposed within the clinic tower as the actual uses to be accommodated would generate

different traffic impacts;

Proposed New Ingress/Egress

- (e) the new ingress/egress would only be able to handle 30% more traffic as compared to the existing ingress/egress. Hence, he doubted whether the new ingress/egress was sufficient to handle the additional traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment, given that the number of beds would be doubled and the additional traffic from the clinic uses had not yet been assessed in the TIA;

Validity of the TIA

- (f) one of the assumptions adopted in the TIA was that 100% of the traffic from the north would use route N2 to access the hospital via the new ingress/egress. There was doubt on this assumption and it was not possible to dictate which route drivers would take to access the hospital;
- (g) he had consulted a university professor who advised that the validity of the TIA was dependent on the time and duration in which the traffic surveys were taken. It was an obvious fact that there was traffic congestion in Happy Valley but that was not reflected in the TIA. The residents did not have the resources to employ another consultant to prepare an independent TIA and he requested the Board to carefully consider HKSH's proposal. A wrong decision made by the Board would stifle the road and / or tram services in Happy Valley;
- (h) the video shown by HKHS at the meeting was not representative of the real traffic situation. The video was taken during the summer holidays when traffic in Happy Valley was generally less congested, as many residents were not in Hong Kong and students did not need to attend schools;

Visual Impact Assessment

- (i) according to the photomontages in the Paper, a scheme with 16m setback along Wong Nai Chung Road (as proposed in HKSH's 2012 Scheme), rather than a setback of 27m as stipulated on the Plan, would have adverse visual impacts as viewed from the tram terminus. Views from the Happy Valley Recreation Ground should be protected and only a development scheme with a lower BH, say of 12 storeys as stipulated on the previous OZP No. S/H7/14, would be acceptable at the Site;

Air Ventilation Impacts

- (j) wind should naturally flow southward from the Happy Valley Recreation Ground to Fung Fai Terrace. However, wind flow to Fung Fai Terrace had been completely blocked by the existing high-rise Phase 3 development on the Site. The situation would become worse if there were further high-rise buildings on the Site;

Hospital Design

- (k) the HKSH proposed to build all single-bed wards in the proposed redevelopment. The Department of Health had indicated in previous paper that single-bed wards were not essential to serve the needs of the general public. Infection control was only HKSH's excuse for building single-bed wards. There were currently multi-bed wards in HKSH and other public hospitals, but there were seldom cases of serious cross-infection within hospital wards. The ultimate objective of building single-bed wards was to maximise profits;
- (l) there were currently 450 beds in the hospital and only 350 more beds were required to achieve the target of 800 beds. If multi-bed wards were provided, only about 50 rooms (rather 350 rooms) would need to be built. Furthermore, it was not necessary to concentrate all clinics on the

Site, the HKSH had already established clinics in places like Central. Hence, there was scope to reduce the BH of the proposed redevelopment;

Other Issues

- (m) he had already mentioned about the nuisance created by the low-frequency noise from the air-conditioning system in the exiting Phase 3 building in the previous meeting. HKSH had promised to improve the situation but no action had been taken; and
- (n) he urged the Board to take into account the interests of the public when making a decision.

159. During the presentation of Mr. Ho Yip Chor, Ms. Liu Yee Ling (R754) supplemented on Mr. Ho's point about the air ventilation impacts of the HKSH development. She said that the Phase 3 development on the Site had blocked wind penetration to Fung Fai Terrace, and this had caused things in her home at Fung Fai Terrace to turn mouldy.

R960 – The Incorporated Owners of Evergreen Villa, Stubbs Road

(Ms. Helen Tsang and Mr. Leung Yiu Kei - representer's representatives)

160. Ms. Helen Tsang made the following main points:

- (a) a key assumption in the TIA was that if the GFA for clinic uses remained unchanged at 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital, the traffic impact of the HKSH redevelopment would be acceptable. This 15% assumption for clinic uses was based on the proportion of clinic uses in the hospital at the time when the traffic surveys were conducted (i.e. October 2009 and June 2011);
- (b) between October 2009 and June 2011, the number of hospital beds on the Site had increased from 438 to 485 numbers but there was no change in the GFA for clinic uses. Hence, the change in traffic trip observed

during the two traffic surveys only accounted for the increase in hospital beds as the GFA for clinic uses had remained constant. Hence, it was wrong to conclude that as long as the proportion of total non-domestic GFA for clinic uses remained unchanged as at the time of conducting the traffic survey (i.e. 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital), the traffic impact of the HKSH redevelopment would be acceptable. However, if the total GFA for clinic uses (rather than the proportion of GFA for clinic uses) was to be kept constant in the proposed redevelopment, the traffic impact might be acceptable;

- (c) in June 2011, the GFA for clinic uses was 8,700m². Upon completion of the proposed redevelopment in 2021, the GFA for clinic uses would be increased to 16,800m² (i.e. equivalent to 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital). Hence, the GFA for clinic uses would be increased by about 8000m², yet the TIA had not assessed the traffic impacts from such additional GFA for clinic uses;
- (d) HKSH had not provided information on the clinics, including the number of clinics, the kind of services to be provided and the expected number of patients and vehicular traffic that would be generated per hour;
- (e) the figure of 15% (for control on the proportion of GFA for clinic uses) was not established based on any scientific or technical assessment. It was just the proportion of GFA for clinic uses that existed in the hospital at the time when the traffic surveys were undertaken in 2009 and 2011; and
- (f) the HKSH should be required to revise the TIA to include an assessment of the traffic impacts that would be generated by the additional GFA for clinic uses.

R969 – Tse, Joseph, R977 – Mr. Wong, R978 – Fum Ying, R979 – Mrs. Ng
R980 – Kellogg W. Ltd. Miss Young, R981 – Jiang Ting Pui, R1005 – Wong Man Yu,
R1006 – Lung Yee Fong, R1007 – Lai, Cindy, R1019 – Mrs. Chu, R1023 – Miss Wan,
R1048 – Mr. Lui, R1049 – Chan Shiu Tong, R1050 – Mrs. Tung, R1051 – Kwan Tai Yuen,
R1052 – Tse, Joseph, R1053 – Chan K., R1054 – Mr. Poon, R1055 – To Ming Fai,
R1056 – Wong K.H., R1057 – Chan Yuk Lan, R1058 – Lau, Alex,
R1059 – Fung King Cheong, R1060 – Ng, Ivan
(Mr. Sum Kit Hang - Representers' representative)

161. Mr. Sum Kit Hang made the following main points:

- (a) he represented the residents of Celeste Court, a residential development at Fung Fai Terrace;
- (b) some residents had raised doubts on the TIA assumption that drivers would choose route N2 in future to access the hospital via the new ingress/egress. In order to use route N2 via Sports Road, drivers had to exit the Canal Road Flyover at the Canal Road East exit, but the ramp down that exit was often congested. A more reasonable choice would be for drivers to continue to use route N1, hence the TIA assumption of all traffic using route N2 was not acceptable; and
- (c) the video shown by HKSH at the meeting was about the existing traffic conditions in Happy Valley. However, there would be increased traffic from the HKHS redevelopment and it was not reasonable to assume that the traffic conditions in future would remain similar to the existing situation.

R971 – Mr. David John Forshaw

(Mr. David John Forshaw - representer

Mr. Cameron MacDonald – representer's representative)

162. Mr. David John Forshaw said that other than traffic impacts, there were other

issues, including visual impact, planning considerations and assessment, air ventilation impact, environmental impact, medical service provision, public consultation, that he needed to address the Board on.

163. The Chairman explained that those other issues had been discussed in previous meetings. The Board deferred a decision on the representations on 11.5.2012 and requested TD to clarify about the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH. Hence, the present meeting should focus on the TIA assumption. Noting the Chairman's clarification, Mr. David John Forshaw invited Mr. Cameron MacDonald, a traffic consultant, to address the Board on the traffic aspects.

164. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr. Cameron MacDonald made the following main points:

- (a) he was a transport planning professional and also a resident of Happy Valley;
- (b) he had reviewed all the traffic documents submitted by HKSH, which included the TIA (June 2010), the two supplementary traffic statements (February 2012 and March 2012) and the sensitivity tests on ingress routes to the hospital (June 2012). He would highlight his observations on those traffic documents, which in his opinion could not adequately assess the traffic impacts of the HKSH redevelopment;
- (c) the TIA (June 2010) concluded that traffic circulation in the surrounding area would be improved and that it would be beneficial to the local road network to implement the HKSH redevelopment. However, this conclusion was not supported by the information on junction performance in the TIA. As shown in Table 5.1 of the TIA, which included a comparison of the junction performances of 12 critical junctions in Happy Valley in the 2021 reference case and the 2021 design case (with the new ingress/egress), only one of the 12 identified critical junctions would perform better with the HKSH redevelopment;

Pedestrian Impact Assessment

- (d) according to TD's Departmental Circular No. 1/2011, TIAs should assess the impacts on pedestrian facilities as well as the requirements for new pedestrian facilities. The traffic related documents submitted by HKSH were incomplete as they had not included an assessment on pedestrian impacts;

Weekend Peak Period

- (e) the traffic statement (March 2012) was prepared with the intention to update the TIA in light of the new traffic signal installed at the junction of Shan Kwong Road / Village Road in front of the existing ingress/egress of the hospital. However, this traffic statement revealed the deficiency in the original TIA as the traffic flow in the weekend peak had not been comprehensively assessed;
- (f) the traffic flow in the weekend peak was first assessed in the traffic statement (March 2012) for a few selected junctions only. It was shown in the traffic statement that the traffic impact in the weekend peak period was much worse in the weekday peak periods. For example, the traffic flow in the weekend peak on Shan Kwong Road (south bound) and Village Road (north bound) were respectively 74% and 80% higher than the weekday am peak;
- (g) the TIA (June 2010) was not credible as it only focused on the traffic impacts on weekday peak periods. The TIA needed to be updated to comprehensively assess the traffic impacts on all critical junctions in Happy Valley during both the weekday and weekend peak periods;

Egress Route Assumption

- (h) the sensitivity tests on the ingress traffic routes to the hospital (June 2012) had assessed seven ingress routing scenarios. However, there was no

robust assessment of the egress routing assumption, which had remained the same as in the TIA (June 2010) i.e. all north bound vehicles (up to 280 passenger car units per hour (pcu/hr)) would exit the hospital via the new exit. Hence, all egress traffic was removed from the two critical junctions (i.e. the junctions at Wong Nai Chung Road / Shan Kwong Road and Shan Kwong Road/Village Road/Yik Yam Street/the HKSH access) being assessed in the sensitivity tests (June 2012). As a result, north bound traffic along Wong Nai Chung Road between these two junctions was less in the 800-bed design case as compared to the 438-bed reference case and the junction performance at Wong Nai Chung Road / Shan Kwong Road was better in every design case;

- (i) the egress assumption was doubtful. The new exit at Wong Nai Chung Road would be two levels lower than the existing exit at Village Road. It was unreasonable to assume that all drivers would drive down two levels within the car park to exit via the new ingress/egress point. In particular, taxis and those parking in the existing car park would likely use the existing exit to leave the hospital. HKSH should be required to prepare sensitivity tests on the egress routing assumptions adopted in the TIA; and
- (j) it was considered that the TIA submitted by the HKSH needed to be comprehensively updated.

[Dr. C.P. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

165. Mr. David John Forshaw continued with the presentation and made the following main points:

- (a) the validity of the assumption adopted in the TIA (June 2010) that all north bound traffic exiting the hospital would use the new exit was doubted. There was no assessment in the traffic statements and sensitivity tests to provide additional support for that assumption;

- (b) he had showed a video in the previous meeting about pedestrians/vehicular conflicts in the area. However, the HKSH had not prepared a pedestrian impact assessment for the HKSH redevelopment;
- (c) the traffic impacts during the weekend peak period had not been comprehensively assessed and there were doubts on the conclusions of the TIA. The conclusions of the TIA (June 2010) that the local road network in Happy Valley would be improved and there would be improved traffic circulation with the HKSH redevelopment were fallacious and not supported by the junction performance information presented in the TIA (June 2010);
- (d) the HKSH Phase 3 development had already created chaotic traffic conditions in Happy Valley. The further development of Phases 3A and 4 on the Site would exacerbate the current traffic chaos. The new ingress/egress would inevitably create new traffic problems; and
- (e) his notes covering other aspects of the case which he originally intended to include in his presentation was tabled at the meeting.

R836 – Ho Kit Wai, Margaret

(Mr. David John Forshaw)

166. Mr. David John Forshaw said that he was to represent R836 to make a presentation at the meeting on the visual aspects. Noting the Chairman's request to focus on the traffic aspects, he tabled R836's observation on the visual aspects.

R972 – Yeung Mei Lam

R999 – Happy Valley Residents' Association

(Ms. Yeung Mei Lam)

167. Ms. Yeung Mei Lam made the following main points:

- (a) traffic congestion had been a major concern in Happy Valley. With

more new developments in Happy Valley as well as the HKSH redevelopment, the traffic conditions would be worsened. This was particularly the case as patients of HKSH, especially celebrities, normally attracted many visitors;

- (b) the TIA had concluded that the traffic impact of the HKSH redevelopment would be acceptable. However, given her understanding of the local traffic problems, she had no confidence in the TIA. She did not think that drivers would strictly follow the routes to enter/exit the hospital as assumed in the TIA;
- (c) in the event that the HKSH redevelopment was built and eventually created adverse traffic impacts in future, there was no indication about any contingency plans or mitigation measures. Such mitigation measures might include extending the mass transit railway to Happy Valley as well as building of a vehicular or pedestrian tunnel to connect Happy Valley with Sports Road / Causeway Bay;
- (d) the video shown by HKSH at the meeting did not reflect the actual traffic conditions in the area. On the contrary, there was always traffic congestion which adversely affected bus and tram services in the area;
- (e) the residents of Happy Valley disliked the Phase 3 development as it had caused adverse impacts on their living environment, including blocking of air ventilation to the Fung Fai Terrace area and the curtain wall building causing glare impacts;
- (f) the residents would not oppose to a 12-storey redevelopment on the Site. However, the more than 20-storey buildings proposed on the Site were unacceptable; and
- (g) the HKSH charged high medical fees which were not affordable for average Happy Valley residents like herself. As HKSH served the entire community in Hong Kong, they should redevelop its hospital

facilities elsewhere.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau returned to join the meeting at this point and Mr. Benny Wong left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R1000 – Cheung Shu Sang

(Mr. Cheung Shu Sang)

168. With the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr Cheung Shu Sang said that at the Board's meeting held on 8.8.2008, the Board did not uphold the representation submitted by HKSH that opposed the 12-storey BHR stipulated on the Site in the previous OZP No. S/H7/14. Various extracts of the minutes were highlighted for Members information:

- (a) it was indicated in paragraph 191 of the minutes that the Secretary of Food and Health's support for more private medical services did not mean that such services had to be provided on the Site, which had town planning problems;
- (b) it was further indicated in paragraph 192 of the minutes that the former Director of Planning (D of Plan) shared the views made by a commenter that not only a few individuals would be affected by the proposed Phase IV redevelopment, but the wider population patronising the popular Bowen Road Walking Trail would be affected. He said that although the former D of Plan had now retired, there should be consistency in Government's policy and PlanD should not have changed its position on the HKSH redevelopment;
- (c) it was indicated in paragraph 194 of the minutes that the 37-storey Phase 3 redevelopment, that was not subject to the Board's approval, was totally out-of-place and should not be used as a benchmark for determining the BH of the remaining phase of the redevelopment on the Site;

- (d) contrary to the Board's previous views, he considered that PlanD had made reference to the Phase 3 development as a benchmark when they justified the stepped BHRs currently stipulated on the Site. PlanD should only make reference to the BH of 12-storey (i.e. equivalent to about 48mPD) stipulated on the previous OZP No. S/H7/14. As such, the BHRs of 89mPD and 115mPD stipulated on the OZP No. S/H7/15 was a drastic increase. By agreeing to such a major change in BH, the Government had set a bad precedent in compromising its position in order to reach a settlement of the judicial review lodged against the Board;
- (e) there would also be cumulative adverse impact by allowing the remaining phases of the redevelopment to be developed at a BH of 89mPD and 115mPD; and
- (f) as recorded in paragraph 196 of the minutes, the Board did not uphold the representation of HKSH for three reasons. Those three reasons remained valid for not upholding HKSH's current representation.

169. At this point, Mr. Ian Brownlee (R708) requested the Chairman to make a ruling on R1000's presentation which covered non-traffic related matters, as the Chairman had asked him earlier not to present non-traffic related matters. In response, the Chairman reminded R1000 to focus on the traffic aspects.

