

1. The meeting was resumed at 9:00 a.m. on 1.2.2018.
2. The following Members and the Secretary were present at the resumed meeting :

Permanent Secretary for Development
(Planning and Lands)
Ms Bernadette H.H. Linn

Chairperson

Professor S.C. Wong

Vice-chairperson

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr H.W. Cheung

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr Dominic K.K. Lam

Ms Christina M. Lee

Mr H.F. Leung

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Dr Billy C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Chief Traffic Engineer (Hong Kong), Transport Department

Mr Eddie S.K. Leung

Chief Engineer (Works), Home Affairs Department

Mr Martin W.C. Kwan

Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Strategic Assessment),

Environmental Protection Department

Mr Raymond W.M. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department

Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Tuen Mun and Yuen Long West District

Agenda Item 1 (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of the Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1

(TPB Paper No. 10378)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese]

3. The Chairperson said that the meeting was the second hearing day of the representations and comments in respect of the Draft Hung Shui Kiu and Ha Tsuen Outline Zoning Plan No. S/HSK/1 (the draft OZP).

4. The Secretary said that Members' declarations of interests were made at the last session on 30.1.2018 (paragraph 3 of the Minutes of 30.1.2018). Members noted that Ms Janice W.M. Lai, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr Patrick H.T. Lau, Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon and Mr Raymond K.W. Lee had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting. As the proposed public housing developments in the draft OZP were related to the housing sites in general rather than housing projects proposed by the Hong Kong Housing Authority (HKHA), a direct conflict of interest did not arise and the Members declared having affiliation/business dealings with the Housing Department/HKHA could stay in the meeting. The Board also agreed that as the interest of Mr S.C. Wong, Mr H.F. Leung, Dr C.H. Hau and Mr Peter K.T. Yuen were indirect, and Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu had no direct involvement in the matter, they could stay in the meeting.

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

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

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Mr David C.M. Lam - District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and
Yuen Long West (DPO/TMYLW), PlanD

C33 - Lam Tsz Ching

C35 - 楊穎姿

C36 - 廖永建

C37 - 李

C38 - Chan P Chu

C39 - 李夢瑤

C40 - 黃駿軒

C41 - 李偉明

C42 - 黃秀香

C44 - 單志良

C45 - Liu Shui Lin

C46 - 林海添

C47 - 林偉強

C48 - 衛文康

C49 - 鄭瑞庭

C50 - 王金湯

C51 - 蔡德成

C52 - 嚴石如

C53 - Chan Yee Han

C54 - 張漢強

C55 - Hajva

C56 - 林海燕

C58 - 黃志豪

C59 - Loog Lam Ho

C60 - 李迎憲

C61 - 陳悅

C62 - 周詠珊

C64 - 梁玉珊

C65 - 梁永順

C66 - 麥望熙

C67 - 鄧錦容

C69 - 黃明珠

C71 - 麥望楸

C71 - 馮煒康

C73 - 周嘉平

C74 - 何志健

C75 - 麥詩渝

C76 - 馮秋蘭

C77 - Leung Tsz Wing

C78 - 陳俊康

C79 - 胡國君

C80 - 陳思慧

C81 - 關天易

C82 - 袁華

C83 - 何于海

C84 - 許詠麟

C85 - 陳春容

C86 - 黃曉丹

C87 - Tsang Hoi Ying

C89 - 陳雪芬

C90 - Wu Hui Chiu

C91 - 陳惠蘭

C93 - 曾燕琴

C94 - 劉桂紅

C95 - 曾愛香

C96 - 梁愉

C97 - 陳子智

C98 - 張陳笑芳

C99 - 陳生

C100 - Cheung Kwok Wing

C101 - 葉桂齊

C102 - 姜文敏

C103 - 阡卜華

C104 - 關佩鈞

C105 - 李國戈

C106 - 周佩儀

C107 - 葉玉和

C108 - 馮文騰

C109 - 吳細梅

C110 - 何詩晴

C111 - 譚新

C112 - Billy

C113 - 卓嘉豪

C114 - 黃添發

C116 - 香惠兒

C118 - 黎國泳

C119 - 曾惠賢

C120 - Li Fei

C121 - 郝中

C122 - 李錦嫦

C123 - 楊巧玉

C124 - 尚麗

C125 - 楊春艷

C126 - 何耀鳴

C127 - 盧逢生

C128 - Yip Pui Yan

C129 - 周冬梅

C130 - 葉嘉慧

C131 - 李敏豪

C132 - Lam Pui Suen

- C133 - 潘建東
- C134 - 楊秀平
- C135 - 盧雪有
- C137 - 羅紹光
- C139 - 胡秀芝
- C140 - Ng Chung Lan
- C141 - 符馨月
- C142 - 宋如嬌
- C143 - 楊家兒
- C145 - 黃少玲
- C146 - Chan Kar Hei
- C147 - Chan Ching Yin
- C148 - Yeung Wai Fong
- C149 - Fan Ka Man
- C150 - 張偉麗
- C151 - 雷偉文
- C152 - 周良偉
- C153 - 柯詠敏
- C154 - 莊綺雯
- C155 - Luk Sing Ling
- C159 - 張雪梅
- C160 - Hung Ching Wa
- C162 - Chiu Po Kam Lucia
- C163 - Chan Yiu Ming
- C164 - 王子都
- C165 - Zena
- C166 - 鄧李嫻
- C167 - Katherine Yu
- C168 - Lam Sin Lung
- C169 - 鄧榮芳
- C170 - Abu Bar Ar

