

**Minutes of the 1169th Meeting of the
Town Planning Board held on 26.4.2018**

Present

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 Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Mr Alex T.H. Lai

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H. Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.F. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East),
Transport Department
Mr Ricky W.K. Ho

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

Deputy Director of Planning/District
Ms Jacinta K.C. Woo

Secretary

Absent with Apologies

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu

Mr Sunny L.K. Ho

Mr David Y.T. Lui

Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung

Mr Philip S.L. Kan

Mr K.K. Cheung

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho

Miss Winnie W.M. Ng

Mr Stanley T.S. Choi

Mr L.T. Kwok

Mr Daniel K.S. Lau

Dr Jeanne C.Y. Ng

Professor Jonathan W.C. Wong

Mr Ricky W.Y. Yu

In Attendance

Assistant Director of Planning/Board

Miss Fiona S.Y. Lung

Chief Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Ms April K.Y. Kun (a.m.)

Mr Kevin C.P. Ng (p.m.)

Senior Town Planner/Town Planning Board

Miss Annie H.Y. Wong (a.m.)

Ms W.H. Ho (p.m.)

Sha Tin, Tai Po & North District

Agenda Item 1

[Open Meeting (Presentation and Question Sessions only)]

Consideration of Representations and Comments in respect of Draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TP/27

(TPB Papers No. 10402 and 10403)

[The meeting was conducted in Cantonese and English]

Group 1 (TPB Paper No. 10402)

1. The Secretary reported that the draft Tai Po Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No.S/TP/27 involved a revision (Amendment Item C) to the stipulated building height (BH) restriction for a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site at On Pong Road for the proposed clinic building including a community health centre to be operated by the Hospital Authority (HA). Mr Edwin W.K. Chan, Assistant Director (Regional 3), Lands Department had declared an interest on the item as his spouse was an employee of the HA. Members noted that Mr Chan’s spouse had no involvement in the project under the item and agreed that he could stay in the meeting.

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

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

- Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shu Tin, Tai Po and North (DPO/STN)
- Ms Channy C. Yang - Senior Town Planner/Country Park Enclaves (STP/CPE)

Transport Department (TD)

- Mr Henry K.N. Hui - Senior Engineer/Project & Tai Po (SE/P&TP)

Representers/Commenters and their Representatives

R2/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

- Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/ Commenter

R1300 – Chan Chuen Yin Anissa

- Ms Chan Chuen Yin Anissa - Representer

R1271 – Tai Po Centre Owners’ Committee

- Mr Lam Chung Ming Gordon - Representer’s Representative

4. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly 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 numbers, followed by the oral submissions by the commenters or their representatives. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or his representative would be 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. A question and answer (Q&A) session would be

held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the hearing would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. After hearing all the oral submissions from the remaining representers/commenters or their representatives who would attend the meeting under Group 2, the Town Planning Board (the Board) would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

5. She then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the representations and comments.

6. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Channy C. Yang, STP/CPE, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the Amendment Item C, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10402 (the Paper).

[Mr Alex T.H. Lai arrived to join this session of the meeting during STP/CPE's presentation.]

7. The Chairperson then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to elaborate on their representations and comments.

R2/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

8. Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

- (a) the Board should ensure that the community should be provided adequate Government, Institution and Community (GIC) facilities, particularly with regard to elderly care facilities; and

- (b) as regard the composition of the Board, the representation of the Board should be more diverse in terms of gender, ethnicity, expertise, etc.

9. The Chairperson said that the comments on the composition of the Board were not related to the amendment items of the OZP and hence would not be considered and discussed in this hearing session.

[Mr Franklin Yu arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

R1300 – Chan Chuen Yin Anissa

10. Ms Chan Chuen Yin Anissa made the following main points:

- (a) as a resident of Tai Po Centre, she objected to the proposed increase in the BH for the Item C site from 3 to 8 storeys as it would block the air penetration from the north-south wind path to the area near On Pong Road. It would also adversely affect air ventilation in terms of dispersal of exhaust fumes from the nearby eating places and road traffic. According to paragraph 6.3.4 of the Paper, the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation revealed that the two major air paths along Nam Wan Road and On Pong Road would be adversely affected. There would be wall-effect in the area near On Pong Road;
- (b) higher intensity development would increase the traffic burden and pedestrian flow of the area and aggravate the problems of traffic congestion, illegal parking and pick-up and drop-off activities, and traffic noise;
- (c) there were already crowds of visitors in the area particularly during weekends and holidays. The public order issue would be worsened with the proposed development;
- (d) the Item C site was previously occupied by a swimming pool. The site

should be retained for sports or recreation facilities to promote public health;

- (e) the living density in the area was already high. The development intensity of the site should hence be reduced rather than increased in order to enhance the environmental quality;
- (f) according to the information provided by the government, a proposed clinic building would be developed at the Item C site and it would include a community health centre, a maternal and child health centre, an elderly health centre, a student health service centre and a special assessment centre. Yet, based on the demand for primary care services in Tai Po, apart from the service for the elderly due to aging population, there was no pressing need for other medical and health services. The facilities to be provided could be adjusted to cater for the demand for the elderly service without the need to relax the BH at the Item C site. Besides, the access of the proposed development would be less than 20m away from the existing residential developments, disputes and conflicts between local residents and users of the clinic building would be expected;
- (g) according to paragraph 6.3.5 of the Paper, the Visual Appraisal (VA) was conducted with focus on public vantage points. The visual impacts to the local residents were not taken into account;
- (h) there were two clinics within a distance of 500m from Tai Po Centre, namely Tai Po Jockey Club Clinic and Tai Po Wong Siu Ching Clinic, which provided primary care services. It was not necessary to provide similar facilities within such a small neighbourhood; and
- (i) the Government had previously identified an alternative site for the proposed development. Since the alternative site was more suitable from environmental perspective and rezoning was not required, it should

be re-considered by the Government.

R1271 – Tai Po Centre Owners’ Committee

11. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Chung Ming Gordon made the following main points:

- (a) as the Chairman of Tai Po Centre Owners’ Committee, he had conducted a questionnaire survey from 18.9.2017 to 30.9.2017 and a total of 4,080 questionnaires were distributed in Tai Po Centre which comprised 6 phases and 22 residential blocks. The views collected from the survey were diverse. Residents in Phases 1, 2, 3 and 4 supported the proposed development at the Item C site for the provision of needed facilities while residents in Phases 5 and 6 raised objections. Phases 5 and 6 were located to the immediate south of the site;
- (b) the Item C site was surrounded by a cycle track and pedestrian walkway at the north, a pedestrian walkway to the east, and an emergency vehicular access (EVA) to its south. Hence, the access to the proposed development for both pedestrians and vehicles would be limited to the southwest corner of the Item C site abutting On Pong Road with a width of 18m. The junction of On Tai Road and On Pong Road was very busy. The problem of traffic congestion was serious particularly during weekends when vehicles queued on public roads for parking spaces at the Tai Po Centre Multi-storey Car Park (the Multi-storey Car Park). The proposed development, without sufficient provision of associated traffic management measures, would likely aggravate the existing traffic problems;
- (c) two storeys of the Multi-storey Car Park building would be converted into a cinema. It was anticipated that a large amount of pedestrian and traffic flows would be generated after the alteration and more serious traffic congestion at On Pong Road, On Tai Road, On Po Road and Nam

Wan Road would be resulted;

- (d) taking into account the aforementioned traffic problems and the condition of the existing pedestrian walkways adjacent to the proposed development, improvements to adjacent roads and pedestrian facilities should be carried out;
- (e) it was suggested to reduce the BH of the proposed development from 8 to 6 storeys and to provide additional parking spaces to address the queuing and illegal parking problem. Two storeys of underground car park should be provided at the proposed development; and
- (f) with the availability of the existing medical services in particular those at the nearby the Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital, the need of the proposed clinic building up to 8 storeys was questioned. Health care facilities should not mix with other types of GIC facilities such as public library and study room in one building to avoid cross-infection among users.

12. As the presentations from the representers/commenter and their representatives were completed, the Chairperson invited questions from Members.

Technical Assessments

13. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:

- (a) whether the proposed BH relaxation for the Item C site would cause adverse traffic impact on the surrounding area;
- (b) why further Traffic Review had to be carried out by the project proponent; and
- (c) how the relevant assessment findings demonstrated that there would be

no insurmountable impact on visual, traffic and air ventilation.

14. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) while there was no change to the current zoning of “G/IC” for the Item C site, it was envisaged that the relaxation of BH restriction from 3 storeys to 8 storeys would not have insurmountable traffic impact on the surrounding area, having regard to the convenient location of the Item C site near the bus terminus in the Tai Po town centre. TD had no objection to the relaxation of BH restriction. Regarding the public’s concern on car parking provision, TD would liaise with concerned user department(s) to explore the opportunity of providing public car park at the Item C site at the detailed design stage. The use of ‘Public Vehicle Park (excluding Container Vehicle)’ was always permitted in the “G/IC” zone. TD would also monitor the traffic situation of the area in respect of traffic queue and illegal parking;
- (b) the Traffic Review would be carried out by the project proponent at the detailed design stage when the types of facilities, and operation and management details including operation hours would be determined. Appropriate traffic management measures would be recommended as appropriate to address the traffic implications, if any, on the surrounding area;
- (c) according to the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) commissioned by PlanD, the Item C site abutted two major air paths along Nam Wan Road and On Po Road. The increase in maximum BH from 3 storeys to 8 storeys therein would not reduce the effective width of these air paths under the prevailing wind directions nor impose any major ventilation problem on the overall wind environment; and
- (d) the Visual Assessment conducted by PlanD concluded that the proposed development was not visually incompatible with the surrounding area.

As a government project, the design and construction of the clinic building would follow the relevant regulations and guidelines including Sustainable Building Design (SBD) Guidelines. According to the Building (Planning) Regulations, the maximum site coverage of the proposed clinic building would not in any event exceed 75%.

15. A Member raised a further question on whether the AVA included the assessment on micro-climate. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that assessment on micro-climate was not included in the AVA. Notwithstanding, the AVA was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the relevant government technical circular. The relaxation of BH restriction from 3 storeys to 8 storeys should not pose insurmountable environmental problem. The Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had no objection to the relaxation. As stated in paragraph 6.3.7 of the Paper, the project proponent would be required to submit environmental review at the detailed design stage in accordance with the relevant guidelines to address any environmental implications.

GIC Facilities in Tai Po and Types of GIC Facilities to be Provided at Item C Site

16. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:
- (a) the location of the two existing clinics, the facilities provided there and the usage rate;
 - (b) whether similar health care services were provided at the Alice Ho Miu Ling Nethersole Hospital;
 - (c) what GIC facilities would be in deficit in Tai Po;
 - (d) whether there was existing special assessment centre in Tai Po;
 - (e) whether relevant government department had taken into account the existing facilities in the district in drawing up the facilities to be included in the site;

- (f) whether library and elderly facilities were compatible with the other facilities proposed in the clinic building; and
- (g) the age profile of the population in Tai Po and the adequacy of the planned elderly facilities in the district.

17. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) with reference to Plan H-1 of the Paper, the locations of Tai Po Jockey Club Clinic and Tai Po Wong Siu Ching Clinic were indicated. Tai Po Jockey Club Clinic which was a 3-storey building built in 1957 provided services including general out-patient clinic, chest clinic, methadone clinic and student health service centre. Tai Po Wong Siu Ching Clinic which was a 2-storey building built in 1985 provided services including general out-patient clinic, maternal and child health centre, dental clinic and elderly health centre. The two clinics were developed years ago and there was growing population in Tai Po. Tai Po New Town should be provided with three clinics to meet the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG) requirement;
- (b) the functions of the health care services provided by hospitals and clinics were different. A full range of specialist services together with accident and emergency services were available in hospitals, while general out-patient services, follow-up medical consultation services and pharmaceutical services were mainly provided in clinics;
- (c) based on the HKPSG requirements, a range of GIC facilities, except for a deficit of 26 primary school classrooms and a deficit of 64 hospital beds, were generally adequate to meet the need of the planned population in Tai Po New Town. The Education Bureau would keep reviewing the latest projections and monitoring closely the supply and demand of school places in Tai Po. As for hospital beds, the HA planned its services

on a cluster basis and Tai Po was under the New Territories East Cluster. Besides, based on the planned population, Tai Po New Town should be provided with three clinics to meet the HKPSG requirement. Currently, there were two existing clinics. The Item C site was therefore reserved for the development of the proposed clinic building;

- (d) as advised by Food and Health Bureau (FHB), apart from a community health centre to be operated by HA, the proposed facilities to be included in the Item C site also included a maternal and child health centre, an elderly health centre, a student health service centre and a special assessment centre to be operated by the Department of Health, while there was currently no special assessment centre in the New Territories;
- (e) FHB had taken into account the existing facilities already provided and the demand in the district in drawing up the facilities to be included in the development;
- (f) in the event that there was still available floor area to accommodate other uses, the project proponent would consider consulting other relevant departments with a view to accommodating other suitable and compatible facilities at the detailed design stage. The provision of other GIC facilities such as library and elderly facilities at the Item C site would also be in line with the planning intention of the “G/IC” zone. The Tai Po District Council (TPDC) would also be timely consulted as the proposed development proceeded; and
- (g) according to the information released by the Census and Statistics Department in 2017, there were about 14.6% of the existing population in Tai Po aged over 65 which was lower than the 15.8% of the overall population. In terms of elderly facilities, there were currently a District Elderly Community Centre, seven Neighbourhood Elderly Centres, a Day Care Centre for the Elderly and seven Residential Care Home for the Elderly in Tai Po as well as a planned Neighbourhood Elderly Centre,

a planned Day Care Centre for the Elderly and a planned Residential Care Home for the Elderly.

18. Ms Chan Chuen Yin Anissa (R1300) said that elderly facilities would be needed in view of the aging population in the district. The provision of GIC facilities should be widely distributed in the district rather than concentrated in the centre of Tai Po.

Traffic Aspect

19. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:

- (a) the main reasons for the existing traffic problems;
- (b) how the proposal of two-storey basement car park at the proposed development could address the existing traffic issues; and
- (c) details of the access arrangement for the proposed development.

20. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Lam Chung Ming Gordon (R1271) highlighted two road junctions near Tai Po Centre, namely the junction of On Pong Road and On Tai Road and the junction of On Po Road and On Chee Road in the west of Tai Po Centre. Traffic congestion at On Pong Road was mainly caused by illegal parking and queuing on public roads for parking spaces at the Multi-storey Car Park which would tail back to the junction of On Po Road and On Tai Road. To address the traffic issue, a measure of changing the traffic movement from two-way to one-way at On Pong Road and On Tai Road was proposed by TD and the TPDC had been consulted. A trial of such measure was carried out last year during the annual sale of the department store at Tai Po Centre. The conversion of two storeys of the Multi-storey Car Park building into cinema would generate more pedestrians and traffic and worsen the problem. The illegal parking and vehicle queue were due to inadequate parking space. The proposal for a basement public car park at the proposed development could help address the problem to a certain extent.

21. In response to Members' questions, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) the existing traffic issues were mainly caused by illegal parking and frequent pick-up and drop-off activities during weekday peak hours and holidays. In view of the operation hours of the proposed clinic building, it was expected that the pedestrian and traffic flows to be generated would not clash with the morning and evening peak hours on weekdays and on holidays; and
- (b) subject to the detailed design, the access of the proposed development would be provided at On Pong Road.

22. The Vice-Chairperson and a member had the following questions:

- (a) the width of On Pong Road;
- (b) how the change of traffic movement at On Pong Road could improve the traffic situation and whether the arrangement had been implemented; and
- (c) the strategies for improving the overall traffic condition in the area.

23. In response, Mr Henry K.N. Hui, SE/P&TP, TD, made the following main points:

- (a) On Pong Road was a two-way single lane road with a total width of about 8m to 10m. Each traffic lane was about 4m to 5m wide. The width of the road was considered sufficient;
- (b) the proposed traffic measure at On Pong Road was to change the traffic circulation to one-way movement and vehicles would have to make a loop through On Tai Road and then to On Pong Road before entering the Multi-storey Car Park. This measure was currently under study; and

- (c) TD was aware of the illegal parking and kerbside loading and unloading activities in the area. Restricted zones had been introduced in the vicinity of the Item C site. TD would continue to monitor the traffic situation in the area. If necessary, the no-stopping restriction time at the critical junctions or road sections could be extended to address the traffic problems.

The Site and the Design for the Building

- 24. The Chairperson and some Members had the following questions:
 - (a) the background and history of the Item C site;
 - (b) the reason for the proposed BH of 8 storeys; and
 - (c) whether basement floors for car parking were planned for the proposed clinic building.

- 25. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:
 - (a) the Item C site was occupied by the Jockey Club Swimming Pool from 1987 to 2007 and it had been vacant since 2007 after the demolition of the swimming pool;
 - (b) taking into account the required health care facilities proposed by the project proponent and the estimated floor area, a preliminary layout of the proposed clinic building with a BH of 8 storeys was formulated by the Architectural Services Department. According to the preliminary layout, the site coverage would be about 60% to 70% and no basement was designed. The loading and unloading arrangement would be subject to the detailed design; and

- (c) according to the Notes of the “G/IC” zone of the OZP, the use of ‘Public Vehicle Park’ was always permitted in the “G/IC” zone. The current BH restriction of 8 storey excluded basement floor. As such, considerations could be given to accommodate public car park in the basement at the detailed design stage.

Alteration Works at the Multi-storey Car Park Building

26. Some Members had the following questions:

- (a) details of the alteration works at the Multi-storey Car Park building and the car park provision requirements under the lease; and
- (b) whether such alteration works had been taken into consideration for the proposed amendment under Item C.

27. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) the Multi-storey Car Park building fell within an area zoned “Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) on the OZP. According to the Notes of the OZP, the use of ‘Cinema’ was always permitted on the lowest three floors of a building in the “R(A)” zone. As required under the lease, 800 spaces for private cars/light vans and 100 spaces for goods vehicles should be provided in the Multi-storey Car Park site. According to the latest General Building Plan submission approved recently, the proposed works which involved the alteration of the restaurants on the ground floor of the Multi-storey Car Park building to cinema would not result in a change in the parking provisions under the lease; and
- (b) the proposed cinema at the Multi-storey Car Park building had been taken into consideration for the proposed amendment under the Item C.

28. Mr Lam Chung Ming Gordon (R1271) said that basement car parks of Tai Po Centre were ancillary to the residential use under the lease. However, the owner of the shopping mall who was also the owner of the basement car parks converted the parking spaces to public hourly car park to attract visitors and enhance business opportunities. The proposed cinema would generate more parking demand.

29. As Members had no further question to raise, the Chairperson said that the hearing procedures in respect of Group 1 had been completed. The Board would deliberate on all the representations and comments in a closed meeting after hearing the oral submissions from the other representers/commenters of Group 2 and would inform them of the Board's decision in due course. The Chairperson thanked the government representatives, the representers/commenters and their representatives for attending the hearing. They all left the meeting at this point.

[The meeting was adjourned for a 10 minutes break.]

[The Vice-Chairperson left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

Group 2

30. The Secretary reported that the following Members had declared interests on this item for having affiliation/business dealings with Ms Mary Mulvihill (R2/C2), Masterplan Limited (R3), MTR Corporation Limited (MTRCL) (R29), Henderson Land Development Company Limited (HLD) which was the mother company of Ford Word Development Limited (R30), Institute of Future Cities (AVA consultant commissioned by PlanD in relation to Item D), MVA Hong Kong Limited (MVA) (traffic impact assessment (TIA) consultant commissioned by TD in relation to Items A and D), or owning properties in the Tai Po area:

Mr Ivan C.S. Fu - having current business dealings with MTRCL, HLD and MVA

Mr Thomas O.S. Ho - having current business dealings with

MTRCL and MVA

- Mr K.K. Cheung] their firm having current business
Mr Alex T.H. Lai] dealings with MTRCL and The Hong
Kong and China Gas Company
Limited, a subsidiary of HLD, and
hiring Mary Mulvihill on a contract
basis from time to time
- Professor John C.Y. Ng - being the fellow of the Institute of
Future Cities
- Professor S.C. Wong - being employee of the University of
(*The Vice-Chairperson*) Hong Kong (HKU) which had received
donation from a family member of the
Chairman of HLD before, and member
of the Advisory Committee for
Accredited Programme of MTR
Academy
- Dr C.H. Hau - being an employee of HKU which had
received donation from a family
member of the Chairman of HLD
before
- Dr Lawrence K.C. Li - being the Treasurer of the Hong Kong
Polytechnic University which had
obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr Peter K.T. Yuen - being a member of the Board of
Governors of the Hong Kong Arts
Centre which had collaboration with
MTRCL on arts projects and had

- received donation from an Executive Director of HLD before
- Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung - being a Director of the Hong Kong Business Accountants Association which had obtained sponsorship from HLD before
- Mr Franklin Yu - having past business dealings with MTRCL, HLD and MVA
- Mr Stephen L.H. Liu - having past business dealings with MTRCL and HLD
- Mr H.W. Cheung - owning a flat at Heung Sze Wui Street
- Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung - his company owning a flat at On Chee Road
- Mr Daniel K.S. Lau - co-owning with spouse a flat at Ma Wo Road (near Item D site)

31. Mr Ivan C.S. Fu, Mr Thomas O.S. Ho, Mr K.K. Cheung, Dr Frankie W.C. Yeung and Mr Daniel K.S. Lau had tendered apologies for being unable to attend the meeting, and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu and Dr Lawrence K.C. Li had not yet arrived to join this session of the meeting. As Mr Alex T.H. Lai and Professor John C.Y. Ng had no direct involvement in the projects on the representation sites, and the property of Mr H.W. Cheung did not have a direct view of the representation sites, Members agreed that they could stay in the meeting. Members also considered that the interests of the other Members were indirect and agreed that they should be allowed to stay in the meeting.

32. The Secretary reported that petition letters were received from Mr Lo Hiu Fung, a member of TPDC (R33) and 關注馬窩路土地用途大聯盟 (R39). It was noted that they attended the meeting as representers and would elaborate on their representations.

Presentation and Question Sessions

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - DPO/STN

Ms Channy C. Yang - STP/CPE

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Henry K.N. Hui - SE/P&TP

BeeXergy Consulting Ltd

Dr Yan Sui Hang] Consultants

Mr Cutis Chan]

MVA

Mr Edmond Chu] Consultants

Mr W H Chau]

Representers/Commenters or their representatives

R2/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/ Commenter

R3 – Masterplan Ltd

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representer' s representatives
Ms Lam Ching Yu Jessica]

R7 – Tai Po Rural Committee

R9 – Simon Lee (Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of Tai Po Mei)

Mr Simon Lee - Representer and Representers' s
representative

R24 – Yau Yik Chung Henry

Mr Yau Yik Chung Henry - Representer

R28 – Yau Wah On (Village Representative of Cheung Shue Tan)

Mr Yau Wah On - Representer

R33 – Mr Lo Hiu Fung (Tai Po
District Council Member)

R307 – M Y Chung

R309 – C W Chung

Mr Lo Hiu Fung

R128 – 鍾玉英

R306 – M H Chung

R308 – Y K Yeung

- Representer and Representers' s
representative

R39 – 關注馬窩路土地用途大聯盟

Mr Chan Wing Cheong - Representers' s representative

R40 – The Hong Kong Tin Tak Shing Kau Chung Woo Ching Sai Association
Ltd.