170. Mr. Cheung Shu Sang continued with the presentation and made the following main points:

- (a) it was necessary for Members to be informed about the Board's decision made in 2008 as many Members present at the meeting today did not attend the 2008 meeting. The Board should have a consistent position about the HKSH redevelopment on the Site;

Visual Impacts

- (b) Happy Valley was a precious tourist resource of Hong Kong and views in Happy Valley should be protected. He thanked PlanD for preparing the additional photomontage of a view from the southeast of the Happy Valley Recreation Ground (as shown in Plan Ha-11) to respond to his representation made at the previous meeting on 11.5.2012;
- (c) he said that according to the TPB PG-No. 41, there should be a conclusion on the overall visual impact of a proposal. However, the assessment of the visual impact as presented in the Paper was inconclusive. It was indicated that the visual impact of the OZP compliant scheme would be partly enhanced and partly adverse. It was also indicated in the Paper that a reduction of setback from 27m to 16m would aggravate the overbearing impact of the proposed development on the local area and would reduce the visual openness along Wong Nai Chung Road. Such conflicting views on the visual impacts were confusing;
- (d) PlanD should follow the TPB PG-No. 41 to review the VIA and provide a conclusive evaluation of the overall visual impact of the proposed redevelopment;

[At this point, the Chairman again reminded the representer to focus on the traffic aspects.]

Traffic Impact Assessment

- (e) the following extracts of the minutes of the Board's meeting held on 8.4.2011 were highlighted for Members information:
 - (i) paragraph 17(m)(xi) – the findings of the TIA submitted by HKSH were acceptable to TD ... the expansion of the HKSH would not cause unacceptable traffic impact on the surrounding areas;
 - (ii) paragraphs 87 to 89 – the Board should rely on the professional

advice of TD on the acceptability of the TIA... however, the TIA was inadequate in many aspects...there were a lot of deficiencies in the TIA even though TD considered it acceptable; and

- (iii) paragraph 95 – the Board decided to defer a decision on the representations in relation to the HKSH site pending the submission of further information by HKSH to TD to substantiate the TIA on the proposed redevelopment scheme;
- (f) the following extracts of the minutes of the Board’s meeting held on 11.5.2012 were highlighted for Members information:
- (i) paragraph 60 – TD considered that the traffic assessment submitted by HKSH were acceptable; and
 - (ii) paragraph 72 – TD had asked MVA about the assumption that all traffic from the north would go to the HKSH via the Sports Road Route (i.e. route N2) and TD had no objection to the assumption;
- (g) the assumption that all traffic from the north would use route N2 to access the hospital via the new ingress/egress was invalid. If the car park at the proposed redevelopment was full and cars were not allowed to enter, drivers would be forced to drive along Wong Nai Chung Road around the Happy Valley Recreation Ground. As this would involve a major detour passing through the congested Wong Nai Chung Road / Morrison Hill Road junction, drivers would more likely continue to use route N1;
- (h) HKSH had indicated that they would distribute pamphlets to ‘educate’ drivers to use route N2. This was a fallacy as most drivers would decide on the travelling route using devices that provided instant update on traffic conditions rather than following a route recommended by HKSH;

- (i) as recorded in the minutes of the meeting held on 11.5.2012, Members had a lengthy discussion and had indicated that there was strong reservation on the TIA; the assumptions used in the TIA seemed not realistic; HKSH had not made effort to communicate with the local residents; and that TD should be asked to revisit the assumption of 100% traffic using the Sports Road route in the TIA. He said that TD seemed to be lenient when assessing the TIA submitted by HKSH;

[At this point, the Chairman again reminded the representer not to repeat the points made in the previous meeting.]

- (j) with the aid of some photos, he said that the existing car park in the hospital, with 65 car parking spaces, was already overloaded. Some cars were parked on the driveways as well as the pick-up / drop off area on the ground floor. Although the number of car parking spaces would increase to 164 in the proposed redevelopment, some of these car parking spaces would only be used for addressing the current shortage of car parking spaces in the hospital;
- (k) with the aid of some photos taken on roads near the existing ingress/egress to the hospital, he said that pedestrians were at risk due to the narrow footpaths that had no scope to be widened. HKSH should assess the impacts of the proposed redevelopment on pedestrians;

[Mr. Benny Y.K. Wong returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Route Selection and Junction Capacity

- (l) TD was of the view that it was logical for motorists to choose the shorter route to access the hospital i.e. route N2 (1.5km) as compared to route N1 (2km);
- (m) drivers using route N2 would need to circulate two levels within the car park to reach the existing pick-up/drop off area. The internal circulation

accounted for some 415m, and assuming a travelling speed of 8km/hr, the internal circulation would take around 3 minutes;

- (n) if the internal circulation was taken into account, route N2 would be around 1.915km, which would be similar to the length of route N1 (around 2.05km). Therefore, it was more appropriate to assume a 50:50 split between route N1 and route N2 and not the TIA assumption of 100% using route N2;
- (o) according to Table 3 in the sensitivity tests, under the 50% diversion to route N2 scenario, the junction capacity at the critical junction of Shan Kwong Road/Village Road/Yik Yam Street/HKSH access would be worsened from 45% under the existing situation to 39% with the redevelopment;

Conclusion

- (p) the HKSH redevelopment would result in adverse visual impact to the Happy Valley community. The former D of Plan had said in the 2008 meeting that the pleasant living environment and the unique character of the Wong Nai Chung area should be protected;
- (q) the additional traffic and pedestrian loading created by the HKSH redevelopment was unacceptable;
- (r) to drastically increase the BHR from 12-storey to 115mPD (27-storey) and 89mPD (20-storey) was unacceptable. The reasons for not upholding the previous representation of HKSH (in respect of OZP No. S/H7/14) were still valid. The Board should not uphold the current representation of HKSH in respect of OZP No. S/H7/15; and
- (s) the two proposed Phase 3A and 4 redevelopments and the Phase 3 building on the Site would create major wall effect. HKSH should formulate a more acceptable development scheme and residents would be

willing to accept a compromise scheme at a lower BH of say 15 storeys.

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

Question and Answer Session

Comparison between Route N1/ Route N2 and Journey Time Analysis

172. A Member asked in what way was route N2 shorter than route N1. Mr. Chan Chung Yuen (Chief Engineer, Traffic Engineering Division (Hong Kong), TD) said that route N2 was shorter than route N1 by absolute distance. In addition, based on the journey time analysis undertaken by HKSH's traffic consultant, it was shown that in the weekday am and pm peaks as well as the weekend peak, the journey time for taking route N2 would be shorter than route N1.

173. With the aid of some powerpoint slides, Mr. Fred Brown (HKSH's traffic consultant) made the following main points:

- (a) a journey time analysis comparing the journey time of the following routes to the hospital were prepared:
 - (i) starting from the Queen's Road East / Stubbs Road junction via route N1 (to the existing village road access) and route N2 (to the new access at Wong Nai Chung Road);
 - (ii) starting from Canal Road Flyer via route N1 (to the existing village road access) and route N2 (to the new access at Wong Nai Chung Road); and
 - (iii) starting from the Blue Pool Road / Sing Woo Road junction via Sing Woo Road (to the existing village road access) and via Blue Pool Road (to the new access at Wong Nai Chung Road);
- (b) the journey time analysis covered the weekday am, weekday pm, weekday off-peak and weekend peak periods. He said that the comment

made by one of the representer's representative that the traffic assessment did not assess the weekend peak traffic was incorrect. In fact, their traffic assessments had fully covered the weekend peak period;

- (c) the findings of the journey time analysis were briefly highlighted as follows:
 - (i) during the weekday am peak, the journey time for using route N2 / Blue Pool Road (to the new access at Wong Nai Chung Road) were shorter than using route N1/Sing Woo Road (to the existing Village Road access) for all three routes;
 - (ii) during the weekend period, the absolute journey time would be longer, but the journey times for routes going to the hospital using the new access were substantially shorter;
 - (iii) the traffic generation from the hospital was similar on weekdays and at weekends. The congestion at weekends was only due to more local traffic; and
 - (iv) their journey time analysis was established using taxi trips and the taxi drivers were not informed that they were conducting a survey. Hence, the results were objective;
- (d) TD had accepted their analysis that route N2 was shorter in terms of both distance and journey time; and
- (e) some representers indicated that the internal circulation (2 levels within the carpark) should also be taken into account when comparing the length of route N1 and route N2. In this regard, he reminded Members that there was also one level difference between the access at Village Road and the existing pick-up/drop-off area. Furthermore, there might be a new pick-up/drop-off area at the level of the new access at Wong Nai Chung Road with direct connection to a new passenger entrance with escalator / lift. Hence, in future, drivers would not need to go up two levels to the existing pick-up/drop-off area. The assumption about route N2 being shorter than route N1 was valid.