C171 - 甘美蓮

C172 - Umar

C173 - Lau Ching Yan

C176 - 文月紅

C177 - Kwok Po Shing

C179 - 黃柱平

C180 - 廖小姐

C181 - 鄭可健

C182 - 盧康

C183 - 盧國子

C184 - 皺煥江

C185 - 李帶

C186 - 陳明霞

C187 - 鄧鳳有

C188 - Lui Ho Yeung

C189 - 胡江霞

C190 - Wu Yujing

C192 - 黃桂梅

C193 - 蔡桂玲

C195 - 周家俊

C196 - 林惜

C197 - 喻浩

C198 - 鄭漢忠

C199 - 董愛妮

C200 - 張文詩

C201 - 朱軒麟

C202 - 歐建興

C203 - 蔡春喜

C204 - Wong Yuk Fan

C205 - Chiu Siu Ching

C206 - Tsang Siu Wo Fletcher

C207 - Chen Yee Lok Eden

C208 - Leung Tak Ming

C210 - 盧生

C211 - 許生

C213 - 陳生

C214 - 鄧振輪

C215 - 張志雲

C216 - 吳秋洋

C218 - 張錦榮

C219 - 李偉深

C221 - 幸小姐

C222 - 黎芷珊

C224 - 吳生

C225 - Ben Tang

C226 - 冼萍

C228 - 盧德祐

C229 - Abdullooh Khan

C230 - 鐘潤東

C231 - 張智傑

C234 - 陳伯

C235 - Hung Ching Yee

C237 - 文二妹

C240 - 余玉蓮

C318 - Ng Ching Yan

洪水橋社區小組 -

Leung Tak Ming

Ng Ching Yan

So Chun Yin

Yeung Wing Chi

Chan Hoi Chi

Commenter and Commenters'
representatives

C277 - 周偉源

Mr Wong Chun Yu

Commenter's representative

C289 - 官潔明

Mr Lau Kai Tung

Commenter's representative

7. The Chairperson extended a welcome and explained the procedures of the hearing. She said that PlanD's representative would be invited to brief Members on the representations and comments. The representers, commenters or their representatives would then be invited to make oral submissions in turn according to their representation/comment number. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or their representative was allotted 10 minutes for making presentation. There was a timer device to alert the representers/commenters or their representatives two minutes before the allotted 10-minute time was to expire and when the allotted 10-minute time limit was up. Question and Answer sessions would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions on that day. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A sessions, the hearing of the day would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives and the government representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing of all the oral submissions from the representers/commenters or their representatives who attended the meeting, the Board would deliberate on the representations/comments in their absence, and inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

8. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representatives to brief Members on the representations and comments.

9. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the formulation of the new Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) for the Hung Shui Kiu New Development Area (HSK NDA) project, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in TPB Paper No. 10378 (the Paper).

10. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their written submissions.

R16 - Tam Kai Hei

11. Mr Tam Kai Hei made the following main points :

- (a) the Town Planning Ordinance (the Ordinance) stipulated that all meetings of the Board or of any committee appointed should be opened to the public. The public should be given an explanation on why the deliberation part of the hearing was conducted in a closed meeting. There had been criticisms that the Board had become a rubber stamp for approving all the Government's proposal including the Three-runway System of the Hong Kong International Airport, North East New Territories (NENT) NDA etc.;
- (b) taking Wang Chau development as an example, the information provided by the Government's consultant regarding the number of buildings/structures surveyed was highly inaccurate. Accurate information should be provided to the Board to facilitate its consideration of proposals and all such information should be released to the public for scrutiny;
- (c) there were great uncertainties in development of HSK NDA, in particular, in the significant amount of land reserved for the development of high-tech industries, as land had already been reserved in Lok Ma Chau Loop and Heung Yuen Wai for the same purpose and the Innovation and Technology Bureau had indicated that priority would be given to develop those two areas. There were doubts on whether there was genuine demand for two various land uses earmarked on the draft OZP; and
- (d) plenty of commercial floor space would be provided in the Kowloon East area under the Energising Kowloon East initiative, and the ex-government office site at Caroline Hill Road, Causeway Bay would also be developed for commercial purpose. There was no demand for so many commercial sites in HSK NDA

and the plot ratio (PR) of up to 9 was excessive. The implementation of HSK NDA should be proceeded under a cautious and incremental approach.

R100 - Cheng Hiu Man

12. With the aid of an audio clip, Ms Cheng Hiu Man made the following main points :

- (a) residents of Hung Fuk Estate objected to the proposed refuse collection point (RCP) nearby mainly on the grounds of environmental hygiene, odour, traffic safety and insufficient consultation; and
- (b) the public consultation carried out by the Government was not genuine in that land was already allocated to the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD) in 2015 for development of the proposed RCP, and there was no mentioning of the RCP until Stage 3 Community Engagement (CE3) of the HSK NDA.

R99 - Poon Sin Yan

13. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Poon Sin Yan made the following main points :

- (a) clinics and elderly homes were proposed around the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Estate. Rehousing sites for residents affected by the NDA development were also located adjacent to the proposed RCP. Those land uses were incompatible with each other; and
- (b) the location of the proposed RCP was not included in Stages 1 and 2 community engagement exercises for the HSK NDA. It was only included in the CE3 which was conducted during June to September 2015. Only very few residents of Hung Fuk Estate had moved in at that time and most of them were still unfamiliar with the surrounding environment. As a result, most of the current residents were not aware of the proposed RCP until recently. They had expressed grave concerns on hygiene, odour and traffic safety issues

associated with the proposed RCP and almost 2,000 signatures were collected at a residents' forum.