Ms Lau Yat Fan]
Mr Lau Yau Keun] Representers' s representatives
Cordells Rompotis -]
Mr Phillip Rompotis]

R122 – So Wing Yan

Ms So Wing Yan

- Representer

R198– Wu Sai Chun

R260– 陳鳳清

R401– 鄺潔茵

R446– 張慧妍

R468– Vera

R498– Wong Man Ying

R504– 梁沛強

R528 – 鍾玉貞

R539– Yeung Sum Yiu Samantha

R562– Leo Li

R593 – Vivian Mak

R603– 陳玉琮

R612– 廖麗容

R614– 陳燕芳

R645– 梁寶玲

R654– 劉雅欣

R668– 陳輝明

R674 – Leung Siu Mui

R682– 劉美玲

R688– Yeung Wai Ching

R732– Ivan Yeung

R737– Name Illegible

R756– Name Illegible

R758 – Fong Kin Yip

R765– 裕德廣

R767– Joe Leung

R781– Alan Wong

R199– Ho Pong Ngai Max

R394– Wong Hau Pong Vincent

R420– Cheung Shun Ho

R467– H K Pang

R497– 張毓雅

R499– 張凱容

R513– 梁皓晴

R532– 張子良

R540– J Banico

R588– 楊心搖

R596 – Lam Tak Yuk

R604– 龐輝

R613– 陳麗雲

R616– 崔綺文

R652– Lau Hang Sim

R665– Samantha

R671– Yeung Wai Chung David

R675– Name Illegible

R687– Lai Kin Ho

R716– Fung Sai Yiu

R736– Name Illegible

R746– Chan Pak Yin

R757– 方淑君

R764– 裕廣華

R766– Justin Leung

R773 – Leung Kam Chuen

R782– Wong Woon Wah

<u>R784– Chen Yan Mei</u>		<u>R792 – Lai Yee Wah</u>
<u>R794– Tsang Brian Wai Keung</u>		<u>R796– Name Illegible</u>
<u>R809– 楊利梅</u>		<u>R813– Name Illegible</u>
<u>R824 Choa Shun Wing</u>		<u>R828– Gerald Li</u>
<u>R829– Aiden Li</u>		<u>R830– Kami Leung</u>
<u>R831 – 梁逸詩</u>		<u>R837– 鍾志勤</u>
<u>R841– 鍾惠華</u>		<u>R866– Chan Pak Yin</u>
<u>R867– Au Yeung Sui Lai</u>		<u>R896– Kau</u>
<u>R907– Fung Tsz Shun</u>		<u>R946– 黃浩</u>
<u>R947– 黃駿</u>		<u>R948– 劉曉邢</u>
<u>R949– 梁少梅</u>		<u>R950– 黃志偉</u>
<u>R981– Billy Ma</u>		<u>R1200– Yam Yuk Yi</u>
<u>R1222– Kung Wai Fan</u>		<u>R1268– Leung Fu Yin</u>
<u>R1269 – 楊立文</u>		
新峰花園三期御峰苑業主委員會]	
Ms Liu Shu Man]	
Mr Man Bun Mo]	
Ms Chung Yuk Ching Mordhia]	Representers and Representatives'
Ms Leung Yat Sze Mary Grace]	representatives
Mr Yueng Lap Man Kelvin]	
Mr Lam Tak Yuk]	
Ms Vivian Mak]	
Ms Lai Yee Wah]	
Ms Lau Hang Sin]	
Ms Choa Shun Wing]	
Mr Fong Kin Yip]	
Mr Leung Kam Chuen]	
Mr Leung Siu Mui]	
<u>R203– 余詠文</u>		
Ms Yueng Sau Ying	-	Representer's representative

R209— Tong Chung Kok David

Mr Tong Chung Kok David - Representer

R220— Leung Hung Fai Sammy

Mr Leung Hung Fai Sammy - Representer

R272— Classical Gardens II Owners' Committee

Mr Lam Fu Keung - Representer's representative

R599— Lau Ting Nui

Ms Lau Ting Nui - Representer

R786— Choy Siu Lai

Ms Choy Siu Lai - Representer

R832— Susanna Lam

Ms Susanna Lam - Representer

R1142— Ho Yuk Ki

Ms Lai Lai Ying - Representer's representative

R1208 – 陳志光

御峰豪園業主委員會 - Representer's representative

Mr Hui Chun Yu

R1236— The Balmoral Owners' Committee

R1247— Law Siu Ching

R1249— Law Ho Kuen

R1257— Law Ka Wai

R1260— Cheung Yuk Ching

R1238— Yeung Chor Kin

Mr Yeung Chor Kin

- Representer and Representers'
representative

34. The Chairperson extended a welcome and briefly 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 numbers, followed by the oral submissions by the commenters or their representatives. To ensure efficient operation of the hearing, each representer/commenter or his representative would be 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. A Q&A session would be held after all attending representers/commenters or their representatives had completed their oral submissions. Members could direct their questions to government representatives, representers/commenters or their representatives. After the Q&A session, the hearing would be adjourned, and the representers/commenters or their representatives would be invited to leave the meeting. The Board would deliberate on the representations and comments in closed meeting, and inform the representers and commenters of the Board's decision in due course.

35. The Chairperson then invited PlanD's representative to brief Members on the background to the representations and comments.

36. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Ms Channy C. Yang, STP/CPE, briefed Members on the representations and comments, including the background of the Amendment Items A, B and D, the grounds/views/proposals of the representers and commenters, planning assessments and PlanD's responses on the representations and comments as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10403 (the Paper).

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

R3 – Masterplan Ltd

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

- (a) he supported the Amendment Items A, B and D in general for residential developments while he objected to the low densities proposed at these three sites;
- (b) taking into account the development intensity of the residential developments along Tolo Highway with plot ratios (PR) ranged from 3.0 to 3.6, the proposed maximum PR at the Item A site and Item B site should be increased from about 2.3 to 3.6 and from about 1.2 to 3.0 respectively. For the Item D site, the PR should be increased to 3.6;
- (c) PlanD's PR calculation of the Item A site and Item D site based on net site areas was misleading. The application of large site reduction factor was considered unnecessary. The reduced area would result in reduction in flat production;
- (d) the setbacks and non-building area requirements for the residential development sites were considered arbitrary and should be removed. The intention of minimising the impacts of the future developments to the surroundings could still be achieved through the submission of technical assessments including AVA by the developers as requested under the lease and the SBD Guidelines; and
- (e) the BH restriction of the sites at Pak Shek Kok along the waterfront was 52 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) and that of the site adjacent to Tolo Highway was 65mPD. With reference to the stepped height concept as suggested in the Urban Design Guidelines, higher BHs should be allowed for developments along the foothill, and gradually decreasing towards the waterfront area. Therefore, the BH restrictions for the Item

A site and the Item B site should be increased to 70mPD as well as 75mPD and 90mPD respectively.

[Dr C.H. Hau left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R7 – Tai Po Rural Committee

R9 – Simon Lee (Indigenous Inhabitant Representative of Tai Po Mei)

39. Mr Simon Lee made the following main points :

- (a) he represented Tai Po Rural Committee (TPRC) and was also the Village Representative (VR) of Tai Po Mei Village;
- (b) he had no in principle objection to new residential developments in view of the housing shortage problem in Hong Kong. However, he had grave concerns on the adverse impacts of the proposed developments at the Item A and Item B sites to the surrounding areas in particular Cheung Shue Tan and Tai Po Mei villages;
- (c) it was unfair that the land resumed by the government for public works at low price would be sold to developers for private residential developments at a high price;
- (d) with the implementation of residential developments surrounding the villages over the years, there had been increasing population in the area resulting in insufficient parking spaces and public transport services. Besides, Tolo Highway near the University Railway Station was heavily loaded. The proposed developments at the Item A, Item B and Item D sites would aggravate the problems;
- (e) the proposed developments would impose adverse visual, air ventilation and environmental impacts. Fung shui would also be adversely affected. The visual impact assessment had not taken into account the

wall effect to the existing villages;

- (f) there should be comprehensive planning for development at the Item A and Item B sites and their surroundings in association with the necessary public infrastructures in particular public transport services. An additional railway station should be provided. Besides, the villages were not served by public sewers and the government should speed up the provision of basic infrastructures for the existing villagers;
- (g) the stream at the Item A site should not be decked over and the future developer should be requested under the lease to carry out beautification of the stream course; and
- (h) the government should respect the local villagers' views in revising the land use proposals.

R24 –Yau Yik Chung Henry

40. Mr Yau Yik Chung Henry made the following main points :

- (a) he was an indigenous villager of Cheung Shue Tan and he objected to the Item A. The land of the Item A site was resumed by the Government for public works but now it was rezoned for residential development. The proposed development at the Item A site would impose adverse air ventilation, visual and environmental impacts to the existing villages;
- (b) a railway station at Tai Po Au and traffic improvements to the road network nearby should be provided; and
- (c) there should be comprehensive planning for developments near the villages with adequate provision of GIC facilities.

[Dr F.C. Chan arrived to join this session of the meeting and Mr C.F. Wong, AD(EA), EPD, left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

R28 – Yau Wah On

41. With the aid of PowerPoint presentation, Mr Yau Wah On made the following main points:

- (a) he was the representative of Tai Po Cheung Shue Tan Heung and represented Cheung Shue Tan and Tai Po Mei villages. He objected to the Items A and B;
- (b) the government had disregarded the objections raised by the TPDC, the TPRC, the representatives of Tai Po Cheung Shue Tan Heung and the VRs of Cheung Shue Tan and Tai Po Mei villages;
- (c) Cheung Shue Tan was located to the west of the Item A site and to the south of the Item B site and at a valley surrounded by hills. Tai Po Mei was located to the south of Cheung Shue Tan. The proposed development at the Item A site which would create wall effect and thus impose adverse air ventilation impact on Cheung Shue Tan;
- (d) taking into account the existing and planned residential developments and those under construction in Pak Shek Kok, there would be substantial increase in population in the area. Tolo Highway was heavily loaded and transport infrastructure was insufficient. There should be comprehensive planning for developing the area into a new town with the provision of a wide range of facilities including a new railway station at Pak Shek Kok, which had been investigated in the Feasibility Study for Pak Shek Kok Development Area completed in earlier days;
- (e) the Government had resumed villagers' land for public works. It was

unfair to the villagers that these land were now zoned for residential purpose, while village developments could only be confined within the “Village Type Development” zone; and

- (f) there was Hip Tin Temple of the Cheung Shue Tan Heung and four ancestral halls in the villages. The proposed development at the Item A site would impose adverse impact on fung shui.