174. The same Member said that cars using route N1 but not going to the hospital would not need to route through the section of Shan Kwong Road and Village Road. For those drivers, route N1 might not be longer than route N2. In response, Mr. Fred Brown agreed that cars going to other places in Happy Valley might not use route N2. However, the sensitivity test was to compare the hospital bound traffic, hence it was necessary to include the section of Shan Kwong Road / Village Road into the calculation of the length of route N1.

175. This Member continued to ask whether there was information to show the proportion of total traffic flow into the district that was not going to the hospital. Mr. Fred Brown used a powerpoint slide to show that under a 0% diversion scenario and in the weekday am peak, about 40% of total traffic volume was going to the hospital (i.e. hospital traffic of 200 pcu/hour as compared to total traffic volume of 455 pcu/ hr).

New Ingress/Egress Would Relieve Traffic in Happy Valley

176. Mr. Fred Brown said that a representer had remarked that the proposed redevelopment, even with the new ingress/egress, would not benefit the local area in traffic terms. With the aid of a powerpoint point slide, Mr. Fred Brown responded by making the following main points:

- (a) without the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road, drivers using route N1 would need to route through Shan Kwong Road / Village Road and those using route N2 would need to route through King Kwong Street / Village Road to go to the hospital. With the new ingress/egress, cars using route N2 would not need to go through King Kwong Street. That would relieve traffic on both King Kwong Street, Shan Kwong Road and Village Road;
- (b) with the new ingress/egress, drivers currently using route N1 to the hospital would have the choice to use route N2. That would relieve the traffic in the inner streets in Happy Valley;

- (c) drivers currently coming from the south would have the choice to drive along Blue Pool Road to use the new ingress/egress instead of driving through Sing Woo Road. That would also relieve the traffic in the inner streets of Happy Valley; and
- (d) according to the junction performance analysis, under the design case with the proposed redevelopment and the new ingress/egress, the performance of road junctions within Happy Valley would remain the same or be improved. For road junctions at the periphery of Happy Valley, there might be slight reduction of junction performance (say from 84% to 83%), but those junctions would still have ample capacities.

177. Mr. Chapman Lam (HKSH's traffic consultant) said that the traffic assessments were to compare the length of route N1 and route N2 for vehicles going to the hospital. Hence, it was necessary to include the section of Shan Kwong Road/Village Road in the calculation of the total length of route N1. In fact, the main benefit of using route N2 was to avoid circulating through this section of Shan Kwong Road / Village Road. In response to the above explanations of HKSH's traffic consultant, a Member said that the TIA had assumed that all traffic would be diverted to route N2, however, it might not be a reasonable assumption as cars travelling to other places in Happy Valley might continue to use route N1. In response, Mr. Fred Brown said that the sensitivity test had already examined different scenarios, covering a 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% and 100% diversion of hospital traffic (from the north) between route N1 and route N2.

Conflict between Traffic on Wong Nai Chung Road and Shan Kwong Road

178. A Member said that it had been assumed that drivers using route N2 would be able to enter the new ingress/egress without any queuing. However, this might not be a valid assumption due to a number of considerations, in that vehicles using route N2 had to cross over the traffic along Shan Kwong Road; there was a bus stop nearby; and there would only be one-way traffic on Shan Kwong Road during horse racing days. As drivers would not be allowed to queue on the heavily trafficked Wong Nai Chung Road, drivers who could not enter the hospital immediately would be forced to drive around the Happy Valley Recreation Ground. If so, drivers might prefer using route N1 and queue along the

inner streets of Happy Valley rather than using route N2.

179. Mr. Fred Brown said that for the new ingress/egress, there would be longer driveways and larger buffer areas for vehicles to queue up within the Site. The chance of traffic tailing back into the main roads would be much reduced. Even if drivers could not enter the new ingress/egress immediately, they would have the choice to turn left near the end of route N2 and use Shan Kwong Road / Village Road to access the hospital. There would normally be special traffic arrangements on horse racing days and it would not be appropriate to predict how the Police would manage the traffic flow near the new ingress/egress. The new ingress/egress apparently provided more flexibility for drivers entering the hospital.

180. Mr. Chapman Lam said that more car parking spaces would be provided in the redevelopment, the parking ratio would be increased from the ratio of 1 car parking space per 7 beds in the existing hospital to 1 car parking space per 5 beds for the whole hospital after redevelopment. In addition, the barrier gate and control point for access to the car park would be placed as far away from the new ingress/egress as possible so that there would be ample buffer space for circulation and waiting within the Site. That would minimise the chance of cars tailing back along Wong Nai Chung Road.

181. The same Member reiterated the point that traffic along Shan Kwong Road might block drivers from entering the hospital through the new ingress/egress. If drivers would then be forced to drive around the Happy Valley Recreation Ground, they might use route N1 instead.

182. In response, Mr. Chapman Lam said that traffic lights on Wong Nai Chung Road and Shan Kwong Road were phased in such a manner that when traffic on Wong Nai Chung Road was moving, the traffic from Shan Kwong Road would be stopped and vice versa. Hence, traffic from route N2 could access new ingress/egress without the need to crossover traffic on Shan Kwong Road. The same Member said that vehicles often tailed back along Shan Kwong Road from the Queen's Road East junction, and that would obstruct the new ingress/egress. The problem might not be related to the phasing of the traffic lights.

183. Mr. Cheung Shu Sang (R1000) said that, according to his memory, there would be times when there were green lights for both north bound traffic on Wong Nai Chung Road and Shan Kwong Road. The Chairman requested the representative of TD to clarify on that point. Mr. Johnny Chan (Engineer/Wanchai, TD) said that as far as he could recall, there should be no conflicting movement for traffic on Wong Nai Chung Road and Shan Kwong Road, which meant that when traffic on Shan Kwong Road moved, there would only be tram movement on Wong Nai Chung Road and private cars had to stop; and when vehicles on Wong Nai Chung Road moved, those vehicles on Shan Kwong Road had to stop.

[Post meeting note: R1000 had written to Members of the Board on 17.8.2012 stating that the above responses given by HKSH's traffic consultant and TD's representative about the traffic light phasing in response to the Member's question on the possible difficulty of entering the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road were wrong. R1000 indicated that there was a very short duration (about 4 to 5 seconds) when the two concerned traffic signals, i.e. Shan Kwong Road (north bound) and Wong Nai Chung Road (west bound) were both showing green. TD subsequently clarified that the two concerned traffic signals were not designed to phase with exclusive green lights. TD further indicated that for the Shan Kwong Road traffic, after passing through the traffic light of the pedestrian crossing, it had to give way to the Wong Nai Chung Road traffic as denoted by traffic sign and road marking arrows. TD explained that having regard to the above give way arrangement, access of vehicles from Wong Nai Chung Road (via Route N2) to the proposed new HKSH ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road would not be difficult.]

Internal Transport Arrangements

184. The Vice-chairman asked the traffic consultant to explain again the transport arrangements that would be adopted to ensure that cars to the hospital would not queue up on Wong Nai Chung Road. Mr. Chapman Lam repeated his explanation as recorded in paragraph 180 above.

185. Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung (D of Plan) said that according to HKSH's conceptual scheme, the turning radius and manoeuvring space for cars at the LG-2 level (i.e. level of the new ingress/egress) appeared inadequate for smooth circulation. Given that there

would also be 11 car parking spaces at that level, the internal circulation of vehicles at that level might affect the efficient performance of the new ingress/egress. The same situation happened in the LG-1 level with 30 parking spaces and a connection with the Phase 1 & 3 car park. He added that Mr. Cameron MacDonald (R971's traffic consultant) had pointed out earlier that the new ingress/egress might not be attractive for drivers as they would be required to climb up two levels within the car park before reaching the existing pick-up/drop-off area. As the new ingress/egress was a critical element proposed in the TIA, he asked whether the arrangements were acceptable to TD.