C9 – Land Justice League

14. Mr Au Kwok Kuen made the following main points :

- (a) since the announcement of development of the HSK NDA and freezing survey conducted in 2017, many residents were forced out of the area by private developers. It was uncertain whether those residents would be eligible for compensation and rehousing. Many of the land were already bought by the private developers before the freezing survey was conducted. There was a suspected transfer of benefits and collusion between Government and the private developers;
- (b) in comparison, the compensation system for the affected was better in the colonial era. Prior to 1998, residents affected by public works project were eligible for relocating to public housing estate without subject to income and asset limits. Villages affected by major public works project, such as construction of reservoir, could be relocated in whole. Despite the Government advocated that no one should be left homeless, it had not adopted a people-oriented approach and many of the residents affected by the HSK NDA development were not properly compensated or rehoused in the same neighbourhood;
- (c) taking the Wang Chau development as an example, the affected residents would need to satisfy a number of criteria before they could be eligible for rehousing in a public housing estate. Those who could not meet the criteria were forced to move to squatters or sub-divided flats and their quality of living would be further deteriorated. As such, it was crucial that the compensation and rehousing arrangements could be made known in time to the residents affected by HSK NDA; and

- (d) the existing farmland in the HSK NDA should be preserved. According to the information from CE3, there was no farmland remained in the NDA and community farms, which could not replace the importance of the existing active farmland, were proposed instead.

C11 – Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS)

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

- (a) HKBWS supported R8's suggestions to preserve the flight corridor for ardeids and the proposal to adopt a stepped building height (BH) profile in Areas 44A, 44B and 46 for protecting the egretty at San Sang Sun Tsuen. R117's suggestion for stepped BH, designation of non-building area (NBA) and preservation of farmland was also supported;
- (b) So far, there had been no successful case for relocating an egretty in Hong Kong. As such, it was crucial to protect and preserve nesting sites of ardeids and the linkages to their foraging areas in the area;
- (c) the egretty was located in an area zoned "Green Belt" ("GB") and "Open Space" ("O") on the draft OZP. However, buildings along the flight corridor in the adjacent "Other Specified Uses" annotated "Enterprise and Technology Park" ("OU (ETP)") zone could be as tall as 90mPD. These tall buildings along the flight corridor would likely affect the flight path of the ardeids. The maximum BH in the "OU (ETP)" zone should be reduced;
- (d) many of the responses provided by PlanD made reference to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) conducted. However, HKBWS did not agree with the methodology of egret flight line survey adopted in the EIA and considered that the adverse impact on the egretty might have been underestimated. The EIA was flawed and insufficient to address the concerns raised by HKBWS on preservation of ardeids;

- (e) in 2011, the EIA Project Profile for HSK NDA development stated that there was about 20 ha of wet agricultural land in HSK. In the subsequent consultation materials published for CE1, it was also stated that there was 102.7 ha of agricultural land in HSK. However, in the EIA submitted in 2016, only 7.59 ha of total wet and dry farmland were identified. There was no logical explanation of such a drastic reduction in agricultural land, which was an important component of the natural habitat and foraging area of ardeids. The reduction in agricultural land taken place from 2011 to 2016 was not reflected in the EIA as an environmental impact resulted from the HSK NDA development; and
- (f) a stepped BH profile was not identified in the EIA as a mitigation measure. HKBWS considered that a descending BH profile in the “OU (ETP)” zone towards the egrettry should be adopted and suitable NBA should be designated. Other bird-friendly designs, such as avoiding use of reflective materials in the façade of building, should also be employed. The above requirements should be stipulated in the Notes of the draft OZP.

C381 – 鄧鋼輝公民社會服務處

16. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Tang Kong Fai made the following main points :

- (a) in CE1 and CE2, PlanD stated that a commercial strip would be provided in Area 19B near Kiu Tau Wai. However, a ‘L’ shape “OU (Mixed Use)” zone had replaced the commercial strip on the draft OZP. The residents of Kiu Tau Wai and Hung Uk Tsuen strongly objected to this proposal as the tall buildings in the “OU (Mixed Use)” zone would be incompatible with the adjacent low-rise village setting. There would also be adverse air ventilation impact in particular during winter;
- (b) according to the Consultation Digest published by PlanD, a NBA would be provided between Kiu Tau Wai and the “OU (Mixed Use)” zone. Given that there was existing residential dwelling along the zoning boundary, a NBA of 6m, as currently proposed by PlanD, was unable to mitigate the adverse impact

brought by buildings, which might be up to 42-storey tall, in the “OU (Mixed Use)” zone. A 50m-wide buffer would be more appropriate and other suitable mitigation measures on landscaping and building disposition should also be adopted;

- (c) PlanD had misintepreted his written representation in the Paper in saying that he had requested additional land for development of educational institution in Kiu Tau Wai. Instead, he advocated reverting to the original proposal in the Preliminary Outline Development Plan (PODP) by reserving the land to the northwest of Kiu Tau Wai for education purpose. While there were suggestions received in CE3 for provision of additional commercial land, there was no strong basis to support such proposal; and
- (d) based on overseas experience, cycle track should be provided along roads, instead of pedestrian path as currently proposed. The proposed Environmentally Friendly Transport System (EFTS) with cycle track and pedestrian path alongside would not encourage people to commute by walking and cycling.