R33 – Mr Lo Hiu Fung (Tai Po

District Council Member)

R307 – M Y Chung

R309 – C W Chung

R128 – 鍾玉英

R306 – M H Chung

R308 – Y K Yeung

42. Mr Lo Hiu Fung made the following main points :

- (a) he was a member of the TPDC. He objected to the Item D in relation to rezoning a site at Ma Wo Road near Classical Gardens from “Green Belt” (“GB”) to “Residential (Group B)10” with stipulation of BH restriction;
- (b) the consultation was conducted improperly since the government had disregarded the objections to the proposed amendments to the draft OZP raised by the TPDC and the local residents. Also, the collected views had not been incorporated and reflected in the submission of the proposed amendments to the Board;
- (c) amongst the 1,300 representations made in respect of the proposed amendments to the OZP, there were 95% adverse representations objecting the Items A, B and D. In particular, there were 1,200 adverse representations (92%) objecting the Item D. The Board should take the public views into consideration;

- (d) the consultation was unfair that the public did not have resources for conducting technical assessments in support of their objecting views while the government could commission various technical assessments to justify that there would be no insurmountable impacts of the proposed developments;
- (e) the proposed residential development at the Item D site with about 1,200 flats for a wealthier group would substantially increase the number of private cars and demand for public transport in the area. It would overload the traffic capacity of Ma Wo Road and its nearby transport network. A request for providing additional shuttle bus service by the residents of Classical Gardens was rejected by TD in 2002. Without improvements to Ma Wo Road, it was doubtful why the proposed development at the Item D site would not cause adverse traffic impact;
- (f) there was insufficient public parking spaces in the area. The two existing temporary car parks would be redeveloped into open space and sports centre and further reduction of parking spaces would be resulted;
- (g) Ma Wo Road was a two-way single lane road. There were illegal parking and pick-up and drop-off activities particularly during the peak hours. Besides, the design of the existing cul-de-sac at Ma Wo Road could not provide sufficient manoeuvring space for buses and the cul-de-sac would be connected with the EVA of the proposed development at the Item D site. It was anticipated that the increase in traffic flow and lack of parking spaces would lead to the problems of blocking the EVA and traffic safety in the area, as well as aggravate the existing traffic problems;
- (h) the planning intention of “GB” zone should be for the preservation of the natural environment and similar consideration was given to reject the previous planning applications of Chung Woo Ching Sai. This consideration should be applicable to the Item D site; and

- (i) the proposed development would impose air and noise pollutions.

R40 – The Hong Kong Tin Tak Shing Kau Chung Woo Ching Sai Association Ltd.

43. Mr Phillip Rompotis said that he represented the lot owner of Chung Woo Ching Sai at Ma Wo Road. Their objections to the Item D had been submitted to the Board on 30.9.2017 and he requested the Board to consider their objections.

R198– Wu Sai Chun

R199– Ho Pong Ngai Max

R260– 陳鳳清

R394– Wong Hau Pong Vincent

R401– 鄺潔茵

R420– Cheung Shun Ho

R446– 張慧妍

R467– H K Pang

R468– Vera

R497– 張毓雅

R498– Wong Man Ying

R499– 張凱容

R504– 梁沛強

R513– 梁皓晴

R528 – 鍾玉貞

R532– 張子良

R539– Yeung Sum Yiu Samantha

R540– J Banico

R562– Leo Li

R588– 楊心樞

R593 – Vivian Mak

R596 – Lam Tak Yuk

R603– 陳玉琮

R604– 龐輝

R612– 廖麗容

R613– 陳麗雲

R614– 陳燕芳

R616– 崔綺文

R645– 梁寶玲

R652– Lau Hang Sim

R654– 劉雅欣

R665– Samantha

R668– 陳輝明

R671– Yeung Wai Chung David

R674 – Leung Siu Mui

R675– Name Illegible

R682– 劉美玲

R687– Lai Kin Ho

R688– Yeung Wai Ching

R716– Fung Sai Yiu

R732– Ivan Yeung

R736– Name Illegible

R737– Name Illegible

R746– Chan Pak Yin

R756– Name Illegible

R758 – Fong Kin Yip

R765– 裕德廣

R767– Joe Leung

R781– Alan Wong

R784– Chen Yan Mei

R794– Tsang Brian Wai Keung

R809– 楊利梅

R824 Choa Shun Wing

R829– Aiden Li

R831 – 梁逸詩

R841– 鍾惠華

R867– Au Yeung Sui Lai

R907– Fung Tsz Shun

R947– 黃駿

R949– 梁少梅

R981– Billy Ma

R1222– Kung Wai Fan

R1269 – 楊立文

R757– 方淑君

R764– 裕廣華

R766– Justin Leung

R773 – Leung Kam Chuen

R782– Wong Woon Wah

R792 – Lai Yee Wah

R796– Name Illegible

R813– Name Illegible

R828– Gerald Li

R830– Kami Leung

R837– 鍾志勤

R866– Chan Pak Yin

R896– Kau

R946– 黃浩

R948– 劉曉彤

R950– 黃志偉

R1200– Yam Yuk Yi

R1268– Leung Fu Yin

44. Ms Liu Shu Man said that she represented the residents of Classical Gardens. They objected to the Item D since the development intensity and BH of the proposed development was not compatible with the surroundings and the proposed residential development at the Item D site would pose adverse impacts on environment and provision of community facilities. The considerations given to reject the previous planning applications of Chung Woo Ching Sai should be applicable to the Item D site.

45. The meeting was adjourned for lunch break at 1:27 p.m.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law left this session of the meeting temporarily at this point.]

[Mr H.W. Cheung and Mr Alex T.H. Lai left this session of the meeting at this point.]

46. The meeting was resumed at 2:45 p.m. on 26.4.2018.

47. 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

Mr Lincoln L.H. Huang

Mr Stephen H.B. Yau

Dr F.C. Chan

Mr Peter K.T. Yuen

Dr Lawrence W.C. Poon

Mr Wilson Y.W. Fung

Dr C.H. Hau

Dr Lawrence K.C. Li

Mr Stephen L.H. Liu

Professor T.S. Liu

Ms Sandy H.Y. Wong

Mr Franklin Yu

Ms Lilian S.K. Law

Mr K.W. Leung

Professor John C.Y. Ng

Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment),
Environmental Protection Department
Mr C.F. Wong

Assistant Director (Regional 3),
Lands Department
Mr Edwin W.K. Chan

Vice-Chairperson

Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East),
Transport Department
Mr Ricky W.K. Ho

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

Director of Planning
Mr Raymond K.W. Lee

[Professor S.C. Wong and Mr C.F. Wong returned to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

[Dr Lawrence K.C. Li and Mr Stephen L.H. Liu arrived to join this session of the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 1

Presentation and Question Sessions (Continued)

[Open Meeting]

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

Government representatives

Planning Department (PlanD)

Ms Jessica H.F. Chu - District Planning Officer/Shau Tin,
Tai Po & North (DPO/STN)

Ms Channy C. Yang - Senior Town Planner/ Country
Park Enclaves (STP/CPE)

Transport Department (TD)

Mr Henry K.N. Hui - Senior Engineer/Project & Tai Po
(SE/P&TP)

BeeXergy Consulting Ltd

Dr Yan Sui Hang] Consultants
Mr Cutis Chan]

MVA Hong Kong Ltd.

Mr Edmond Chu] Consultants
Mr W H Chau]

Representers/Commenters or their representatives

R2/C2 – Mary Mulvihill

Ms Mary Mulvihill - Representer/ Commenter

R3 – Masterplan Ltd

Mr Ian Brownlee] Representer' s representatives
Ms Lam Ching Yu Jessica]

R33 – Mr Lo Hiu Fung (Tai Po District Council Member)

R307 – M Y Chung

R309 – C W Chung

Mr Lo Hiu Fung - Representer and Representers' representative

R128 – 鍾玉英

R306 – M H Chung

R308 – Y K Yeung

R39 – 關注馬窩路土地用途大聯盟

Mr Chan Wing Cheong - Representer's representative

R198– Wu Sai Chun

R260– 陳鳳清

R401– 鄭潔茵

R446– 張慧妍

R468– Vera

R498– Wong Man Ying

R199– Ho Pong Ngai Max

R394– Wong Hau Pong Vincent

R420– Cheung Shun Ho

R467– H K Pang

R497– 張毓雅

R499– 張凱容

- R504– 梁沛強
R528 – 鍾玉貞
R539– Yeung Sum Yiu Samantha
R562– Leo Li
R593 – Vivian Mak
R603– 陳玉琮
R612– 廖麗容
R614– 陳燕芳
R645– 梁寶玲
R654– 劉雅欣
R668– 陳輝明
R674 – Leung Siu Mui
R682– 劉美玲
R688– Yeung Wai Ching
R732– Ivan Yeung
R737– Name Illegible
R756– Name Illegible
R758 – Fong Kin Yip
R765– 裕德廣
R767– Joe Leung
R781– Alan Wong
R784– Chen Yan Mei
R794– Tsang Brian Wai Keung
R809– 楊利梅
R824 Choa Shun Wing
R829– Aiden Li
R831 – 梁逸詩
R841– 鍾惠華
R867– Au Yeung Sui Lai
R907– Fung Tsz Shun
R947– 黃駿
- R513– 梁皓晴
R532– 張子良
R540– J Banico
R588– 楊心搖
R596 – Lam Tak Yuk
R604– 龐輝
R613– 陳麗雲
R616– 崔綺文
R652– Lau Hang Sim
R665– Samantha
R671– Yeung Wai Chung David
R675– Name Illegible
R687– Lai Kin Ho
R716– Fung Sai Yiu
R736– Name Illegible
R746– Chan Pak Yin
R757– 方淑君
R764– 裕廣華
R766– Justin Leung
R773 – Leung Kam Chuen
R782– Wong Woon Wah
R792 – Lai Yee Wah
R796– Name Illegible
R813– Name Illegible
R828– Gerald Li
R830– Kami Leung
R837– 鍾志勤
R866– Chan Pak Yin
R896– Kau
R946– 黃浩
R948– 劉曉邢

R949– 梁少梅

R950– 黃志偉

R981– Billy Ma

R1200– Yam Yuk Yi

R1222– Kung Wai Fan

R1268– Leung Fu Yin

R1269 – 楊立文

新峰花園三期御峰苑業主委員會]

Ms Liu Shu Man]

Ms Chung Yuk Ching Morphia] Representers and Representers'

Ms Leung Yat Sze Mary Grace] representatives

Mr Yueng Lap Man Kelvin]

Mr Lam Tak Yuk]

Ms Lai Yee Wah]

Ms Lau Hang Sim]

Ms Choa Shun Wing]

Mr Leung Kam Chuen]

Mr Leung Siu Mui]

R203– 余詠文

Ms Yueng Sau Ying - Representer's representative

R209– Tong Chung Kok David

Mr Tong Chung Kok David - Representer

R220– Leung Hung Fai Sammy

Mr Leung Hung Fai Sammy - Representer

R272– Classical Gardens II Owners' Committee

Mr Lam Fu Keung - Representer's representative

R1142– Ho Yuk Ki

Ms Ho Yuk Ki - Representer

Ms Lai Lai Ying - Representer's representative

R1208 – 陳志光

御峰豪園業主委員會 - Representers' representative

Mr Hui Chun Yu

R1236– The Balmoral Owners' Committee

R1247– Law Siu Ching

R1249– Law Ho Kuen

R1257– Law Ka Wai

R1260– Cheung Yuk Ching

R1238– Yeung Chor Kin

Mr Yeung Chor Kin - Representer and Representers' representative

C4 – Wong Sin Yee Olivia

Protect Cha Kwo Ling - Commenter's representative

HarbourfrontConcern Group –

Mr Tse Chun Wah

49. The Chairperson extended a welcome to the government representatives, representers, commenters and their representatives. She then invited the representers, commenters and their representatives to give their oral submissions.