186. In response, Mr. Chan Chung Yuen (Chief Engineer, Traffic Engineering Division (Hong Kong), TD) said that according to a GBP submitted by HKSH, there would be a new pick-up/drop-off area at the LG-2 level that would have direct access to the lobby of the Phase 4 redevelopment. Cars could leave the hospital at the LG-2 level after dropping off passengers and the comment made by R971's traffic consultant earlier that cars using the new ingress/egress had to climb up two levels to get to the existing pick-up/drop-off point might not be a relevant concern. Mr. Chapman Lam said that the scheme submitted was only conceptual and the detailed design about the turning radius and circulation arrangements would be further refined during the GBP stage in order to ensure smooth circulation. In response to Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung's further question, Mr. Chan Chung Yuen said that the GBP that he referred to was not yet approved by the Building Authority.

Egress Assumption

187. The Chairman asked the HKSH's consultant to respond to R971's traffic consultant's comment on the assumption that 100% of the traffic would exit the hospital using the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road. Mr. Fred Brown said that by using the new exit, drivers could avoid possible delay caused by traffic lights on Shan Kwong Road and Wong Nai Chung Road and that would be the obvious choice for north bound traffic. Nevertheless, the Village Road / Shan Kwong Road junction would still be able to accommodate some traffic using the existing exit to leave the hospital and that was not a major issue of concern.

Assessment of Weekend Peak

188. The Chairman asked HKSH's traffic consultant to clarify the point made by R971's traffic consultant that the traffic assessments had not adequately assessed the weekend peak period. Mr. Fred Brown said that there was no assessment of the traffic impact during the weekend peak in the original TIA but assessment of the weekend peak was covered in the subsequent traffic statements. In fact, during the weekend peak, there would likely be more diversion to route N2 as the local streets in Happy Valley were more congested. Mr. Chapman Lam supplemented that the original TIA was prepared using the typical TIA methodology which included assessment for the weekday am and pm peaks only. The subsequent traffic statements had covered the weekend peak mainly to address queries raised by the Board and some representers.

Pedestrian Impact Assessment

189. The Chairman asked whether the impact on pedestrian environment had been assessed. Mr. Fred Brown said that a new pedestrian access with lifts and/or escalators would be provided, and that would be more attractive for pedestrians as compared to the existing flight of stairs. Pedestrians from the tram station, bus terminus or the new bus stop could make use of the existing pedestrian crossings on Village Road and Shan Kwong Road to reach the new pedestrian access to the hospital. As the pedestrian flow was only estimated to be a few hundred per hour, rather than a few thousand per hour as for station design which R971's traffic consultant was an expert on, there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate the pedestrian flow.

190. Mr. Chan Chung Yuen clarified that the TD Departmental Circular No. 1/2011 quoted by R971's traffic consultant was an internal document that provided a check-list of matters that might need to be assessed in a TIA. However, the specific matters that needed to be assessed in a TIA would depend on the nature and scale of the proposed development and pedestrian impact assessment was not a requirement for all TIAs. For example, a TIA for an exhibition and convention centre use might need to include a pedestrian impact assessment. As for the HKSH redevelopment, pedestrian impact assessment was considered not necessary. Even if HKSH was asked to prepare such

assessment, TD was confident that it would meet the necessary standards.

Traffic Benefits to Happy Valley

191. The Chairman asked for a clarification about the comment made by R971's traffic consultant that the proposed redevelopment would not benefit the traffic in Happy Valley. Mr. Fred Brown recapped the explanations he made earlier and said that the proposed redevelopment with the new ingress/egress would help to relieve traffic in some inner streets in Happy Valley. In particular, cars using route N2 via the new ingress/egress would no longer need to go through King Kwong Street to enter the hospital; cars coming from the south via Blue Pool Road would not need to route through Sing Woo Road, Shan Kwong Road and Village Road when using the new ingress/egress; and cars using route N1 had the choice to use route N2 and would avoid the inner streets of Happy Valley. The critical junction at Shan Kwong Road / Village Road would benefit most, and the performance of road junctions within Happy Valley would remain the same or be improved. The capacity of some road junctions at the periphery of Happy Valley might be reduced, but those junctions would still have ample capacities.

192. Mr. Chan Chung Yuen said that the TIA was to assess the traffic conditions with the HKSH redevelopment and the new ingress/egress, instead of finding ways to resolve the current traffic congestion problems in Happy Valley. In TD's opinion, the HKSH redevelopment with the new ingress/egress would be better in traffic terms as compared with the reference case without the HKSH redevelopment.

193. Mr. Jimmy C.F. Leung asked whether the HKSH redevelopment would generate more traffic on Wong Nai Chung Road (north bound). Mr. Chan Chung Yuen indicated that there would be more a higher level of traffic, but it would be at a sustainable level.

Assumptions in the Sensitivity Test

194. A Member asked for clarification as to whether the sensitivity test only assessed hospital related traffic; and whether the conclusion was that even if no traffic was diverted to route N2, the junctions would still have sufficient capacities.

195. In response, Mr. Chan Chung Yuen said that the sensitivity test prepared by HKSH's traffic consultant only assessed the variation in the route selection for traffic to the hospital. The results of the sensitivity test were that if 50% of the traffic using route N1 was diverted to route N2, the impact would be neutral i.e. neither improved nor worsened. In the scenario where there was no diversion of traffic to route N2 i.e. all traffic would continue to use route N1, there would still be some reserve capacity to accommodate the increased traffic generated by the hospital.

Proportion of Clinic GFA

196. This Member said that some representers had raised doubts about the rationale of controlling the proportion of GFA for clinic uses to a maximum of 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital and how that control would relate to the traffic impact. Although the matter had been discussed in the previous meeting, TD was asked to explain again in this regard.

197. Mr. Chan Chung Yuen said that the traffic consultant had to derive a trip generation rate for forecasting the traffic impact of the proposed hospital redevelopment. The trip rate was derived from traffic surveys conducted by the traffic consultant. At the time the traffic surveys were conducted at the HKSH, there were 400 odd beds (438 beds and 485 beds respectively at the time of the 2009 and 2011 traffic surveys) and 15% of the GFA of hospital was for clinic uses. The trip rate, which was based on the observed trips generated by both the hospital beds and the clinics, was derived and then applied to project traffic generated by the proposed redevelopment with a total number of 800 beds.

198. Mr. Chapman Lam said that the trip rate derived had taken account of the trips generated by the 400 odd beds and the clinic uses that constituted 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital. In this regard, PlanD had recommended the Board to revise the Notes of the Plan to specify, inter alia, that not more than 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the development should be used for clinic purpose.

199. A Member said that at the time when the traffic survey was carried out, there were 400 odd beds and 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital was for clinic

uses. In future, there would be 800 beds and again 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital would be for clinic uses. This Member asked whether the ratio of the GFA for clinic uses to the GFA for ward uses (not number of beds) would remain the same in future.

200. Ms. Anna Lee (project manager of HKSH) said that traffic generated by the hospital was projected based on the number of beds, and not GFA of the wards. The trip rate was derived by a traffic survey undertaken at a time when 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital was for clinic uses. It was appropriate to impose control on the basis of the number of beds (i.e. not GFA of wards) and proportion of GFA for clinic uses.

201. Ms. Anna Lee continued to explain that the same number of beds would require more GFA to accommodate in future as compared to the existing hospital. For example, the number of beds in their intensive care unit (ICU) had remained at 13 numbers for the past years but the floor space for accommodating the ICU had almost tripled, the number of staff had doubled and space for medical equipments had also increased substantially.

202. Mr. Ian Brownlee (HKSH's planning consultant) said that the TIA and traffic statements were prepared based on the assumptions that the traffic generated by the hospital would be related to the number of hospital beds, with the proportion of GFA for clinic uses remained unchanged as in the existing hospital (i.e. at 15% of the total non-domestic GFA of the hospital). In this regard, TD had asked for a mechanism to ensure that the proportion of GFA for clinic uses in the HKSH redevelopment would be capped at 15%. Mr. Ian Brownlee said that the matter about the proportion of GFA for clinic uses and its possible effects on traffic had already been discussed and deliberated in previous meetings.

Relationships with the Community

203. A Member asked what HKSH had done to address the concerns of residents about the proposed redevelopment, especially on the possible adverse traffic impacts in the area. Ms. Anna Lee said that they firmly believed that the new ingress/egress was

essential to alleviate the current traffic problems and should be implemented with no further delay. She had attended many meetings with residents to answer queries about the redevelopment project. She had also met with the residents of Fung Fai Terrace on many occasions and would repair the private road there. At this point, some representers indicated that the road at Fung Fai Terrace had still not been repaired.

[Ms. Timothy K.W. Ma left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

General Concerns about Traffic Impacts

204. A Member said that the future phases of the hospital redevelopment would change its mode of operation, for example, there would be single-bed wards rather than multi-bed wards and there might be one nurse per bed rather than one nurse looking after several beds. Such change in mode of operation and staff ratio might have implications on the validity of adopting the trip rate observed in the existing hospital to project the traffic impact of the future redevelopment.

