

(Translation)

Islands District Council
Minutes of Meeting of
District Infrastructure and Development Planning Committee

Date : 30 April 2024 (Tuesday)
Time : 2:30 p.m.
Venue : Islands District Council Conference Room,
14/F, Harbour Building, 38 Pier Road, Central, Hong Kong

Present

Vice-Chairman

Mr CHOW Yuen-kuk, Jonathan

Members

Mr NG Man-kit
Mr HO Siu-kei
Mr NG Choi-wah
Mr HO Chun-fai
Mr YU Hon-kwan, MH, JP
Ms KWOK Wai-man, Mealoha
Mr HUI Chun-lung, MH
Mr WONG Man-hon, MH
Ms WONG Chau-ping
Mr WONG Hon-kuen, Ken
Mr YIP Pui-kei
Mr LAU Chin-pang
Ms LAU Suk-han
Ms LAU Shun-ting

Attendance by Invitation

Mr TANG King-yan, Sunny	Senior Town Planner/Islands 1, Planning Department
Ms LIU Mei-fong, Kennie	Town Planner/Islands 3, Planning Department

In Attendance

Mr MOK Mong-chan	Assistant District Officer (Islands)1, Islands District Office
Mr LAM Wai-chuen, Eddie	Senior Engineer/17 (Lantau), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr KWONG Wang-ngai, Walter	District Planning Officer/Sai Kung & Islands, Planning Department
Ms WONG Shuk-man, Suman	Engineer/Lantau Development, Transport Department