C33 - Lam Tsz Ching

C35 - 楊穎姿

C36 - 廖永建

C37 - 李

C38 - Chan P Chu

C39 - 李夢瑤

C40 - 黃駿軒

C41 - 李偉明

C42 - 黃秀香

C44 - 單志良

C45 - Liu Shui Lin

C46 - 林海添

C47 - 林偉強

C48 - 衛文康

C49 - 鄭瑞庭

C50 - 王金湯

C51 - 蔡德成

C52 - 嚴石如

C53 - Chan Yee Han

C54 - 張漢強

C55 - Hajva

C56 - 林海燕

C58 - 黃志豪

C59 - Loog Lam Ho

C60 - 李迎憲

C61 - 陳悅

C62 - 周詠珊

C64 - 梁玉珊

C65 - 梁永順

C66 - 麥壘熙

C67 - 鄧錦容

C69 - 黃明珠

C71 - 麥壘根

C71 - 馮煒康

C73 - 周嘉平

C74 - 何志健

C75 - 麥詩渝

C76 - 馮秋蘭

C77 - Leung Tsz Wing

C78 - 陳俊康

C79 - 胡國君

C80 - 陳思慧

C81 - 關天易

C82 - 袁華

C83 - 何于海

C84 - 許詠麟

C85 - 陳春容

C86 - 黃曉丹

C87 - Tsang Hoi Ying

C89 - 陳雪芬

C90 - Wu Hui Chiu

C91 - 陳惠蘭

C93 - 曾燕琴

C94 - 劉桂紅

C95 - 曾愛香

C96 - 梁愉

C97 - 陳子智

C98 - 張陳笑芳

C99 - 陳生

C100 - Cheung Kwok Wing

C101 - 葉桂齊

C102 - 姜文敏

C103 - 阡卜華

C104 - 關佩鈞

C105 - 李國戈

C106 - 周佩儀

C107 - 葉玉和

C108 - 馮文騰

C109 - 吳細梅

C110 - 何詩晴

C111 - 譚新

C112 - Billy

C113 - 卓嘉豪

C114 - 黃添發

C116 - 香惠兒

C118 - 黎國泳

C119 - 曾惠賢

C120 - Li Fei

C121 - 郝中

C122 - 李錦嫦

C123 - 楊巧玉

C124 - 肖麗

C125 - 楊春艷

C126 - 何耀鳴

C127 - 盧逢生

C128 - Yip Pui Yan

C129 - 周冬梅

C130 - 葉嘉慧

C131 - 李敏豪

C132 - Lam Pui Suen

C133 - 潘建東

C134 - 楊秀平

C135 - 盧雪有

C137 - 羅紹光

C139 - 胡秀芝

C140 - Ng Chung Lan

C141 - 符馨月

C142 - 宋如嬌

C143 - 楊家兒

C145 - 黃少玲

C146 - Chan Kar Hei

C147 - Chan Ching Yin

C148 - Yeung Wai Fong

C149 - Fan Ka Man

C150 - 張偉麗

C151 - 雷偉文

C152 - 周良偉

C153 - 柯詠敏

C154 - 莊綺雯

C155 - Luk Sing Ling

C159 - 張雪梅

C160 - Hung Ching Wa

C162 - Chiu Po Kam Lucia

C163 - Chan Yiu Ming

C164 - 王子都

C165 - Zena

C166 - 鄧李嫻

C167 - Katherine Yu

C168 - Lam Sin Lung

C169 - 鄧榮芳

C170 - Abu Bar Ar

C171 - 甘美蓮

C172 - Umar

C173 - Lau Ching Yan

C176 - 文月紅

C177 - Kwok Po Shing

C179 - 黃柱平

C180 - 廖小姐

C181 - 鄭可健

C182 - 盧康

C183 - 盧國子

C184 - 鄒煥江

C185 - 李帶

C186 - 陳明霞

C187 - 鄧鳳有

C188 - Lui Ho Yeung

C189 - 胡江霞

C190 - Wu Yujing

C192 - 黃桂梅

C193 - 蔡桂玲

C195 - 周家俊

C196 - 林惜

C197 - 喻浩

C198 - 鄭漢忠

C199 - 董愛妮

C200 - 張文詩

C201 - 朱軒麟

C202 - 歐建興

C203 - 蔡春喜

C204 - Wong Yuk Fan

C205 - Chiu Siu Ching

C206 - Tsang Siu Wo Fletcher

C207 - Chen Yee Lok Eden

C208 - Leung Tak Ming

C210 - 盧生

C211 - 許生

C213 - 陳生

C214 - 鄧振輪

C215 - 張志雲

C216 - 吳秋洋

C218 - 張錦榮

C219 - 李偉深

C221 - 幸小姐

C222 - 黎芷珊

C224 - 吳生

C225 - Ben Tang

C226 - 洗萍

C228 - 盧德祐

C229 - Abdullooh Khan

C230 - 鐘潤東

C231 - 張智傑

C234 - 陳伯

C235 - Hung Ching Yee

C237 - 文二妹

C240 - 余玉蓮

C318 – Ng Ching Yan

17. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Ms Chan Hoi Chi made the following main points :

- (a) regarding the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Estate, more than 200 comments were collected by their concern group from the nearby residents. Most of the comments objected to the proposed location of the RCP. As most of the residents of Hung Fuk Estate moved in after CE3, they did not have the opportunity to express their concerns;
- (b) there had been a proposal to locate the proposed RCP to an alternative site further away from Hung Fuk Estate. However, FEHD considered that the alternative site was not suitable as there was a proposed cycle track and underground drainage reserve and utility pipeline nearby. She opined that the additional cycle tracks were not needed as there were already cycling tracks in the area and the problem of interference with the drainage reserve and utility pipes could be resolved by providing a maintenance access at basement level of the RCP to allow access by maintenance personnel as required;
- (c) there was scope to develop an integrated community resource centre (ICRC) incorporating the proposed RCP which would help promoting recycling of valuable recyclable resources. With reference to the overseas examples, these ICRCs would typically have a conveyor belt and sorting system on the lower floors to separate recyclables from other garbage whereas the upper floors would have space for the community to share resources and recycle used items such as old toys, books and furniture. Community farms utilising fertilisers converted from kitchen-waste could also be developed on the roof top of ICRCs. Zoning for such ICRCs could be tailor-made to accommodate, among

others, community centre, recycling and resources sharing facilities and community farm;