205. Dr. Chan Woon Tong (Deputy Medical Superintendent of HKSH) said that the staff ratio of one nurse per bed was only applicable to ICU, and it would not be feasible to adopt such high staff ratio in all wards. The clinics in the hospital were mainly for specialist treatments, and the number of patients visiting these specialist clinics would be much less than the general out-patient clinics. There might only be a few patients visiting the specialist clinics each day. The new ingress/egress would increase flexibility for drivers. The hospital had currently employed security guards to implement on-site traffic management measures to avoid vehicles queuing up and tailing back onto the main roads. Similar traffic management measures might be considered in future, if necessary, to ensure minimal disruption to the local road network. If there was really traffic problems generated by clinic uses, some clinics could be relocated off-site. At present, HKSH had already established a few family medical centres and eye centres in places like Taikoo Shing and Central. Members could be rest assured that the hospital would put paramount importance to avoid adverse traffic impacts in the area and that was the main reason for proposing a new ingress/egress in the redevelopment project.

206. A Member said that according to TD's FI, even if all trips continued to use route N1 to access the hospital, there would still be sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic from the proposed redevelopment. However, residents had major concerns about traffic congestion even under the existing situation and it appeared that there was a different perception between TD and the residents on the traffic condition in the area.

207. Mr. Chan Chung Yuen said that different persons who observed the traffic conditions during different times of the day might have a different perception of the traffic situation. However, TD's view was that the information and assessment in all the traffic submissions by HKSH had adequately demonstrated that there would be sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional traffic generated from the proposed redevelopment.

[Ms. Janice W.M. Lai left the meeting at this point.]

208. A Member asked that given that there were still doubts on the traffic impact of the proposed redevelopment, what HKSH's views would be if they were asked to engage an independent third party to re-assess the traffic impacts of the proposed redevelopment. Mr. Ian Brownlee said whether an independent third party's opinion should be sought was up to the Board. HKSH's traffic consultant had conducted a TIA and prepared three additional traffic submissions following the well established technical and professional approach to prepare TIAs. TD was the professional department advising the Board and they had indicated no objection to all the traffic submissions of the HKSH. The criticisms made on the traffic submissions were based on perceptions that were difficult to quantify. As DPO/HK had mentioned in his introduction, the Government had already responded to the request of the Legco arising from a Legco Case Conference about the proposed redevelopment, that there was no particular reason to employ independent expert to re-assess the traffic impacts of the proposed redevelopment. Members should have sufficient information to accept the professional advice provided by TD on the traffic aspects.

209. As Members had no further question, the government representatives, and the representers and their representatives were invited to leave the meeting room. They all

left the meeting room at this juncture.

[The meeting was adjourned for a five minute break.]

[Mr. Timothy K.W. Ma returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Deliberation Session

210. The Chairman asked Members to consider the representations taking into account all the written submissions; the oral representations made by the representers and the Board's discussions in this meeting and at previous meetings held on 4.8.2012 and 11.5.2012. Members also noted the documents tabled by R754, R836 and R971 at the meeting.

211. At this point, Ms. Bernadette Linn (D of Lands) declared an interest that her spouse, who was a private practice doctor, would occasionally use the facilities in the HKSH to provide consultation / treatment for patients but her spouse was not an employee of HKSH nor was he involved in the HKSH redevelopment project. After some discussion, Members agreed that the interest declared by the D of Lands was indirect and she was allowed to stay and participate in the meeting.

Acceptability of the Traffic Impact Assessment

212. The Chairman said that in the previous meeting held on 11.5.2012, Members had doubts on the validity of the TIA assumption that 100% of the traffic coming from the north would use route N2 to access the hospital using the new ingress/egress at Wong Nai Chung Road. TD had subsequently submitted clarification on why it considered the assumptions tenable. TD had also commented on the sensitivity test submitted by HKSH for hospital traffic ingress route assignment (adopting percentage splits of 0%, 25%, 50%, 75% or 100% between route N1 and route N2). As stated in TD's FI, TD considered that the assumptions adopted in the TIA submitted by HKSH were justifiable and maintained its view of having no objection to the proposed redevelopment from traffic perspective. With regard to the impact of the proposed redevelopment on pedestrian activities, TD had explained at the meeting that pedestrian impact assessment was not necessary for the

proposed redevelopment and there would be sufficient capacity at the existing pedestrian footpaths / crossings to accommodate the additional pedestrian flow to and from the hospital. Members had also sought clarifications at the hearing on various aspects of the TIA and internal circulation arrangement of the new Phase 4 building. Based on the above, the Chairman asked Members to consider whether the findings of the TIA were acceptable.

213. A Member said that TD's FI provided more assurance of the acceptability of the TIA and that the traffic situation would be sustainable. In particular, the Member noted the finding that the traffic impact would be neutral even if only 50% of the traffic would be diverted to route N2; and there would still be sufficient capacity at the critical junctions if 100% of the traffic continued to use route N1. In respect of pedestrian impacts, HKSH had proposed a new pedestrian access with lifts and/or escalators.

214. This Member continued to say that one of the concerns raised at this meeting was the need to avoid queuing up on Wong Nai Chung Road through adopting suitable internal transport arrangements. The Board might consider whether there were things which could be done in this regard to ensure due attention and follow up by HKSH. The Chairman said that TD would scrutinise the internal transport arrangements of the proposed redevelopment in the GBP submission stage in accordance with the established practice. If necessary, the Police might also require the HKSH to implement necessary traffic management measures to ensure no traffic queuing up on the main roads.

215. A Member said that the information provided by TD and HKSH's traffic consultant had clarified the concerns that Members had in the previous meeting. The sensitivity test had provided information to show that the traffic impacts would be acceptable even if not 100% of the traffic from the north would use route N2. The choice of a driving route was largely dictated by the drivers' past experience but that could be gradually modified in the course of time in view of changing circumstances. The progressive modification to the traffic arrangements at Times Square was a good example. This Member opined that with the new ingress/egress to divert some traffic from the local road network and the additional traffic management / transport measures that would be adopted to avoid queuing up of cars on Wong Nai Chung Road, the proposed redevelopment would unlikely worsen the existing traffic conditions in the area.

216. The Vice-chairman said that in light of the FI submitted by TD and the discussion at the meeting, he maintained his previous view that the additional ingress/egress would help to relieve the existing traffic congestion problem in the area. In the GBP stage, it was important to ensure that there would be sufficient car parking spaces, and buffer and circulation space for cars within the Site to avoid any cars tailing back on Wong Nai Chung Road.

217. The Chairman added that the TD had offered their independent professional assessment on the TIA submitted by HKSH's traffic consultant to safeguard the public interest. There was no reason for TD to agree to a proposed redevelopment that would create unacceptable traffic impacts.

218. Another Member said that based on the personal experience in vetting TIAs, the traffic submissions made by HKSH were properly prepared and had provided sufficient assessments. The comments made by R971's traffic consultant had actually been addressed in the traffic submissions of HKSH. This Member agreed with TD's view that the TIA was acceptable and that the transport improvements in the proposed redevelopment were not for resolving all traffic problems in Happy Valley. The Chairman added that according to the advice of TD and the HKSH's traffic consultant in the previous meeting, not a very high percentage of vehicles passing through the Shan Kwong Road/Village Road junction would go to the hospital.

219. Two other Members agreed that the Board should trust TD's professional advice that the TIA was acceptable given TD's FI and the responses made by TD and HKSH's traffic consultant at the meeting. In addition, one of the Members said that the proposed redevelopment might present a chance for overall improvement to the existing traffic problem with more car parking spaces, larger drop-off/pick-up area and circulation space within the Site.

220. Another Member said that based on the traffic submissions and the advice of TD, the TIA could be considered acceptable. However, being a former resident of Happy Valley, the perception and worries of the residents of Happy Valley was understandable. There might be traffic problems if the internal transport arrangements of the proposed

redevelopment were not suitably refined to provide adequate buffer and circulation space at the detailed design stage as mentioned in the meeting. TD and HKSH should be advised to take extra care in this regard during the GBP submission stage.