Secretary

Mr LEE Cher-hin, Vincent

Executive Officer I (District Council),
Islands District Office

Absent with Apology

Mr CHOW Yuk-tong, SBS, MH

~~~~~

**Welcoming remarks**

The Vice-Chairman welcomed Members and representatives of the government departments to the meeting, and introduced Mr MOK Mong-chan, Assistant District Officer (Islands)<sup>1</sup> of the Islands District Office, who succeeded Mr LI Ho, Thomas.

I. Confirmation of the Minutes of Meeting held on 28 February 2024

2. The Vice-Chairman said that the captioned minutes had incorporated the amendments proposed by the government departments and Members and had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting. Members had no other amendment proposals and the minutes were confirmed unanimously.

II. Amendments Incorporated into the Draft Discovery Bay Outline Zoning Plan No. S/I-DB/5

(DIDPC Paper No. 4/2024)

3. The Vice-Chairman drew the meeting's attention to the DIDPC Paper No. 4/2024.

4. Ms Kennie LIU briefly presented the paper with the aid of PowerPoint presentation.

5. Members expressed their views as follows:

(a) Members were concerned whether the captioned amendments would affect the environment of Discovery Bay and increase the traffic burden in the area. Members also enquired whether the new clubhouse would be open to the general public or restricted to specific persons.

(b) Members were concerned whether the relocation of the kaito pier to a waterfront area would affect the operation of the ferry and increase the

walking distance for residents. Members said that the Planning Department (PlanD) had to ensure the captioned amendments would not affect the traffic to and from Peng Chau, and suggested that the Department should provide transport options to and from the kaito pier at the bus terminus, such as the provision of shuttle bus services by the developer.

- (c) Members enquired about the reasons for constructing the helipad through reclamation when other land options were available.

6. The Vice-Chairman said that the Town Planning Board (TPB) had rejected a land development application from Hong Kong Resort Company Limited (HKR) in 2017 on the ground that Discovery Bay was a low-density residential area which could only accommodate a population of about 25 000. He enquired whether the captioned amendments, which included the construction of five 18-storey residential blocks, would deviate from the original development concept of Discovery Bay as a low-density residential area.

7. Mr Walter KWONG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The captioned amendments arose from two projects which had been approved by the TPB upon application by the HKR. The PlanD revised the outline zoning plan (OZP) to take account of the permitted development and submitted it to the Committee for Members' comments. The main purpose of formulating the OZPs was to put development and redevelopment plans in the districts under statutory planning control.
- (b) The developer said that the proposal to relocate the kaito pier had been preliminarily agreed by the kaito operating company. Although the new pier would be moved to a new waterfront area, it was estimated that the additional walking time would only be about two minutes.
- (c) The developer planned to carry out the reclamation works by erecting platforms at the water surface, which would be more effective in minimising the impact on water quality than the conventional reclamation method that required dredging. Before carrying out the reclamation works, the developer would be required to submit an environmental impact assessment (EIA) report based on the advice of the Environmental Protection Department to confirm that the marine ecology and water quality, etc. would not be affected by the reclamation works.
- (d) The community facilities, shopping malls and transport facilities, etc. in Discovery Bay would be developed by the developer, while the ferry and bus services in the area would be regulated by the relevant departments.

- (e) The developer had completed studies such as the EIA and the traffic impact assessment (TIA). It was stated in the reports that the development would not cause any significant impact on the environment and traffic in the area, and the capacity of the relevant infrastructures and the environmental capacity were acceptable. The current planned population of Discovery Bay was 25 000. Upon completion of the two new residential developments, the population in the area would increase by about 3 000, representing an increase of about 10%. Since Discovery Bay was a private development, the Department believed that the developer would enhance the transport and relevant community facilities in response to the population growth in the area. In conclusion, the overall planning intention for Discovery Bay remained to be a low-density residential development and to retain the character of a car-free development.

8. Members expressed their views as follows:

- (a) Members suggested that when charging land premium for the captioned amendments, the Lands Department (LandsD) should consider requiring the developer to make a provision for the improvement of the ferry and feeder bus services, such as offering concessionary kaito/ferry or feeder bus fares to Peng Chau residents. The provision could also be used to subsidise the expensive ferry fares for Discovery Bay residents travelling to and from the urban area, thereby stabilising the fares.
- (b) Members suggested that after the relocation of the kaito pier, a cover should be provided for the pedestrian walkway between the new pier and the bus terminus to protect residents from sun and rain.
- (c) With the increase in population, the transport facilities in Discovery Bay should be improved accordingly, especially the provision of sufficient feeder bus services for residents in need. The relevant departments should consider whether the transport facilities in the area were sufficient.

9. The Vice-Chairman expressed his views as follows:

- (a) Due to manpower shortage and insufficient bus captains, the current bus services in Discovery Bay could only be maintained at an acceptable level. He queried the credibility of the TIA report submitted by the developer and hoped that the PlanD would pay attention to whether the existing transport facilities could cope with the population growth in the area.
- (b) In negotiating with the developer, the Department could fight for

reasonable community facilities for the residents, such as requesting the developer to open up the proposed sports and recreational clubhouse for use by the general public.

- (c) Discovery Bay Transportation Services Limited was applying to the Transport Department (TD) for a fare adjustment for its licensed ferry services, requesting a 60% fare increase for ferry routes travelling to and from the urban area. The said ferry company was a subsidiary of the HKR. He enquired how the Department would perform its gate-keeping role in respect of the developer's fare increase application.

10. Mr Walter KWONG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The developer did not give a detailed account of the mode of operation of the sports and recreational clubhouse, but it was believed that the clubhouse would continue to be operated on a private basis.
- (b) Regarding the location of the proposed sports and recreational clubhouse in the OZP, the developer had explained that part of the existing clubhouse site on the hill had not been developed, and due to the topography of the area, the extension of the clubhouse on the hill was not ideal for daily operation. Therefore, in the amendments, a piece of coastal land owned by the same developer was rezoned for clubhouse use, while the clubhouse site on the hill was rezoned for residential development, with the two pieces of land being basically the same size.
- (c) Regardless of whether the development was on reclaimed land or on existing land, if it was not in compliance with the land lease, the developer would have to amend it and pay the land premium to the Government. At present, there was no established mechanism for the Government to subsidise the improvement of ferry and feeder bus services through land premium. The Department believed that the TD would continue to monitor the ferry and bus fares in Discovery Bay through an effective mechanism.
- (d) The Department would convey Members' views to the developer, including the ways to beautify the harbourfront environment and the provision of a cover for the pedestrian walkway between the new kaito pier and the bus terminus.
- (e) If the construction works would affect the existing facilities, such as the operation of the kaito pier, the developer would be required to discuss with the relevant departments and submit a solution when implementing the development.

11. Members expressed their views as follows:

- (a) Members suggested that the Department should include ancillary conditions in the premium clauses, including requiring the developer to provide shading facilities and consider relocating the kaito pier to a nearer location.