- (d) it would be more desirable to have an one-stop integrated refuse collection/recycle production system which could minimise the transportation costs by collecting recyclables and converting them into new products at the same site. It would also provide a great opportunity to educate the public and raise their awareness in waste management. The recycling business could also provide employment opportunities for the local residents. She had helped setting up weekly community markets in Yuen Long and Kwai Fong to promote reuse/recycling. Similar markets could now be found in more than 10 districts in Hong Kong;
- (e) many of the brownfield operators were involved in recycling business which usually required a large open area for its packing, processing and storage activities. At the moment, many of the recyclables collected within the territory were sent to HSK for processing. Since only 24 ha of land in the HSK NDA were reserved for port-backup, storage and workshop uses, many of the existing brownfield operators would be displaced by the NDA development and it would adversely affect the recycling industries in Hong Kong. It was difficult for those affected businesses to be accommodated in multi-storey buildings (MSBs) due to the technical constraints on floor loading and internal transport arrangement. Many of the recycling business might be operating without proper licenses/approvals hence they might not be eligible for compensation under the HSK NDA development. Suitable sites should be reserved under a new “OU (Recycling Industry)” zoning to accommodate the affected recycling businesses;
- (f) there was a drastic reduction in the area of agricultural land from some 20 ha to 7 ha. Agricultural land was an important element in promoting a green environment and lifestyle and its function could not be replaced by community farms;

- (g) according to the Long Term Housing Strategy announced in 2014, the public-private housing should be provided at a ratio of 60:40 respectively and 185,000 public housing units would have to be provided in years 2022-27 in order to meet the target as set out by the Government. However, only 51% of the planned housing units in HSK NDA were public housing while the remaining 49% were private housing. The public and private housing mix of 60:40 should be adopted in all housing sites. Also, there was no strong justification to combine the public to private housing mix in HSK NDA and Tin Shui Wai New Town for calculation; and
- (h) five non-indigenous villages would be affected by the HSK NDA development. It appeared that those villagers, as well as the farmers, brownfield operators and current residents in Hung Fuk Estate would all suffer from the NDA development. Their rights should be duly considered, and they should also be fully engaged in the NDA development.

[Mr David Y.T. Lui arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

18. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and the visualiser, Mr Leung Tak Ming made the following main points :

Location and design of the RCP near Hung Fuk Estate

- (a) it was unfair to the residents of Hung Fuk Estate to bear the proposed location of the RCP, which was not needed to serve Hung Fuk Estate but other residential developments in the nearby “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) zone. For the alternative RCP location as proposed by local residents, technical reasons such as alignment of cycle track should not present an insurmountable problem;
- (b) multi-storey community buildings with RCP on the ground floor and street sleepers’ shelter above had been proposed in Yau Ma Tei district. Currently, the upper floors of the proposed RCP building near Hung Fuk Estate were intended to be used for office/storage purposes which reflected a poor

utilisation of floor spaces. An integrated building incorporating the RCP should be developed instead in order to provide the required community facilities, such as day-care centre for the residents of Hung Fuk Estate. Should the Board consider relocating the proposed RCP impractical, the current RCP proposal should be revised to incorporate recycling and community facilities;

- (c) consideration should be given to rezoning some areas currently reserved for “G/IC” or “Amenity” to “OU (Multi-storey Community Centre cum Refuse Collection Point)” to encourage development of an integrated facility. That would allow community recycling activities to be conducted and promote reuse and sharing of resources;
- (d) the Community Green Stations initiative promoted by the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) was unsuccessful and unable to benefit the recycling industry. A well-established recycling system should comprise different groups of players including local recyclable collectors, packaging and processing companies, production factories that utilised the recycled materials and exporters. With a proper, reliable material recycling system, the public would be more willing to participate in recycling activities and ultimately it would reduce the dependency on landfill and incinerators;

Brownfield operations

- (e) according to a newspaper report, compared to 10 years ago, the total area of the land available for recycling industry under Short Term Tenancy had decreased by 37%. From the industry’s perspective there was insufficient support from the Government. On the one hand, the EcoPark in Tuen Mun had a set of very stringent admission requirements that most of the local small and medium-scale operators could not meet and on the other hand, the effectiveness of the Recycling Fund set up by the Government was yet to be seen. Due to these constraints, many of the smaller recycling businesses had no choice but to operate in a manner that was not in compliance with the land lease and statutory planning control. Many of them had also been forced to relocate to remote areas as far as Pak Nai;

- (f) currently there were about 20 recycling operators in HSK providing about 200 employment opportunities. However, the feasibility of relocating affected operators into MSBs was yet to be confirmed. It was unfair that the NDA development proposal had to be considered by the Board at this stage in the absence of those information;
- (g) “OU (Port Back Up, Storage and Workshop Uses)” zones should be rezoned to “OU (Recycling Industry)” zones to provide land for the affected recycling businesses. Without making land available to the recycling industry, none of the policies and plans could be implemented;
- (h) while some might argue that the current draft OZP mainly dealt with land uses rather than policy matters, the substantial amount of land zoned for housing development in the OZP had reflected that the Government’s policy was biased in favour of housing development instead of a balanced land use;
- (i) provision of recycling services currently relied solely on market forces. Instead, it should be a public service as in many other countries. Without Government’s coordination, the recycling industry faced great uncertainties in their operation. In 2017, the recycling industry almost came to a halt when the Mainland suspended import of waste/used papers without prior notice. It was anticipated that the import requirements of the Mainland would be further tightened in the coming years. That should be a wake-up call for the Government to establish a comprehensive recycling framework; and

Loss of agricultural land

- (j) many of the farmers were forced to move out by private developers after the Government announced the NDA development. Despite the New Agricultural Policy announced by the Government, no real action was taken by the Government to safeguard farmland and promote farming in Hong Kong. The diminishing agricultural activities only reflected that the Government was biased towards providing land for housing development.

19. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr So Chun Yin made the following main points:

- (a) according to the reply given by FEHD in June 2016, the Lands Department (LandsD) had notified FEHD in July 2015 that a piece of land at Hung Yuen Road and Hung Ping Road was allocated for development of a RCP. PlanD later replied to the Architectural Service Department that the development intensity at the site should be much higher than what was required for a typical RCP;
- (b) LandsD in December 2016 pointed out that there was plan for relocation of RCP No. YL96 since 1992 and an application for land allocation was received in 2012. Subsequently the RCP proposal was incorporated into the CE3 which was held from June to September 2015. Based on the above, he suspected that PlanD was only consulting the public during CE3 as a formality as the land allocation for the RCP had already been made before/during the consultation period;
- (c) while the proposed RCP would be fully enclosed, it would operate 24-hour daily and only one daily visit would be made by garbage trucks. For the remaining time the garbage would need to be transferred from various locations in HSK to the RCP by workers utilising wheeled bins, which would likely cause great nuisance to the nearby residents and pedestrians;
- (d) development of the existing RCP No. YL96 predated that of Aster Court. It was unreasonable and unfair to relocate that RCP to another location simply because it caused nuisance to Aster Court, as the residents of Aster Court was well-aware of the existence of the RCP before they moved in. The location of the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Tsuen was also in close proximity to residential dwellings and other sensitive community uses including clinic, elderly homes and playground; and
- (e) there was no convincing explanation from PlanD on why the alternative locations was not feasible for relocation of the RCP.

20. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Yeung Wing Chi made the following main points:

- (a) currently the HSK NDA was planned to be a regional economic and civic hub and about 150,000 employment opportunities in various hi-tech and creative industries and social services sectors would be provided. However, there was no detailed information on how that projection was made. Without sufficient employment opportunities, residents of the HSK NDA would have to travel to other areas for work, which would be time-consuming and costly;
- (b) the main focus of the Government was only on converting the agricultural land for development and increasing the development intensities. The planning process lacked transparency and no information was available to the public to justify designation of various land use zonings. For example, six sites were designated for hotel development and many other sites would be used for development of commercial facilities including shopping centre. Given that HSK was primarily a residential neighbourhood, there was no reason to provide so many shopping malls as it would attract many outside visitors and cause nuisance to the local residents;
- (c) regarding the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Estate, many of the residents considered that it should not be located in such close proximity to residential developments. It was also hoped that the proposed RCP could incorporate other uses/functions to promote reusing and recycling of resources thereby reducing the amount of garbage to be disposed. Many of the community services needed by the residents, such as day-care centre, community hall and roof-top community farm, could be provided if the RCP building was developed as an integrated community facility;
- (d) many of the large scale development projects in Hong Kong had overlooked the importance of preserving the fabric of the existing community. In the current case, many of the farmers, brownfield operators and villagers were displaced;

- (e) five non-indigenous villagers were affected by the NDA development. It was unfair to take away their right to live in their existing homes simply because more housing was required to meet the wider community's aspiration;
- (f) the ratio of public and private housing in HSK NDA was 51:49 and a few pieces of land near Hung Fuk Estate were reserved mainly for private residential development. Given the acute demand, more land should be designated for public/subsidised housing development; and
- (g) currently, many brownfield operators were located in HSK area. While findings from detailed study on brownfield operations were not yet available, the Government had continued to pursue the HSK NDA development and no proper relocation proposal for the affected operators had been proposed. As a result, these brownfield operations might spill-over to agricultural land in the surrounding areas and cause degradation to the rural environment.

21. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Miss Ng Ching Yan made the following main points:

- (a) the Light Rail Transit (LRT) system should not be adopted in the HSK NDA as it had already been proven unsuccessful in Tin Shui Wai. The LRT had created segregation and limited the use of many places for various community activities. Pedestrians would have to utilise the elevated footbridge network to get around the district, making the ground level lifeless and unattractive;
- (b) the loading of West Rail (WR) had already reached 104% of its capacity and became very congested. Even if the HSK NDA could really generate 150,000 employment opportunities as claimed by the Government, the congestion problem of the WR could still not be solved by simply replacing the current 7-car trains by 8-car trains. The railway should not be relied on as the sole backbone of the transportation system; and
- (c) more stores in terms of number and variety should be provided in public market to meet the needs of the local residents.

C277 - 周偉源

22. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Wong Chun Yu made the following main points:
- (a) the railway system in HSK should be an elevated or underground system so that it would be separated from other traffic on the ground level;
 - (b) the proposed Tuen Mun Western Bypass and Route 11 would divert traffic around HSK and Tuen Mun towards Lantau. However, traffic in New Territories West might be paralyzed if there was any accident on the North Lantau Link as it was the only route connecting Lantau and the metro area;
 - (c) the representative from FEHD who attended a residents' forum in August 2017 explained that various measures would be put in place to ensure the proposed RCP near Hung Fuk Estate would not cause adverse odour or hygiene impacts on the surrounding areas. However, garbage would still need to be transferred to the RCP by workers using wheeled bins and it would cause severe nuisance to road users and pedestrians and residents along the route; and
 - (d) based on the reply obtained from FEHD, among the 12 alternative locations for RCP, two had been developed as facilities of Hung Fuk Estate, whereas the other locations were considered not suitable for development of RCP for various reasons, including the proximity to residential dwellings. However, there was no minimum distance requirement between RCP and residential dwellings and there was an example in Kowloon that a RCP was located on the ground floor of a private residential development.

C289 - 官潔明

23. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Lau Kai Tung made the following main points:
- (a) the use of LRT as the means of mass transit in HSK NDA was not supported as the existing LRT had caused severe traffic problems in Yuen Long and Tin

Shui Wai Area. A mass transport network with a circular line similar to JR Yamanote Line (山手線) in Tokyo should be considered. Interesting designs should be adopted for the railway stations and the surrounding areas should be developed as shopping streets to attract visitors;

- (b) some of the existing LRT stations had not incorporated barrier-free designs. People in wheelchairs often had difficulty in boarding the trains as well as getting around the stations. Attention should be given to improving accessibility for people with disability in public transport facilities in the HSK NDA; and
- (c) based on overseas example, cycle track should be located along the road, instead of along pedestrian path.