221. The Chairman said that the Board could include advisory comments to request HKSH and TD to carefully plan the internal transport arrangements of the new ingress/egress of the hospital and car park layouts during the GBP submission stage to avoid any queuing up of cars on Wong Nai Chung Road. HKSH should also be requested to pay careful attention, in consultation with TD, to traffic arrangements during the construction stage to avoid exacerbating the existing traffic problem; and an advisory group with the participation of residents might be set up by HKSH for such purpose.

Submission of Development Scheme for the Board's Approval

222. A Member said that in the previous meeting on 11.5.2012, the possibility to require submission of MLP for the proposed redevelopment had been discussed. This Member asked whether the internal transport arrangements of the proposed redevelopment could be submitted as a part of a MLP. As requested by the Chairman, the Secretary explained that in the previous meeting, the discussion about MLP submission arose when some Members considered that there should still be room for improvement in the building design. Under such context, she had advised that if Members considered that there was a need to vet the building design of the proposed redevelopment, the zoning of the HKSH site could be amended to require HKSH to submit a MLP to the Board for consideration through the planning application system. However, if Members were currently of the opinion that the building design could be scrutinised by the Building Authority effectively during the GBP submission stage, then such requirement for MLP submission would not be necessary.

223. The Secretary further explained that any submission of MLP to the Board would follow the statutory procedures under section 16 of the Ordinance. The MLP submission would be published for public comments and the submission would also be circulated to government departments for comments. The planning application would be considered by the MPC of the Board but unlike in a representation procedure, persons who submitted comments would not be invited to attend the MPC meeting.

224. A Member considered that it was not necessary for the Board to vet the building design of HKSH's redevelopment scheme through the planning application system.

Visual Impact and Air Ventilation

225. The Chairman asked Members to note the additional photomontage in Plan Ha-11 of the Paper that showed the view of the proposed redevelopment from the southeast of Happy Valley Recreation Ground. That photomontage was prepared in response to concerns at the previous meeting that there was no photomontage showing the visual impacts from the front of the proposed development. The Chairman said that there would inevitably be some visual impacts with new buildings on the Site, and Members had to decide whether the visual impacts were at an acceptable level. At the previous meeting on 11.5.2012, Members generally accepted the maximum building height of 115mPD and 89mPD of the scheme submitted by HKSH. In addition, at the previous meeting, Members had also sought clarifications with regard to the air ventilation impacts of the proposed redevelopment and considered that the AVA submitted by HKSH to be generally acceptable.

226. The Secretary said that it was necessary to clarify about the points made by Mr. Cheung Shu Sang (R1000) regarding comments made by the former D of Plan at the Board's meeting held in 2008. The Board's meeting held on 8.8.2008 was the hearing for consideration of representations (including a representation submitted by HKSH) in respect of the previous OZP No. S/H7/14. At that time, HKSH proposed a Phase 4 redevelopment at 148mPD (37-storeys) i.e. similar to the BH of the Phase 3 building on the Site. At that meeting, Members did not agree to the 148mPD proposal and the comments quoted by R1000 from the minutes of the 2008 meeting were about the 148mPD redevelopment scheme, and not the current proposal (at 89mPD and 115mPD) being considered by the Board at the meeting today.

227. The Chairman also requested Members to consider whether HKSH's proposal to reduce the setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m was acceptable. The Chairman said that at the previous meeting on 11.5.2012, Members noted the

information about the geotechnical constraints of the Site provided by HKSH to justify their proposed reduction of the setback in order to accommodate the planned facilities, including single-bed wards, in the proposed redevelopment. The Geotechnical Engineering Office (GEO) of the Civil Engineering and Development Department had no comment on HKSH's 2012 Scheme from geotechnical perspective. At the previous meeting, Members generally considered that the visual impact arising from the reduction in the setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m was not significant. The Chairman invited comments from Members.

228. A Member considered that as seen from the tram terminus, the reduction in setback along Wong Nai Chung Road would result in greater adverse visual impact. However, on balance of other planning considerations, this Member was of the view that such level of visual impact could still be tolerated and the proposed reduction of setback along Wong Nai Chung Road as proposed by HKSH could be allowed. Another Member had no objection to the proposed reduction in setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m.

229. A Member held a different view and said that the 27m setback as stipulated on the Plan should not be amended. The MPC had thoroughly discussed the amendments to the Plan based on the development scheme submitted by HKSH in 2010 that featured a 27m setback. Geotechnical constraint was HKSH's excuse to ask for a reduction of the setback, the all single-bed wards hospital design was the key reason why their target of 800 beds could not be achieved if the 27m setback was retained. If there were geotechnical constraints as claimed, the HKSH should adjust their hospital design instead of requesting the Board to amend the Plan.

[Ms. Julia M.K. Lau left the meeting at this point.]

230. Another Member said that although the 27m setback was originally proposed by HKSH, there would be no unacceptable visual impacts if the setback was reduced to 16m. This Member considered that the Board should respect the hospital's own planning and management on the suitable type of services to be provided within its premises for its patients.

231. In response to the Chairman, the Secretary said that the main planning consideration about whether the setback should be reduced was about visual impacts. According to the VIA prepared by PlanD, the visual impacts of reducing the setback from 27m to 16m was considered acceptable from three out of the four viewpoints assessed. However, as seen from the viewpoint at the tram terminus, the visual impact would be worsened if the setback was reduced from 27m to 16m. The Board had to weigh such visual impacts against other considerations, such as geotechnical constraints, hospital design and the need to provide 800 beds as discussed in the previous meeting held on 11.5.2012. In respect of hospital design, the Secretary said that at the previous meeting, HKSH indicated that they would adopt a central service core arrangement with all single-bed wards and the minimum depth required for a typical ward floor was 33m. She said that HKSH had explained in the previous meeting that there would be loss of some hospital rooms and could not fully accommodate the GFA permissible on the Site, if the building had to be built closer to the slope due to the 27m setback along Wong Nai Chung Road.

232. In response to the Chairman, the Secretary said that air ventilation assessments undertaken by HKSH indicated that the air ventilation performance for the scheme with the 27m setback and the scheme with a reduced setback (a scheme with 17m setback was assessed in the AVA) were comparable. In response to a Member's further question, the Secretary said that HKSH had prepared air ventilation assessments by both expert evaluation and computational fluid dynamics to assess the impacts of reducing the setback.

233. A Member said that the Phase 3 building on the Site was a visual eye-sore. However, in respect of the reduction of the setback along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m, it could be considered acceptable as there was no major difference in the overall visual impact. It was necessary to balance the visual impact considerations with the need for more hospital services / beds and the hospital design proposed by HKSH.

234. The Vice-chairman said that the Board was mindful of the need to provide flexibility to accommodate technical and site constraints through mechanisms such as the provision for minor relaxation in the planning application process. He considered that the reduction of the setback to 16m was acceptable as there would be no major, nor unacceptable, visual or air ventilation impacts. This was in line with the spirit of the

Board to allow for minor relaxation of planning restrictions to cater for site specific circumstances.

235. A Member said that there appeared to be no strong technical grounds, such as air ventilation, not to allow for a reduction of the setback. The adverse visual impact from one of the viewpoint at the tram terminus (as shown in Plan Ha-10 in the Paper) was also not a strong reason not to allow for a reduction of the setback. In this regard, the Secretary recapitulated the reason for imposing a 27m setback on the OZP. She said that the 27m setback was proposed by HKSH as a planning gain in the scheme submitted to the Board for consideration of amendments to the Plan in 2008. Subsequently, the HKSH submitted a representation opposing the Plan and proposed, inter alia, to reduce the setback area along Wong Nai Chung Road from 27m to 16m on technical grounds. The Chairman supplemented that the key consideration was a balance between the need to provide new medical services and site-specific visual concerns.

Plan-making Procedures

236. In response to the Chairman's question, the Secretary said that if the Board decided to amend the setback distance to 16m as proposed by HKSH, the proposed amendment would be published and subject to the further representation procedures. In response to a Member's question, the Secretary said that Members had agreed in the previous meeting to amend the Notes of the Plan to specify that the total number of hospital beds provided should not be in excess of 800 beds and not more than 15% of total non-domestic GFA of the development should be used for clinic purpose. HKSH had also proposed some detailed boundary adjustments to the BH sub-areas in the "G/IC" zone in their 2012 Scheme (Drawing Ha-1). Hence, regardless of the Board's decision regarding the setback, the Plan would need to be amended and the proposed amendments would be subject to the further representation procedures. In response to the Vice-chairman's question, the Secretary further supplemented that the HKSH could make a planning application to request for minor relaxation of the 27m setback as currently stipulated on the Plan, even if no amendment to the setback on the Plan was made by the Board.