R198– Wu Sai Chun

R199– Ho Pong Ngai Max

R260– 陳鳳清

R394– Wong Hau Pong Vincent

R401– 鄺潔茵

R420– Cheung Shun Ho

R446– 張慧妍

R467– H K Pang

R468– Vera

R497– 張毓雅

R498– Wong Man Ying

R499– 張凱容

R504– 梁沛強

R513– 梁皓晴

R528 – 鍾玉貞

R532– 張子良

R539– Yeung Sum Yiu Samantha

R540– J Banico

R562– Leo Li

R593 – Vivian Mak

R603– 陳玉琮

R612– 廖麗容

R614– 陳燕芳

R645– 梁寶玲

R654– 劉雅欣

R668– 陳輝明

R674 – Leung Siu Mui

R682– 劉美玲

R688– Yeung Wai Ching

R732– Ivan Yeung

R737– Name Illegible

R756– Name Illegible

R758 – Fong Kin Yip

R765– 裕德廣

R767– Joe Leung

R781– Alan Wong

R784– Chen Yan Mei

R794– Tsang Brian Wai Keung

R809– 楊利梅

R824 Choa Shun Wing

R829– Aiden Li

R831 – 梁逸詩

R841– 鍾惠華

R867– Au Yeung Sui Lai

R907– Fung Tsz Shun

R947– 黃駿

R949– 梁少梅

R981– Billy Ma

R1222– Kung Wai Fan

R588– 楊心搖

R596 – Lam Tak Yuk

R604– 龐輝

R613– 陳麗雲

R616– 崔綺文

R652– Lau Hang Sim

R665– Samantha

R671– Yeung Wai Chung David

R675– Name Illegible

R687– Lai Kin Ho

R716– Fung Sai Yiu

R736– Name Illegible

R746– Chan Pak Yin

R757– 方淑君

R764– 裕廣華

R766– Justin Leung

R773 – Leung Kam Chuen

R782– Wong Woon Wah

R792 – Lai Yee Wah

R796– Name Illegible

R813– Name Illegible

R828– Gerald Li

R830– Kami Leung

R837– 鍾志勤

R866– Chan Pak Yin

R896– Kau

R946– 黃浩

R948– 劉曉彤

R950– 黃志偉

R1200– Yam Yuk Yi

R1268– Leung Fu Yin

R1269 – 楊立文

R1236– The Balmoral Owners' Committee

R1247– Law Siu Ching

R1249– Law Ho Kuen

R1257– Law Ka Wai

R1260– Cheung Yuk Ching

R1238– Yeung Chor Kin

R272– Classical Gardens II Owners'
Committee

50. Ms Chung Yuk Ching made the following main points :

- (a) she was a representative of the local residents and had been living in Classical Gardens Phase 1 for more than 10 years;
- (b) Item D site was located on a slope. The use of explosives for site formation works of the proposed development might lead to landslip and soil erosion, which would affect the safety of the local residents. Small scale landslip near Block 17 of Classical Gardens Phase 1 had already occurred previously; and
- (c) the nearby “Green Belt” (“GB”) area was a habitat for birds and small animals, acted as green lung for the local residents to purify the pollutants from Tolo Highway and Chung Woo Ching Sai (CWCS) and helped to maintain the temperature in the local area. The proposed residential development would affect the tranquil environment and cause adverse visual and health impacts on the area.

51. With the aid of the visualiser, Mr Yeung Lap Man Kelvin made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Classical Gardens Phase 1 for more than 20 years and was very familiar with the local area;
- (b) the proposed residential development at Item D site for the provision of about 1,300 flats (a scale similar to Classical Gardens Phase 1) on a sloping site without any supporting infrastructure facilities was a maladministration in planning. In considering the expansion proposal

submitted by CWCS (next to the Item D site), it was noted that the Environmental Protection Department (EPD) had advised that the sewerage facilities in the area did not have spare capacity for additional discharge. The Transport Department (TD) also advised that the existing traffic at Ma Wo Road was already saturated and could not cope with an increase in traffic flow. However, those views were ignored by PlanD in rezoning of the Item D site for residential development;

- (c) without sufficient public transport and supporting infrastructure facilities, the additional population would cause adverse impacts on the local area. Besides, the increase in heavy vehicles at the construction stage would also affect pedestrian safety at Ma Wo Road; and
- (d) the Government should conduct feasibility studies with a view to developing another “GB” site at To Yuen Tung (near the junction of Tat Wan Road/Tolo Highway) which would be more suitable for residential development than the Item D site since no traffic and sewerage problems were anticipated at that site.

52. Mr Yeung Chor Kin made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Chairman of the Balmoral Owners’ Committee (Classical Gardens Phase 5). The existing developments at Ma Wo Road were about eight storeys high. The proposed residential development at the Item D site with 13 blocks of 13 storeys at a higher altitude on a slope would affect the air ventilation and sunlight penetration to the existing developments. According to the information provided, it was noted that the building layout and height in the current proposal were different from those presented to them in their discussion with PlanD last year. The conclusion of the technical assessments that the proposed development would not cause adverse impacts on air ventilation and sunlight penetration was unacceptable; and

- (b) the expansion proposal of CWCS was previously rejected by the Town Planning Board (the Board) and one of the rejection reasons was related to its proposed building height of 18.1m. Given such background, it was self-contradictory to propose a residential development with 110mPD at the Item D site next to CWCS. The Government should properly explain why the proposed development would not cause adverse impacts on the local residents.

53. Mr Leung Kam Chuen made the following main points:

- (a) he was an owner at Classical Gardens Phase 3;
- (b) it was incomprehensible why PlanD had considered the proposed development, which would create additional burden on the existing infrastructure facilities, would only have minor impacts on the local residents; and
- (c) the Government had not provided convincing information nor proposal to address the traffic congestion problems to be created by the proposed development especially at Ma Wo Road where there was no space for road widening. If the traffic problem could not be resolved, it would affect both the existing and future residents. The Government was urged to provide feasible solutions to address the local residents' concerns before putting forward new development proposal.

54. Mr Lam Fu Keung made the following main points:

- (a) he was representing the Owners Committee of Classical Gardens Phase 2 to make presentation;
- (b) Ma Wo Road was a one-lane two-way road and the only access road serving Classical Gardens Phases 1 to 5, a secondary school and an international school in the area. The school buses and private cars generated by the nearby schools had created burden on the morning peak

hour traffic. Besides, Ma Wo Road was connected to Tat Wan Road which linked to Tai Po Market Railway Station, Tai Po town centre and Tolo Highway. With the proposed addition of about 1,300 residential units, which was similar to the scale of Classical Gardens, it would create significant traffic flow exceeding the carrying capacity of Ma Wo Road and thereby creating a bottleneck at Tat Wan Road; and

- (c) a small community had originally been planned at Ma Wo Road since 1990s. It was doubtful if the planned sewerage facilities could cater for the intensification of developments. Besides, if partial road closure at Ma Wo Road and Tat Wan Road were required for the upgrading works to the existing sewerage facilities for the additional population, the local traffic would be significantly affected. The Government should resolve the sewerage and traffic issues before putting forward rezoning proposal to the Board.

55. Ms Leung Yat Sze made the following main points:

- (a) she was a representative for Classical Gardens Phase 3;
- (b) she doubted there were adequate supporting facilities including markets and eating places in the nearby areas to cater for the additional 1,300 flats. The Government should not ignore the problems faced by the local residents in the name of addressing territory-wide housing problems;
- (c) there was still alternative land for housing development, including golf course and brownfield sites. The government's policy should not be biased towards those with power and wealth; and
- (d) the local residents had long been suffering from the air pollution, noise and hygiene problems created by CWCS. The Board should reject the rezoning proposal at the Item D site based on the same rationale in

rejecting the expansion proposal of CWCS and thus preventing the local environment from further deterioration.

R209– Tong Chung Kok, David

56. Mr Tong Chung Kok, David made the following main points:

- (a) he was an owner of Classical Gardens Phase 2;
- (b) he considered that the hearing arrangement was unsatisfactory as he was asked to arrive at 9:30am but the hearing of the Group 2 representations was started at 11:30am, and PlanD's representative had used about 30 minutes to introduce the TPB Paper No. 10403 (the Paper). The arrangement could be improved by providing better estimated arrival time to the representers and deleting the session of introduction of the Paper by PlanD's representative;

[Mr Franklin Yu left this session of the meeting at this point.]

- (c) the local residents did not have resources to conduct technical assessments to rebut the data provided by government departments. As assessments commissioned by different parties might have different stances, for objectivity and thus better creditability, consideration should be given to have the technical assessments commissioned by the district council, and the reports made available for public inspection. He questioned if the technical assessments for the proposed development had been uploaded onto the website for public inspection;
- (d) the views of the local residents should not be overtaken by technical data. Personal experience of the local residents should be more important and could help the Board Members to understand the severity of the problems; and

- (e) the increase in population in the area would affect the tranquil environment and cause adverse impacts on the surrounding area, thus affecting the property price of the existing developments.

R220– Leung Hung Fai Sammy

57. Mr Leung Hung Fai Sammy made the following main points:

- (a) he had been living in Classical Gardens Phase 2 for 15 years;
- (b) the Board had previously rejected the expansion proposal of CWCS for columbarium use and the proposed rezoning of a “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) site to the east of Classical Gardens Phase 2 which was reserved for a proposed sports centre for residential use. It was believed that the Board would make a right decision again this time;
- (c) Tai Po District Council (TPDC) had objected to the proposed development at the Item D site on grounds of insufficient supporting and transport facilities. Obviously, its views had been ignored in the rezoning process; and
- (d) before the Item D site was put up for land sale, the future developer should be requested to provide all necessary infrastructure facilities so as to avoid degradation of the living quality of the local residents.

R1142 – Ho Yuk Ki

58. Ms Ho Yuk Ki made the following main points:

- (a) she objected to the proposed development at the Item D site;
- (b) due to the insufficient car parking space provision in the area, illegal parking blocking the traffic at Ma Wo Road and Ma Chung Road could

often be found. The proposed population increase in the area would increase the demand for car parking spaces and aggravate the traffic problem;

- (c) although there were residents' shuttle buses connecting the area with Tai Po Market Railway Station, the parking spaces at the railway station were insufficient to cope with the existing demand in Tai Po area. The additional population would further aggravate the shortage of parking spaces at the railway station; and
- (d) the proposed development at a natural slope within the "GB" zone would destroy the natural environment and adversely affect the landscape amenity of the area.

R2/C2 - Mary Mulvihill

59. With the aid of the visualiser, Ms Mary Mulvihill made the following main points:

Hearing Arrangement

- (a) given the increase in the number of objections to the controversial amendment items in statutory plans, it was time for the Board to review the existing hearing arrangements with a view to allowing more time for the Members to digest the views raised by the representers/commenters and asked for input from relevant government departments before making a decision. The court had also ruled on judicial review cases that Members of the Board should make inquiry into the matters raised by representers and fully acquainted with details of the site; and

Item A Site

- (b) Item A site had been included in the land sale list since last year before the proposed rezoning was considered by the Board. Members of the

Board would therefore feel pressured to approve the rezoning proposal. It was noted that some Members who depended on the Government for their income would always back the Government against the wishes of the community.

60. The Chairperson stopped Ms Mary Mulvihill at this point because her remark was an insult to Members of the Board and reminded her that no disrespect to Members of the Board should be made in her oral submission, which was supposed to be elaboration on her submitted representation.