- (b) Members were concerned whether the captioned amendments would affect the Nim Shue Wan Village, in particular whether the villagers' daily access would be affected when the reclamation works were carried out; and whether the Department could include in the lease conditions a solution to the problem of potable water supply for the Nim Shue Wan villagers.

12. Mr Walter KWONG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) In general, the Department would first refer Members' views to the developer so that the developer could enhance and improve the development project. In addition, the Department would continue to perform its gate-keeping role in accordance with the relevant mechanism, and would consider incorporating the relevant requirements into the lease conditions if necessary. In the process of drawing up the lease conditions, the LandsD would consult various departments and consider whether their requirements should be incorporated into the lease conditions.
- (b) The captioned amendments would not affect Nim Shue Wan Village. The developer's development proposal was still at the preliminary planning stage. When the project formally commenced, the relevant departments would ensure that the works would not affect the neighbouring villagers in accordance with the control mechanism and through vetting and approving the detailed development plan submitted by the developer.

13. The Vice-Chairman said that the new-term District Council (DC) would have to ensure effective communication between the Government and the people. The PlanD had responded to Members' enquiries one by one and would actively convey Members' views to the developer. The Department would also perform its gate-keeping role under the relevant mechanism. In addition, Members could organise residents' meetings to listen to and collect public views on issues relating to the Discovery Bay community.

III. Question on the construction of a government office building in Tung Chung  
(DIDPC Paper No. 5/2024)

IV. Question on the provision of a municipal complex in Tung Chung  
(DIDPC Paper No. 6/2024)

14. The Vice-Chairman welcomed the guests to the meeting to respond to the questions. The written replies of the Government Property Agency, the PlanD, the Immigration Department, the TD and the Labour Department had been distributed to Members for perusal prior to the meeting.

15. Mr YIP Pui-kei and Mr LAU Chin-pang briefly presented the questions.

16. Mr Walter KWONG said that the PlanD had reserved land in Tung Chung New Town for the construction of schools and sports grounds, etc., and the relevant departments had also reserved areas for the future public housing developments for the provision of community facilities such as kindergartens. The government departments could also rent private premises or purchase flats from private developers for the provision of community facilities as necessary. The proposed development between Fu Tung Estate in Tung Chung Area 6 and the MTR Tung Chung Station would also reserve floor space for the provision of a market. A market had also been planned in the public housing development in Area 133 near the MTR Tung Chung East Station. Although a government office building might not be constructed in Tung Chung in the future, the Department believed that various departments would provide community services to residents at different locations in Tung Chung.

17. Members expressed their views as follows:

- (a) The works project in Tung Chung Area 6 would affect the traffic in the vicinity during the construction period. The Department should explore ways to minimise the impact of the project on the traffic in the vicinity before the railway network was extended to Area 6.
- (b) As a newly developed town, Tung Chung should have sufficient conditions and development justifications for the construction of a government office building/municipal complex. Being the centre of the entire Tung Chung New Town, Tung Chung Area 1 was considered by many residents as an ideal location for a government office building/municipal complex. The DC was also willing to assist in facilitating the project. Citing the Sai Kung Tseung Kwan O Government Complex as an example, Members suggested that the departments should give favourable consideration to the actual situation of the district and the residents' demand for various public services, so as to cope with the service demand arising from the anticipated population growth in the district. Some Members also pointed out that the setting up of departmental offices in Tung Chung would not only facilitate visits by the public, but also enable the departments to have a closer understanding of the life of residents, thereby enhancing the efficiency of policy implementation.
- (c) A 30-storey commercial building would be constructed in Tung Chung Area 6, of which two floors would be used for the provision of a

municipal market. Some Members considered that the gross floor area of two floors was insufficient for the provision of various public services, while others opined that since some government departments had to rent or purchase premises from private owners to set up offices, the PlanD could properly plan and reserve land for the construction of government properties.

18. Mr Walter KWONG said that according to the OZP, Tung Chung Area 1 was zoned “Government, Institution or Community” for the development of a variety of community facilities. According to the current planning, Tung Chung Area 1 was reserved for the construction of cultural and entertainment facilities, which would be taken forward by the Leisure and Cultural Services Department. If there was spare space in taking forward the project, the relevant department would consult other government departments on whether they were interested in joint development under the “single site, multiple use” model, so as to optimise the use of land resources.

V. Annual District Plan – 2024-2025 - Planning  
(DIDPC Paper No. 3/2024)

19. Mr Walter KWONG briefly presented the paper.

20. Members expressed their views as follows:

- (a) Residents had yet to understand the project details of the “Initiatives for South Lantau Eco-recreation Corridor – Investigation” and hoped that the Department would enhance communication.
- (b) Members suggested widening and enhancing the road surface from South Lantau Road to Keung Shan Road and improving the bends of the relevant road section to facilitate tourism development in South Lantau.

21. Mr Walter KWONG said that items (iii), (v) and (vi) in part (III) of the paper, namely “Initiatives for South Lantau Eco-recreation Corridor – Investigation”, “Feasibility Study on Road Network Enhancement to South Lantau” and “Improvement to South Lantau Road (between Cheung Sha and Mui Wo) and Tai O Road – Investigation, Design and Construction” were projects taken forward by the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD). The role of the PlanD was to assist the CEDD in taking forward the projects and to provide planning advice. It was believed that the CEDD would consult the villagers, residents and the DC before taking forward the projects.

22. Mr Eddie LAM said that he would convey Members’ views to the relevant sections for follow-up.

23. Members expressed their views as follows:



- (a) It was hoped that the PlanD would liaise and communicate more with the DC.
- (b) Regarding the item “Processing of development proposals in Islands District” in part (II), Members asked the Department to explain how it would handle Members’ views on the development of the Islands District.
- (c) Members would continue to actively reflect views of the community to the Department to tie in with its work plan for this year, and hoped that the Department would take forward the projects as scheduled.
- (d) Members suggested that the Department should inspect South Lantau Road together with other departments.

24. The Vice-Chairman said that he would review with the Secretariat and the relevant departments after the meeting the need to arrange site visits.

(Post-meeting note: The TD and the Highways Department (HyD) conducted a site visit to South Lantau Road and Keung Shan Road on 27 March 2024 together with Members. The Vice-Chairman and Members noted the arrangement after the meeting and agreed that there was no need to re-arrange the visit.)

25. Mr Walter KWONG made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) The PlanD would consult the DC on district planning in a timely manner.
- (b) Taking today’s agenda item on Discovery Bay as an example, the PlanD was mainly responsible for matters relating to land use planning, while other infrastructural developments were handled by the relevant departments, such as the HyD or the CEDD, which were responsible for road construction and management. The Department would consult the relevant departments in handling development projects to ensure that the development would not adversely affect the traffic and other infrastructures.

## VI. Date of Next Meeting

26. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:24 p.m. The next meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 25 June 2024.

-END -