Question and Answer (Q&A) Session

24. As the presentation from PlanD's representative, the representers/commenters and their representatives had been completed, the meeting proceeded to the Q&A session. The Chairperson explained that Members would raise questions and the Chairperson would invite the representers/commenters, their representative and/or PlanD's representatives to answer. The Q&A session should not be taken as an occasion for the attendees to direct questions to the Board or for cross-examination between parties. The Chairperson then invited questions from Members.

25. The Chairperson and some Members raised questions on the following aspects:

Location and design of the RCP near Hung Fuk Estate

- (a) background and public consultation on the relocation of the RCP, and whether there was scope to expand the existing RCP No. YL96 instead of constructing a replacement RCP near Hung Fuk Estate;
- (b) what the proposed measures were to minimise odour generated by the RCP to the nearby residents and whether constructing the RCP underground, as proposed by one of the representers, would be a feasible solution to address the odour and

hygiene concerns while facilitating the provision of other community facilities on the upper floors; and whether there was any buffer distance requirement between a RCP and residential dwellings;

- (c) whether there were any alternative site for the RCP, noting that many "G/IC" sites were designated on the OZP; and whether consideration had been given to relocating the proposed RCP to the western side of the same "G/IC" zone so that it would be further away from Hung Fuk Estate;
- (d) whether there was any appropriate sites for an integrated building of recycling and community facilities and whether the zoning of the RCP could allow provision of such integrated facilities;
- (e) whether there was any policy to promote reuse and recycling of materials and resources;

Compensation and Rehousing Arrangements

- (f) whether compensation and rehousing arrangements were in place;
- (g) whether there was more detailed information on the number of villagers affected by the development and whether there was information to support the claims of the representers/commenters regarding insufficient land for relocation and rehousing;

Impact on farming activities

- (h) whether the affected farmers in HSK NDA would be relocated;
- (i) whether there was scope to encourage community farms to be set up within the NDA to compensate for the reduction in farmland;
- (j) the reasons for the drastic loss in farmland in HSK area as reflected in the different surveys and studies conducted by the Government;

Accommodation of brownfield operations into MSBs

- (k) what the accommodation plans were for affected brownfield operators and whether accommodating them in MSBs was technically feasible;

Protection of the egretty

- (l) noting that an EIA including ecological impact assessment had been conducted under the HSK NDA Study, whether there was sufficient measures to protect the egretty near San Sang San Tsuen and minimise the impact on the nesting and foraging areas of ardeids;

Public and private housing mix

- (m) what the justification was for combining HSK NDA and Tin Shui Wai New Town for calculation of public and private housing mix;

Other issues

- (n) whether the buffer between the commercial area and Kiu Tau Wai was sufficient;
- (o) whether the land zoned “OU (ETP)” would be developed by the Government or private sector; and
- (p) regarding the pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment, whether barrier-free access or universal design would be adopted to facilitate movement by people with disability.

26. In response, Mr David C.M. Lam, DPO/TMYLW, made the following main points:

Location and design of the RCP near Hung Fuk Estate

- (a) the existing RCP No. YL96 located adjacent to a pedestrian access near Aster court was built in 1990s as a village-type RCP. The design was sub-standard

with limited capacity and the existing RCP had already been operating over its design capacity. The proposed replacement RCP site had an area of 750m², whilst the existing RCP only had a footprint of about 70m². Further expansion at the existing RCP site was not possible due to the limited space available at the site. The RCP would collect garbage from residential buildings around Hung Fuk Estate and those collected on the street. As such, it should be noted that the need for a replacement RCP did not arise from the HSK NDA development. FEHD had tried to identify suitable relocation site since 2008 but without success and the Ombudsman had made inquiry on the delay in relocation of the RCP. Subsequently, the current site near Hung Fuk Estate, which had once been planned for the development of a clinic in the 1980s and zoned “G/IC” on the then Ping Shan Outline Zoning Plan, was selected as a relocation site for the RCP. The proposal for the replacement RCP was incorporated into the RODP, which was put forward for public consultation in CE3 in 2015. During 2016 and 2017, representatives of PlanD and FEHD had also met with the residents, relevant concern groups and Legislative Councillors on various occasions to discuss their concerns relating to the subject RCP;

- (b) due to technical considerations, including maneuvering/ramp requirements of refuse collection vehicles (RCV) and the limited site area, providing the RCP at a basement level, as proposed by a commenter, might not be feasible from technical perspective. According to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there was no minimum separation requirement between RCP and other uses including residential dwellings. It was not uncommon for RCP to be integrated within large scale residential developments. Taking the comprehensive residential development at Long Ping Station South as an example, a RCP was provided on the ground floor of the development at Ping Shun Street, with a school located just opposite the site. For the proposed replacement RCP near Hung Fuk Estate, suitable measures, including installation of a negative air pressure system and using fully-enclosed RCVs, would be adopted to minimise any possible odour nuisance
- (c) for the subject RCP, it was considered necessary to find a relocation site on government land, as a site involving private land would require land resumption

and hence delay its implementation programme. Relevant departments had examined some other Government land in the area. However, all alternative locations were either reserved for other purposes or considered not suitable for various reasons, for example, outside the catchment area thus workers had to push the carts across major roads which was undesirable from operation and safety perspectives. Remaining part of the same “G/IC” zone comprised mostly private land. It was concluded that the current proposed location on the government land near Hung Fuk Estate was most suitable;

- (d) sufficient flexibility had been provided in the “G/IC” zoning to allow for possible integration of recycling and community facilities. Subject to advice from relevant departments, the feasibility of developing an integrated recycling facility could be further examined in the detailed design stage;
- (e) the relevant departments had all along followed the government policy in promoting recycling of valuable resources. Land had been reserved in the NDA and zoned “OU(Port Back-up, Storage and Workshop Uses)” for brownfield operations. The current land use zonings on the draft OZP had sufficient flexibility to accommodate recycling activities;