61. Ms Mary Mulvihill continued to make the following main points:

Need for "G/IC" Site

- (a) "G/IC" zones were required not only to meet the demand of the current needs of the community, but also the needs of the future residents. She questioned if the "G/IC" site was no longer required and the rezoning would not affect the long-term provision of GIC facilities as claimed by the Government as no information on the provision of GIC facilities in the local area was provided. It was noted that the villagers had complained that the Government had resumed some agricultural and building lots for public works and GIC uses at a low price but the concerned land was later found on the land sale list;
- (b) given that there was currently no standard for the provision of elderly facilities under Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines (HKPSG), she doubted how PlanD could say that the requirements for GIC facilities had been met. Quite on the contrary, more "G/IC" sites should be required to cope with the needs arising from the upsurge of the elderly population. Due to the lack of suitable "G/IC" sites, elderly facilities usually needed to be located in industrial/government office buildings or to be provided by developers in new development sites, which were considered unsatisfactory. Since the Policy Address and the Elderly Services Programme Plan had set out the blueprint to

improve elderly services and it was recommended that population-based planning ratios for various elderly services be re-instated in the HKPSG, those objectives should be followed through;

- (c) while there was a shortage of hospital beds provision in the district according to HKPSG, the figure could not truly reflect the severity of the hospital beds shortage problem and the over-crowdedness of the existing hospitals;
- (d) the Government had the obligation to provide GIC facilities in appropriate standalone “G/IC” sites. Before the demand for GIC facilities was fully addressed, the “G/IC” sites readily available to meet the needs of the community should not be rezoned for other uses unless under special circumstances with strong justifications. The subject “G/IC” site was rezoned on the excuse of facilitating housing development, but it was luxury housing to be provided at the site rather than public housing to meet the needs of the community. Even if there was no designated uses for the “G/IC” site, it should be retained for elderly care and other community facilities;

Alternative Use

- (e) since the Item A site was close to Science Park, it was suitable for tertiary education focusing on technology and practical subjects and thereby creating a synergy effect. Besides, given its close proximity to the Chinese University of Hong Kong (CUHK), it could share the sports facilities with CUHK;
- (f) the Item A site was also a suitable alternative site for the proposed Vocational Training Council (VTC) campus at Cha Kwo Ling (CKL) Harbourfront. Currently, the geographical distribution of VTC facilities was imbalance, with most of the existing campuses located in Kowloon and Hong Kong Island and only a few facilities located in the New Territories (NT). This was not in line with the recommendation

of the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” that services and facilities should be equally distributed throughout the territory. It was more sensible for new VTC facilities to be provided in the NT such that the daily commuting trips of the students would be in reverse direction of that of the workers. Besides, VTC was obligated to provide skills training to persons with disability but such training opportunity had not been provided in the NT East; and

Item B Site

- (g) the villagers had pointed out the importance of a stream passing through the area. Members of the Board should look into the situation with the support of relevant data so as to avoid possible landslip in future.

C4 - Wong Sin Yee, Olivia

62. With the aid of a PowerPoint presentation, Mr Tse Chun Wah made the following main points:

- (a) he was the Vice-convener of the Protect Cha Kwo Ling Harbourfront Concern Group. They had made representation to the proposed amendments to the draft Kai Tak Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) No. S/K22/5 objecting the proposed VTC campus at CKL waterfront, which had a net site area of 3.2ha for the development of a 60-70m high building;
- (b) CKL waterfront was not a suitable location for the proposed VTC campus as it was previously planned for a waterfront park, which was in great demand in Kwun Tong area. The relocation of the liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) filling station due to the proposed VTC campus would attract a larger number of taxis queueing up at the waterfront area, which would affect the amenity of the harbourfront and the health of the local residents;

- (c) as VTC had confirmed that a waterfront site was not necessary, the Item A site would be a suitable alternative site for the proposed VTC campus. The Item A site, which had a site area of about 3.2ha and close to University Station (6 minutes by shuttle bus) with public transport services, was originally zoned “G/IC” and reserved for tertiary educational institution and associated uses. As the Item A site was a mirror image of the CKL site in terms of size and configuration, re-provisioning the VTC campus at the Item A site would achieve a win-win situation; and
- (d) given the decision on the proposed amendments to the draft Kai Tak OZP No. S/K22/5 had not yet been made, the Board was urged to consider reserving the Item A site for the proposed VTC campus instead.

63. As the presentation from government 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 representatives and/or the government 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.

Amendment Item A

Need for “G/IC” Site

64. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representative:

- (a) the consultation process undertaken by PlanD before the proposed rezoning of the “G/IC” site for residential use;

- (b) whether the proposed residential development at the Item A site amid the “G/IC” zones was considered compatible in terms of land use;
- (c) whether the site was a suitable alternative site for the proposed VTC campus at CKL as requested by some representers/commenters; and
- (d) whether the sports centre to the north of the site was granted to Education University of Hong Kong (EdUHK) under permanent land allocation and what transportation arrangement was for the students.

65. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of a PowerPoint slide:

- (a) the Item A site was originally zoned “G/IC” and reserved for tertiary educational institution and associated uses. Before the identification of Item A site for residential use, relevant government departments had been consulted. The Education Bureau had no objection to release the site for other higher priority development as there was no requirement for use of the site by CUHK and EdUHK nor for other education development. Other government departments also had no objection to the proposed residential development at the site. While the Item A site was rezoned for residential use, the “G/IC” sites to its east were still reserved for the planned facilities of CUHK;
- (b) the Item A site was surrounded by the existing and planned CUHK facilities to its east, sewage pumping station, stormwater pump house and public car park and other reserved “G/IC” sites including for public car park use to its southwest and the EdUHK Sports Centre to its north. G/IC and residential developments were compatible in terms of land use;
- (c) VTC requested for a site of 3 to 5 ha in the urban area to re-provision two existing overcrowded and aged campuses in Cheung Sha Wan

and Kwun Tong respectively. Although the Item A site had a gross site area (GSA) of about 3.81 ha, the developable area (i.e. net site area (NSA)) was only about 2.45 ha after excluding the public road and drainage reserve. As such, the Item A site was not suitable for the proposed VTC campus in terms of location and site area; and

- (d) she had no information regarding land allocation of EdUHK Sports Centre at hand. It was noted that EdUHK had provided shuttle bus service for their students to go to the sports centre and the sports centre could be booked by other schools through application.

Land Sale List

66. A Member asked whether it was appropriate to include the Item A site in the land sale list before the rezoning process was completed. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that the Item A site was originally included in the 2017-18 land sale programme but its sale had been delayed as the rezoning proposal had not been approved by the Board. It was the established practice that a site would only be sold after the relevant town planning procedures were completed. The Chairperson supplemented that the incorporation of the site in the land sale list was to provide information on the sites available for development to the market. There was previous example that if the rezoning proposal was not agreed by the Board, the site would be deleted from the land sale list. As such, putting a site on the land sale list would not pre-empt the decision of the Board.

Drainage Reserve and NBA

67. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions:
- (a) whether the streams near the existing villages would be affected by the proposed development at the Item A site;
 - (b) whether it was possible to have development on top of the drainage reserve along Pok Yin Road;

- (c) whether the proposed development at the Item A site would cause wall effect to the nearby Cheung Shue Tan village as alleged by some representers/commenters; and
- (d) whether the proposed development at the site would affect the fung shui of the nearby village.

68. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) there were two main streams passing through the existing villages and leading to the south-eastern corner of the Item A site. It was believed that the drainage reserve at the periphery of the Item A site was channeling the streams from the inland area to the sea;
- (b) according to Drainage Services Department's advice, no structure should be built on top of the drainage reserve;
- (c) according to the findings of the air ventilation assessment (AVA), a 15m wide non-building area (NBA) along the existing drainage reserve to facilitate the penetration of prevailing wind from the north-east to the inland areas was proposed. There were also provisions in the Sustainable Building Design Guideline (SBDG) to prevent long building façade and ensure a provision of minimum 30% green coverage for larger sites which were conducive to air ventilation. Besides, if the site was used for tertiary educational institution as originally planned, the proposed development would have a BH of 47mPD. The proposed BH of 50mPD for Item A site was only 3m (about 1 storey) higher than that on the original "G/IC" zone; and
- (d) Lands Department (LandsD) had advised that there was fung shui area within Cheung Shue Tan Village but no fung shui area for Tai

Po Mei Village. The proposed development at the Item A site did not form part of the said fung shui area.

69. In response to the Chairperson's question, Mr Ian Brownlee (R3's representative) said that given no development was allowed on top of the drainage reserve, the designation of NBA along the drainage reserve was unnecessary. In response to the request of the nearby villagers, it would be more sensible to designate a NBA in a north-east and south-west direction across the site so as to provide a visual corridor from the entrance of Cheung Sheu Tan Village towards the sea. Such NBA would not affect the development potential of the site.

BH and Development Density

70. A Member asked how the stepped BH profile and development intensity were derived for the Item A site. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the Tolo Highway had divided the area into inland and waterfront clusters. With respect to the inland cluster, a stepped BH profile was formulated along the hillslope with Deerhill Bay at the top of the hill and the BH descending toward the Item B site at the hillside and then further down to the Item A site at the foot of the hill. The development intensity for the Item A site was derived based on NSA which had excluded the drainage reserve and public road according to HKPSG. If the GSA and a plot ratio (PR) of 3.6 were adopted as proposed by R3, a gross floor area (GFA) of 137,160m² would be resulted, equivalent to a PR of about 5.6 if based on NSA. As such, the GFA restriction of 88,200m², which was estimated based on a PR of 3.6 on NSA, was considered appropriate for the Item A site.

71. In response to some questions, Mr Ian Brownlee said that Tolo Highway should not be a consideration in formulating BH restrictions. As the BH restrictions for waterfront sites to the east of the Item A site ranged from 52mPD to 65mPD, it was more sensible to increase the BH restriction for the Item A site to 70mPD to create a stepped BH profile ascending from the waterfront area to the inland area and avoid unnecessary development control at the site.

72. Ms Mary Mulvihill supplemented that Mr Ian Brownlee's proposed development parameters for the Item A site, i.e. with a BH of 70mPD and a NBA across the site, made it a perfect alternative site for the proposed VTC campus in CKL.

Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)

73. A Member asked if TIA had been conducted for the proposed development at the Item A site. In response, Mr Edmond Chu, consultant of MVA Hong Kong Ltd., said that a TIA for the proposed residential development had been conducted. According to the TIA, the traffic generation and attraction were 146 trips/hour and 59 trips/hour respectively in the morning peak hours, and 65 trips/hour and 88 trips/hour respectively in the evening peak hours. The proposed development would not create insurmountable adverse traffic impact on the nearby junctions. To cater for the additional traffic demand, public transport facilities such as green minibus (GMB) service would need to be enhanced.

Land Resumption

74. A Member asked if there had been land resumed from villagers for public works and GIC uses but was later proposed to be sold for private development as alleged by some representers. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, with the aid of a PowerPoint slide, said that the land resumed for PWP Item No. 713CL as quoted by the representations was for provision of roads, car parks and infrastructural facilities to serve Cheung Shue Tan and Tai Po Mei Villages and did not fall within the Item A site. There were, however, 12 private lots within the Item A site together with other lots outside the Item A site which had been resumed for other public works to facilitate Pak Shek Kok Development and they had all been handed back to LandsD upon completion of the road works. The land resumed might be used in such a manner as the Government thought fit. There were examples in other areas that the private lots resumed for public works were put up for land sale. In response to the Chairperson's question, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu said that those 12 private lots had never been zoned "Village Type Development" nor fell within the village 'environs' of the two nearby villages.

Amendment Item B

75. A Member asked if the proposed development at the Item B site would block the views of Deerhill Bay. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that the BH restrictions for the Item B site was generally lower than the existing site levels of Deerhill Bay. The BH restrictions at the northern and southern parts of the Item B site were 55mPD and 65mPD respectively, while the existing site levels of Deerhill Bay near Item B site were 61.7mPD and 68.2mPD respectively.