Conclusion

237. After deliberation, the Chairman concluded that Members agreed to uphold R708 and to amend (a) the Notes to specify that the total number of hospital beds provided should not be in excess of 800 beds and not more than 15% of total non-domestic GFA of the development shall be used for clinic purpose; (b) the boundary of the BH control sub-area stipulated with BHRs 89mPD and 115mPD and 2-storey on the basis of HKSH's 2012 Scheme (Drawing Ha-1). The Secretary supplemented that other than reduction of the width of the setback area along Wong Nai Chung Road to 16m, HKSH had also proposed some adjustments to the boundaries of the BH sub-areas in the "G/IC" zone.

238. The Chairman recapped Member's earlier views that the Board should inform TD and advise R708 to (a) carefully plan the internal transport arrangements of the new ingress/egress of the hospital and the car park layout during the GBP submission stage to avoid any queuing up of cars on Wong Nai Chung Road; and (b) pay careful attention, in consultation with TD, to traffic arrangements during the construction stage to avoid exacerbating the existing traffic problem and an advisory group with the participation of residents might be set up by HKSH for such purpose.

239. Members also decided to note the support of R1 to R703 (except R253, R267, R294, R325) to the BHRs on the HKSH site; the support of R704 (part) to R706 (part) to the BHRs of 89mPD and 115mPD on the HKSH site; and the support of R996 (part) to R1003 (part) to the BHR of 2-storeys on the HKSH site. Members noted R267 and R294 that had not specified any view or ground.

240. Members also decided not to uphold R253, R325, R707, R709 to R793, R795 to R995, R1004 to R1023, R1026 to R1046, and R1048 to R1068, and the remaining parts of R704 to R706 and R996 to R1003.

R1 to R703 (except R253 and R325)

241. After further deliberation, the Board decided to note the support of R1 to R703 (except R253, R267, R294, R325) to the BHRs on the HKSH site. The Board also noted R267 and R294 that had not specified any view or ground.

R253, R325, R707, R709 to R793, R795 to R995, R1004 to R1023, R1026 to R1046, and R1048 to R1068, and the remaining parts of R996 to R1003

242. After further deliberation, the Board decided to note the support of R996 (part) to R1003 (part) to the BHR of 2-storeys on the HKSH site. The Board also decided not to uphold the representations of R253, R325, R707, R709 to R793, R795 to R995, R1004 to R1023, R1026 to R1046, and R1048 to R1068, and the remaining parts of R996 to R1003. Members then went through the suggested reasons for not upholding the representations as detailed in paragraph 7.2 of the Paper and agreed that they were appropriate. The reasons were:

- (a) in amending the BHRs for the HKSH site, the Board had thoroughly assessed the specific development scheme and technical assessments submitted by HKSH and balanced relevant factors, including the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone, surrounding land uses, the development and operation needs of the hospital, technical constraints of the Site, the permissible GFA of the Site under the lease and Buildings Ordinance, the availability of other development options, compatibility of the BHs with the general BH bands for the area and surrounding developments, visual impact of the proposed development on major local vantage points, and acceptability of the development from traffic and infrastructural viewpoints (*R253, R325, R707, R709 to R793, R795 to R1023, R1026 to R1046 and R1048 to R1068*);
- (b) the BHRs of 89mPD, 115mPD and 2 storeys for the Site were not incompatible with the existing BH bands of 85mPD to 115mPD for the valley floor area covered by the Wong Nai Chung OZP, and would not have a major adverse impact on the view from major local vantage points. There was also a balanced consideration of the visual assessment and other relevant factors, including the permissible development intensity of the Site under the Building Ordinance and the lease, technical constraints of the Site, and functional and operational needs of the hospital in terms of integrated design for the hospital blocks (*R709 to R793, R795 to R957,*

R960 to R962, R964 to R974, R977, R978, R980, R982, R985 to R987, R989 to R999, R1001, R1002, R1004, R1005, R1009, R1010 to R1012, R1015, R1016, R1018, R1019, R1021, R1022, R1026, R1029 to R1031, R1033 to R1046, R1048, R1050 to R1053, R1058, R1060, R1061, and R1063 to R1067);

- (c) according to the AVA conducted for the OZP area, Shan Kwong Road was one of the major wind corridors for the area. As the HKSH was located in the north-western corner of the valley floor area and the 2-storey BHR on the OZP would ensure the provision of a 16m setback of the hospital tower along Shan Kwong Road/Wong Nai Chung Road, the BHRs for the HKSH site should not have significant adverse impact on the air ventilation and heat dispersal in the area (*R960, R963, R977, R980, R986, R990, R992 to R995, R997, R998, R1000, R1002, R1005, R1009, R1010, R1012, R1016, R1023, R1026, R1027, R1032, R1051, R1059, R1066 and R1067);*

- (d) according to the TIA, Traffic Statement, Further Traffic Statement conducted for the proposed redevelopment at the HKSH site and TD's clarification and comments on the sensitivity test report, the redevelopment under the amended BHRs would not cause unacceptable traffic impact on the surrounding areas (*R709 to R793, R795 to R960, R962 to R973, R976 to R979, R981, R982, R984, R986, R989 to R995, R998 to R1001, R1003 to R1014, R1016, R1017, R1021 to R1023, R1026 to R1030, R1032 to R1046, R1048 to R1050, R1053 to R1068);*

- (e) according to Chapter 9 of the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, 'Hospital' was not classified as polluting use and would not generate insurmountable environmental impact on the surrounding areas. The environmental impacts during the construction and operation stages of hospital redevelopment were subject to statutory control under various pollution control ordinances. Proper air ventilation and hygiene would be maintained in the hospital building in accordance with the relevant guidelines issued by the Government (*R709 to R793, R795 to R955, R957, R960, R963 to R970, R972, R973, R977, R979, R982, R991, R993*

to R998, R1000, R1001, R1003, R1006, R1009, R1010, R1012 to R1014, R1016, R1021, R1023, R1026, R1028, R1032 to R1046, R1059, R1061 and R1063 to R1067);

- (f) the proposed hospital redevelopment at the Site allowed under the revised BHRs could enhance and upgrade the medical services and capacity of the hospital to meet the needs of the community (*R709 to R793, R795 to R948, R954, R955, R958, R959, R964, R969 to R973, R989, R990, R992 to R997, R1001, R1008, R1020, R1022, R1027, R1032, R1043, R1046, R1061, R1062 and R1065 to R1067*); and
- (g) the amendments to the OZP were exhibited for public inspection for two months in accordance with the provisions of the Ordinance. The exhibition of the amendments was a statutory channel for public consultation. Any person had the right to make a representation to the Board. In addition, Wan Chai District Council and Wan Chai South Area Committee were consulted and a consultation forum was held to solicit the views of the locals. These statutory and administrative consultation procedures were considered adequate (*R964, R971, R1009, R1010, R1027 and R1061*).

R704 to R706

243. After further deliberation, the Board noted the support of R704 (part) to R706 (part) to the BHRs of 89mPD and 115mPD on the HKSH site. The Board who decided not to uphold the remaining parts of R704 to R706. Members then went through the suggested reason for not upholding the representations as detailed in paragraph 7.3 of the Paper and agreed that they were appropriate. The reason was:

- the 2-storey BHR for the north-eastern part of the Site would ensure the provision of a setback of the hospital tower from Wong Nai Chung Road to mitigate the visual impact of the proposed development. The restriction should not impose undue constraint on the design of the hospital development.

R708

244. After further deliberation, the Board decided to uphold the representation of R708 and proposed the following amendments to the “G/IC” zone covering the Site:

- (a) to amend the Notes to specify that the total number of hospital beds provided should not be in excess of 800 beds and not more than 15% of total non-domestic GFA of the development shall be used for clinic purpose; and
- (b) to amend the boundary of the BH control sub-area stipulated with BHRs of 89mPD, 115mPD and 2-storey on the basis of HKSH’s 2012 Scheme (Drawing Ha-1).

245. The Board also decided to advise R708 of the following:

- (a) to carefully plan the internal transport arrangements of the new ingress/egress of the hospital and the car park layout during the GBP submission stage to avoid any queuing up of cars on Wong Nai Chung Road; and
- (b) to pay careful attention, in consultation with TD, to traffic arrangements during the construction stage to avoid exacerbating the existing traffic problem and an advisory group with the participation of residents might be set up by HKSH for such purpose;

Agenda Item 15

[Open Meeting]

Any Other Business

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese.]

246. There being no other business, the meeting closed at 7:00pm.