Compensation and Rehousing Arrangements

- (f) while it was estimated that about 1,600 households, mostly living in squatters, would be affected by the NDA development, the figure could only be ascertained after the freezing survey was completed by LandsD. Two sites had been reserved in the NDA for providing rehousing units to those among the affected residents eligible for such. For the affected villagers in recognised villages, land had been reserved and zoned “V(1)” to facilitate relocation under the Village Removal Terms;

Impact on farming activities

- (g) about 7 ha of active farmland would be affected by the HSK NDA development. The Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD) and PlanD had

identified suitable sites at Ha Pak Nai and AFCD would explore the feasibility to relocate the affected farmers;

- (h) sufficient flexibility had been allowed in some zonings, e.g. “O”, to permit development of community farm in the NDA;

Accommodation of brownfield operations into MSB

- (i) the HSK NDA development would be implemented by phases. Based on the current development programme, first population intake would be in 2024 whereas the development was expected to be fully completed in 2037-38. About 320 brownfield operators would be affected by the HSK NDA development. The feasibility to accommodate them in MSBs was still under study by CEDD;

Public and Private Housing Mix

- (j) Tin Shui Wai New Town was adjacent to the HSK NDA and it was not unreasonable to look at the ratio of public and private housing mix from a more holistic, district perspective. Upon completion of the HSK NDA development, the overall public and private housing mix in the area would be around 60:40;

Other Issues

- (k) a 6m setback would be provided in the commercial development to the north of Kiu Tau Wai. The buffer provided was considered sufficient and would facilitate a better integration with the surrounding village setting;
- (l) implementation of development within the “OU (ETP)” zone would be subject to further deliberation by the relevant government departments; and
- (m) barrier-free access and universal designs would be incorporated in the detailed design stage of developments to ensure convenient accessibility for people with disability and meet the needs of the ageing population. However, it should be noted that the draft OZP was to indicate the broad land use zones and major road

network. The design details of each individual projects would be further studied at a later stage.

27. Mr Tony K.L. Cheung, CE/W3, supplemented on the following issues:

Loss of farmland

- (a) there appeared to be a misunderstanding in terms of the reduction in farmland resultant from the HSK NDA development. The original area under study for HSK NDA development in CE1 covered a much wider area, including an area to the south of Castle Peak Road, and the initial calculation of farmland (102 ha) had included abandoned farmland that had been used for brownfield operations. Subsequently, taken into account the public comments received, the area to the south of Castle Peak Road was excluded from the HSK NDA. Only some 27 ha of existing farmland would be affected by HSK NDA project, of which about 7 ha was active farmland;

Accommodation of brownfield operations into MSBs

- (b) the majority of existing brownfield operations in HSK area were warehouses and vehicle repair workshops. The Government had been liaising with the brownfield operators to ascertain the feasibility of accommodating those operations in MSBs. According to the feedback from the operators, they were mainly concerned about whether their daily operation would be affected, as many of those operations required a large, open area with special machineries, and whether the accommodation proposed was financially viable. Based on overseas experience and the Government's initial assessment, it was technically feasible to accommodate those uses in MSBs. In terms of phasing of development, the northern portion of the area in the vicinity of existing road connection would be developed first, and the remaining areas would be developed in later phases. As such, the transition of those operations from their existing locations into MSBs and other suitable alternative locations would be done in stages and impact on the operators could be minimised;

Protection of the egret

- (c) the egret near San Sang Sun Tsuen had been zoned “GB” on the draft OZP and additional land along the flight corridor had been zoned “O” in order to provide a wider, unobstructed flight path to the egret. According to the EIA report approved under the EIAO, suitable mitigation measures, including avoiding site formation works during ardeid breeding season, and monitoring mechanism would be put in place during different construction phases to protect the flight corridor and the egret; and

Creating a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment

- (d) a study on suitable form of EFTS system was underway. Findings from the study would provide useful reference in creating a convenient transport network to promote easy and green commuting for the residents. The EFTS would be designed as far as practicable for grade separation from the road traffic. Attention would also be given to the detailed design of EFTS stations to ensure good accessibility for people with different mobility requirements. Meanwhile, a study on creating a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment would be commissioned to promote walkability and enhance the pedestrian and cycling environment on the street level.

28. In response to the answer given by Mr Tony K.L. Cheung on accommodation of brownfield operations in MSBs, Mr Leung Tak Ming said that currently information regarding cost of accommodating and operating within MSBs was not available and such information should be made available to the public at an early stage so that the affected operators could assess whether the accommodation proposed was acceptable.

29. The Chairperson asked whether consideration had been given to revising the BH restrictions within the “OU (ETP)” zone to better protect the flight corridor for ardeids. Mr Tony K.L. Cheung said that while a stepped BH profile for the buildings in the “OU (ETP)” zone was not part of the mitigation measures proposed under the EIA process, there might be scope to incorporate such BH profile in the detailed design stage. Mr David C.M. Lam said that the EIA report approved under the EIAO concluded that the current land use proposals for the HSK NDA

would not create unacceptable impacts on the egretry with the mitigation measures implemented. The requirement for a stepped BH profile could be further considered in the detailed design stage.

30. In response to the issue on compensation policy adopted by the Government as raised earlier by a representer, the Chairperson remarked that prior to 1998, those affected by government's development projects and rehoused to subsidised housing were not subject to the comprehensive means test which was applicable today.

[Ms Christina M. Lee, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu left the meeting during the Q&A session.]

31. As Members had no more question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing on the day was completed. She then thanked the government's representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting and said that the Board would resume the hearing session on 7.2.2018. The Board would deliberate the representations and comments in closed meeting after completing all the hearing sessions and would inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government's representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives left this session of the meeting at this point.

32. This session of the meeting was adjourned at 1:40p.m.