Amendment Item D

Concerns Related to CWCS

76. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the proposed development with respect to the planning applications submitted by CWCS and the rejection reasons for the applications;
- (b) whether the existing developments and uses in CWCS was allowed under the lease;
- (c) whether the proposed development at Item D site would block the existing pedestrian access to CWCS; and
- (d) whether the proposed residential development at the “GB” zone to the north of CWCS would provide an excuse for approving the expansion plan of CWCS.

77. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) CWCS was located to the south of the Item D site. While CWCS was in existence before the first gazette of Tai Po OZP in 1980, a number of

structures were constructed since 1993 with extensive vegetation clearance but without planning permission from the Board. A number of planning applications for regularization and/or expansion of the religious institution and columbarium uses had been submitted by CWCS in the past 10 years but none was approved. The latest application (No. A/TP/624) was rejected by the Rural and New Town Planning Committee (RNTPC) of the Board on 7.4.2017 on the grounds that the proposed development was not in line with the planning intention of the “GB” zone, the proposed columbarium use was not compatible with the existing residential developments in the surrounding areas, the applicant failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would have no adverse traffic and landscape impacts, and approval of the application would set an undesirable precedent for similar application in the “GB” zone, encouraging “destroy first, build later” activities and extensive vegetation clearance;

- (b) some of the existing developments and uses in CWCS did not comply with the lease conditions. There were a number of known and suspected unauthorised structures and building works within CWCS, including the existing columbarium building and the terraced open-air columbarium;
- (c) the Item D site, which was a piece of government land, fell outside the boundary of CWCS. While CWCS was currently accessible via a footpath within the Item D site, there were other alternative accesses including another footpath and a vehicular access road connecting to Ma Wo Road. The development at the Item D site would not deprive the access right of CWCS; and
- (d) the proposed residential development at the Item D site was in line with the Government’s multi-pronged approach to identify “GB” sites at the fringe of the urban area with infrastructural facilities and no insurmountable problems to meet the pressing housing needs in the short-to-medium terms. It was an extension of the existing

developments along Ma Wo Road and was compatible with the surrounding environment. Relevant technical assessments, including tree survey, revealed that the proposed development would not create significant impacts on the surrounding area. Given that there was about 1,230 ha of “GB” zone covering about 50% of the draft Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/27 (the draft OZP), the proposed rezoning would not adversely affect the integrity of the overall “GB” zone in Tai Po. The existing columbarium uses in CWCS, however, were not compatible with the existing residential developments in the surrounding area. As such, all of the previous planning applications submitted by CWCS were rejected by the Board. The continued operation of private columbaria in CWCS would be regulated through a licensing scheme under the Private Columbaria Ordinance. It was noted that CWCS had applied for an exemption under the licensing scheme.

Sewerage Facilities

78. A Member asked the representers/commenters and their representatives the sources of information regarding the lack of sewerage capacity in the area. In response, Mr Yeung Lap Man Kelvin (R1269) said that in commenting on CWCS’s application for expansion of its existing facilities, EPD had advised that as the existing sewer in the area was planned for Classical Gardens, there was no spare capacity to cope with additional discharge from CWCS. CWCS was requested to use septic tanks to handle the sewerage discharge. Ms Liu Shu Man (representers’ representative) supplemented that CWCS’s previous application for the construction of two toilets within the site was rejected by the Board due to the advices of the EPD that the existing sewer in the area was fully occupied and there was no spare capacity to cope with additional discharge from the toilets.

79. In response to the Chairperson’s question on whether EPD had advised that the sewerage facilities in the area did not have spare capacity in the previous applications submitted by CWCS, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, with the aid of the visualizer showing EPD’s advice regarding the latest application No. A/TP/624, said that EPD had not raised objection to CWCS’s latest application, nor advised that the public sewer did not have spare capacity to cater for new development in the area.

80. Ms Liu Shu Man stated further that reference should not merely be made to application No. A/TP/624. Given the Government's stance of not approving CWCS's application, relevant departments might not have repeated their previous objections in the latest application No. A/TP/624. The comments from relevant government departments in relation to CWCS's previous applications had been kept by the representers and submitted to the Board for consideration.

81. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) noting CWCS's proposal to collect wastewater to underground sewerage holding tank with time-controlled pump for discharge into the existing public sewer during non-peak hours in application No. A/TP/624, whether there was spare capacity in the public sewer in the area and whether relevant government departments had requested for the upgrading of the public sewer before land sale;
- (b) whether the sewerage issue could be addressed through the land sale conditions; and
- (c) any information on the carrying capacity of the existing public sewer and whether spare capacity had been built-in when the area was previously planned for residential development.

82. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) before rezoning of the Item D site was proposed and after the receipt of representations/comments on the proposed amendments to the draft OZP, comments from relevant government departments, including EPD, had been sought. EPD had not advised that there was no spare capacity in the public sewer in the area nor insurmountable problems would be encountered due to the proposed development. Under the established

practice, if a proposed development would cause insurmountable sewerage problems, relevant government departments would raise concern. In the current case, EPD had no objection to the proposed development at the Item D site and requested the requirement on sewerage impact assessment (SIA) be incorporated into the lease at the land disposal stage;

- (b) the Item D site would be put up for land sale and the requirement for the submission of a SIA would be incorporated into the lease conditions. Under the established practice, the SIA would need to assess the existing sewerage capacity and identify suitable mitigation measures to cater for the proposed development. The future developer would also be requested to implement the mitigation measures as identified in the SIA to the satisfaction of EPD. There was provision under the draft OZP to allow for the upgrading works of the sewerage facilities. It had also been clearly stated in the Explanatory Statement (ES) of the draft OZP that relevant technical assessments, including noise impact assessment, SIA, drainage impact assessment, quantitative risk assessment and natural terrain hazard study, if considered necessary, would be incorporated into the lease at the land disposal stage. The technical assessments should be conducted to the satisfaction of relevant government departments; and
- (c) while she had no information on the carrying capacity of the public sewer in the area at hand, it was noted that no concern on such aspect had been raised by relevant government departments. The existing residential developments at Ma Wo Road were planned in the 1980's and the "Residential (Group B)" ("R(B)") zone was designated in 1986. Suitable infrastructure and supporting facilities including sewerage facilities had been constructed to facilitate the developments.

83. In response to the Chairperson's question, Mr C.F. Wong, AD(EA), EPD said that according to EPD's general practice in sewerage planning, whether there was insurmountable sewerage problem for a proposed development depended on the capacity

of the trunk sewer in the downstream. EPD would not raise objection if the trunk sewer had spare capacity to cater for additional sewerage discharge. Regarding the sewerage capacity near the development site, the future developer would be requested to conduct a SIA to assess if the existing sewerage facilities were sufficient and if mitigation measures such as small-scale upgrading works were required. In the subject case, if EPD had not advised that there would be insurmountable problem in the sewerage facilities, the issue could be handled through the submission of SIA and the implementation of the mitigation measures as identified in the SIA by the future developer to the satisfaction of EPD.

Traffic Impact

84. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) the existing public transport facilities at Ma Wo Road;
- (b) how the number of flats in the proposed residential development was derived and what the existing number of flats was at Ma Wo Road; and
- (c) the traffic improvement measures to be implemented at Ma Wo Road to cater for the additional needs of the proposed development.

85. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points:

- (a) the major public transport services at Ma Wo Road were residents' shuttle bus services provided by the Classical Gardens and the GMB No. 20S connecting the area with Tai Po Market Railway Station;
- (b) the maximum development intensity in terms of GFA for the Item D site was estimated based on the site area and the proposed PR. With the flat size assumption of 60m² per flat, the total number of about 1,200 flats for the Item D site was derived, which served as an input for the estimation of car parking spaces as well as traffic generation/attraction

to the area in the TIA. The TIA would evaluate if the proposed development would create insurmountable impacts on the local road network and recommend mitigation measures if necessary. The existing number of flats in Classical Gardens was about 1,520; and

- (c) the reports/executive summaries of technical assessments, including TIA, had been included in RNTPC Paper No. 5/17 on the proposed amendments for the approved Tai Po OZP No. S/TP/26, which had been made available for public inspection.

86. In response, Mr Henry K.N. Hui, SE/P&TP, TD, with the aid of the visualiser, said that according to the TIA conducted by the consultants, the proposed development would not generate insurmountable traffic impact on the surrounding area. The junction assessment revealed that the junctions along Ma Wo Road, Tat Wan Road and near Tai Po Market Railway Station would be operating with reserve capacities. Regarding the public transport services, it was proposed to enhance the existing or provide additional public transport services, such as GMB and franchised bus, to cater for the extra trips to be generated by the proposed development. The cul-de-sac at the end of Ma Wo Road and a section of Ma Wo Road would need to be expanded for manoeuvring of buses. A lay-by for public transport would also be provided.

87. The Chairperson and a Member raised the following questions to the representers/commenters and their representatives:

- (a) what transport facilities were used by the local residents in daily travel and the time with traffic congestion;
- (b) the time taken to walk from Ma Wo Road to Tai Po Market Railway Station; and
- (c) whether bus services at Ma Wo Road would be welcome by local residents.

88. In response, Ms Leung Yat Sze (R831), Mary said that while she had a private

car, it could not be used in weekends as there was serious traffic congestion problem near Tai Po Market and Railway Station. She mainly relied on residents' shuttle buses in her daily travel. However, the shuttle bus service would be delayed in peak hours due to the traffic congestion in Tai Po town centre or Tolo Highways. The additional population at Ma Wo Road would further aggravate the traffic problems in the area.

89. Mr Yeung Lap Man Kelvin (R1269) said that while there were a few hundred private cars owned by the local residents, they mainly used residents' shuttle buses for daily travel due to traffic congestion problem near Tai Po Market Railway Station. There were currently 4 residents' shuttle buses operating from 7:00am to 12:00pm for connection to Tai Po Market Railway Station. As the shuttle buses were usually full at 7:00am to 9:00am and afterschool until 8:00pm, the residents might not be able to get on board at the first bus arrived. If there was traffic congestion near the railway station, the shuttle bus service would be delayed. A long queue for shuttle bus would usually be expected at the railway station. The GMB No. 20S, which was operating from 6:00am to 10:00pm, was usually full and could not cater for the needs of the existing residents. The traffic condition at Ma Wo Road would also be affected by school buses. The TIA report stating that no severe traffic problem at Ma Wo Road was not reflecting the reality.

90. Regarding the walking time and the bus service, the attendants said that the walking time from Ma Wo Road to Tai Po Market Railway Station was about 20 minutes. The local residents would not welcome bus service at Ma Wo Road due to safety concern. Mr Tong Chung Kok David (R209) supplemented that as Ma Wo Road was a one-lane two-way road and the existing developments were located close to the road, the local residents were suffering from the noise nuisances from the existing traffic. The introduction of bus service would further aggravate the traffic noise problem.

91. Mr Leung Kam Chuen (R773) disagreed with TD's advice that the proposed residential development would not generate adverse traffic impact on the area. He questioned which department would be responsible for the adverse impacts generated by the proposed development in future.

92. Ms Liu Shu Man (representers' representative) said that CWCS had previously applied for additional 27 parking spaces but the application was rejected by the Board based on TD's advice that Ma Wo Road, which was a one-lane two-way road, was overloaded and could not cater for additional traffic demand. Assuming a car parking provision ratio of one space per flat, the proposed development would generate more than a thousand car parking spaces, which would exceed the carrying capacity of Ma Wo Road. She questioned if the traffic survey of the TIA had reflected the real situation and the technical issues could be addressed by the future developer after land sale.

93. In response to the Chairperson's question, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that TD's objection to CWCS's application for parking spaces were mainly based on the columbarium proposal. As there would be substantial traffic flow in the festival periods of spring and autumn, the proposed parking provision and crowd management measures might not be able to address the adverse impacts on Ma Wo Road. It should be noted that the nature of CWCS's application was different from the proposed residential development at the Item D site, and the traffic generation in terms of traffic flow and pattern would also be different.

94. Noting the traffic problems raised by the representers/commenters and their representatives, a Member asked (i) whether there was adequate space at Ma Wo Road for the implementation of traffic improvement measures to cater for additional traffic demand, and (ii) whether traffic congestion problem was encountered at Ma Wo Road or in Tai Po town centre. In response, Mr Henry K.N. Hui, SE/P&TP, TD said that according to the TIA, about 140-150 car parking spaces would be required for the provision of about 1,200 flats in the Item D site, and about 170 trips/hour would be generated and 59 trips/hour would be attracted in the morning peak hour (from 7:30am to 8:30am). Although Ma Wo Road was a one-lane two-way road, it had a width of 10m (5m for each traffic lane) and had spare capacity to cater for additional traffic flow arising from the proposed development and loading/unloading (L/UL) activities. To cater for the public transport needs of the additional population, the frequency of the GMB services would need to be increased and double-decked bus service (estimated up to 7 trips/hour) was proposed for connection to Tai Po Market Railway Station. Mr Hui said that the demand for L/UL activities in Tai Po Market Railway Station was high. Regarding traffic congestion

problem in Tai Po Market Railway Station, it was probably caused by illegal parking at the L/UL areas that obstructed the residents' shuttle buses to pick up/drop off. The problem would be addressed by strengthening the enforcement actions against illegal parking and providing additional L/UL areas near the railway station. Besides, the traffic accidents in Tolo Highway might also cause traffic congestion problem in Tai Po due to tailed back of traffic.

Air Ventilation and Sunlight Penetration

95. In response to a Member's question on how to avoid wall effect in the future development, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, said that the requirements under SBDG such as building separation, would be incorporated into the lease where necessary. She stated that the proposed development at the Item D site would not have adverse air ventilation impacts to the existing developments according to the AVA. Regarding sunlight penetration to the existing developments, there was some distance between the Item D site and the existing developments.

Slope Works/Safety

96. Some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether there was record of landslip in the area;
- (b) whether there was safety concern for the proposed residential development at a sloping site; and
- (c) given the site was located on a slope, whether the future site formation works would be extended outside the site boundary and cause adverse impacts on the adjacent "GB" area.

97. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of some PowerPoint slides:

- (a) she had no information on landslip record at hand;
- (b) the site was located on a slope with site level ranging from 40-90mPD. The Geotechnical Engineering Office of Civil Engineering and Development Department (GEO, CEDD) had not raised any concern on the technical feasibility for the construction of residential development. Natural terrain hazard study might need to be conducted by the future developer for the approval of GEO, CEDD; and
- (c) while the Item D site had a gross site area of 2.28ha, a discounting factor of 0.8 had been applied for the estimation of development intensity, which should have provided enough buffering area for the slope works within the site. No concern had been raised by GEO, CEDD regarding the possible encroachment onto the adjacent “GB” area due to site formation works at the Item D site.

Others

98. The Chairperson and some Members raised the following questions to the government representatives:

- (a) whether environmental impact assessment (EIA) under the EIA Ordinance was required for the proposed development at the site;
- (b) whether noise impact assessment (NIA) was required as the site was located in close proximity to Tolo Highway;
- (c) how the graves would be cleared to facilitate the proposed development;
- (d) would the site be more suitable for elderly home and whether such facilities could be provided within “R(B)10” zone; and
- (e) the feasibility of residential development at To Yuen Tung.

99. In response, Ms Jessica H.F. Chu, DPO/STN, made the following main points with the aid of the visualizer:

- (a) no EIA under the EIA Ordinance was required for the proposed development at the site;
- (b) a NIA might need to be conducted by the future developer. The noise nuisances at Tolo Highway could be addressed by appropriate building disposition and design;
- (c) if the affected graves would need to be cleared for development, the Government would follow the established procedures including posting notices, liaising with the descendants for the relocation arrangements and issuing ex-gratia allowance to eligible grave/urn's claimants. Approval from the Home Affairs Department was also required for the clearance of graves;
- (d) the development proposal had been circulated for departmental comments and no request from Social Welfare Department regarding elderly care facilities had been received. Notwithstanding, 'Social Welfare Facility' was a column 2 use within the "R(B)10" zone which might be permitted upon application to the Board. There were currently a number of public and private elderly care facilities located in different areas in Tai Po district; and
- (e) To Yuen Tung had been identified for public housing development and the development proposal had been made known to Tai Po District Council (TPDC). The technical feasibility of the proposed development was subject to study and TPDC would be consulted in due course.

[Ms Lilian S.K. Law and Dr C.H. Hau returned to join this session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

[Mr Stephen L.H. Liu, Dr Lawrence K.C. Li, Dr F.C. Chan and Mr Stephen H.B. Yau left this

session of the meeting during the Q&A session.]

100. As Members did not have any further questions, the Chairperson said that the Q&A session was completed. She thanked the government representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives for attending the meeting. The Board would deliberate the representations/comments in closed meeting and would inform the representers/commenters of the Board's decision in due course. The government representatives as well as the representers/commenters and their representatives left the meeting at this point.

Deliberation Session

Group 1

Amendment Item C

BH and GIC Facilities

101. Some Members considered that the proposed relaxation of BH restriction from 3 storeys to 8 storeys at the Item C site was compatible with the surrounding environment and would not cause adverse air ventilation impacts on the surrounding area. A Member said that as the relaxation of BH restriction was proposed based on the needs of relevant government departments to provide a clinic building to meet the shortfall of services in the district, it was reasonable and acceptable.

102. Noting the concern of some representers' that the increase in BH at the Item C site might affect the air ventilation in the area, a Member said that the issue could be addressed at the detailed design stage. Another Member said that the concern of some representers on air ventilation was more a general issue rather than specific on the Item C site.

103. Members generally agreed that the BH restriction of the Item C site should be revised from 3 storeys to 8 storeys to optimize the use of limited land resources and to meet the accommodation requirements of the proposed clinic. The proposed BH of 8

storeys was compatible with the surrounding BH profile and would not cause adverse air ventilation and visual impacts as demonstrated by relevant technical assessments.

104. With respect to other GIC facilities as requested by some representers/commenters, a Member asked if the amendment to relax the BH restriction could be subject to the condition of provision of certain GIC facilities. Mr Raymond K.W. Lee, Director of Planning said that such a condition for provision of certain specific GIC facilities might involve further amendment to the draft OZP. As the “G/IC” zoning provided some flexibility with the types of facilities to be provided, if the Board had any views or comments regarding the implementation of a project, they could be passed to relevant government departments for consideration.

105. Members noted that the OZP was mainly to provide a framework to guide and control the development and use of land and the “G/IC” zoning had provided flexibility for the provision of different types of GIC facilities to serve the needs of the local residents and/or a wider district. While development restrictions could be imposed on a particular zoning, there was a need to strike a balance between development control and providing flexibility. The proposed relaxation of BH restriction at the Item C site was mainly to meet the requirement of relevant government department for the clinic development serving the district needs. While the site could not address all of the shortage in GIC facilities, in the event that there was still available floor area to accommodate other uses, the project proponent would consult relevant departments with a view to accommodating other suitable and compatible facilities at the detailed design stage. The TPDC would also be timely consulted as the proposed development at the Item C site proceeded.

Traffic Impact

106. Noting the concern of some representers/commenters that the increase in BH at the Item C site would cause adverse traffic impacts and the request for more car parking spaces in the area, a Member asked if the future project proponent would be required to provide a basement car park at the site.

107. Mr Ricky W.K. Ho, Chief Traffic Engineer (New Territories East), TD, said that according to TD’s preliminary assessment, the proposed increase in BH at the Item C

site would not cause insurmountable traffic problems in the area as the trips generated by the proposed development were relatively insignificant as compared with the baseline traffic volume. However, a Traffic Review would be carried out by the project proponent on the operation and management measures of the proposed development, as well as the demand for public car parking spaces so as to address the traffic issues on the surrounding area. If sufficient car parking spaces and L/UL facilities were provided at the site, it could help address the L/UL problem on street.

108. The Vice-Chairperson and some Members agreed that the proposed relaxation of BH restriction at the Item C site would not create significant traffic problem in the area.

109. The Chairperson said that due to the high demand for public car parking spaces, the provision of public car park in the basement of government buildings would be explored as far as possible for new GIC facilities. Members' views could be passed to relevant government department for consideration.

110. Some Members opined that the provision of public car park might not necessarily be helpful in resolving the traffic problems as it might attract more vehicle trips to the area. The traffic demand should better be addressed by the provision of sufficient public transport services in particular for GIC uses. Notwithstanding, sufficient car parking spaces and L/UL facilities should be provided for users of the clinic building.

111. Mr Ricky W.K. Ho said that according to the transport policy, public transport was still the backbone of transportation in Hong Kong. The provision of public car park near Tai Po Centre would be reviewed by a holistic approach. TD was undertaking studies to improve accessibility of pedestrians and promote a walkable city in Hong Kong.

112. The Meeting noted that the future project proponent would conduct a Traffic Review to address the traffic implications of the proposed development on the surrounding area. The existing traffic problems in the area such as illegal parking and L/UL activities could be addressed with proper traffic management measures and enforcement actions. The Vice-Chairperson said that the provision of public car parking places could also be explored under the Traffic Review for this site.

113. Members generally considered that the major grounds of the representations and comments had been addressed by the departmental responses as detailed in the TPB Paper No. 10402 and the presentations and responses made by the government representatives at the meeting.

114. After further deliberation, the Board noted the supportive views of representations No. R1(part), R1270(part) and R1271(part), and other views of representations No. R1(part) and R2(part), and agreed to advise them as follows:

- “(a) the Tai Po District Council will be timely consulted by the project proponent on provision of necessary Government, Institution or Community facilities as the proposed development at the Amendment Item C site proceeds; and
- (b) the statutory and administrative procedures in consulting the public on the zoning amendments have been duly followed. The exhibition of the Outline Zoning Plan for public inspection and the provisions for submission of representations and comments also form part of the statutory consultation process under the Town Planning Ordinance.”

115. The Board also decided not to uphold the remaining part of Representations No. R1270 and R1271 and representations No. R1272 to R1304 and that the Plan should not be amended to meet the representations on Amendment Item C for the following reasons:

“Amendment Item C

- (a) the Amendment Item C site has been zoned “Government, Institution or Community” and reserved for the proposed clinic building with a view to meeting the district needs. The proposed relaxation of building height (BH) restriction from 3 storeys to 8 storeys is compatible with the surrounding BH profile and considered appropriate to optimize the use of the site and to meet the accommodation requirements without causing

adverse air ventilation and visual impacts as demonstrated in the relevant technical assessments (R1270 to R1304);

- (b) the relaxation of BH restriction allows more flexibility to accommodate the needed GIC facilities (R1271, R1300 and R1301); and
- (c) like all Government projects, the project proponent would be required to carry out Traffic Review and Preliminary Environmental Review to address any traffic and environmental implications of the proposed development. Public order is subject to the control under the Public Order Ordinance and appropriate infection control measures will be taken for the proposed clinic building (R1270 to R1274, R1277 to R1285, R1287 to R1300 and R1302 to R1304).”

Group 2

Amendment Items A,B and D

116. Noting some Members’ request for more background information regarding CWCS’s previous applications for reference and more time would be required for discussion while it was already 7:30p.m. at this juncture, Members agreed that the deliberation on Group 2 representations with respect to Amendment Items A, B and D should be adjourned to another day to facilitate a more thorough discussion.

[The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.]