

**Minutes of the 10<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the  
District Development and Housing Committee (DDHC)  
Southern District Council (2016-2019) (SDC)**

Date : 31 July 2017  
Time : 2:30 p.m.  
Venue : SDC Conference Room

**Present:**

Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP (Chairman of SDC)  
Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH (Vice-Chairman of SDC)  
Mr LAM Kai-fai, MH (Chairman of DDHC)  
Dr MAK TSE How-ling, Ada, MH (Vice-Chairlady of DDHC)  
Mr AU Lap-sing, MH  
Mr AU Nok-hin  
Mr CHAI Man-hon  
Ms CHAN Judy Kapui  
Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying  
Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH  
Mr CHU Lap-wai  
Mr FUNG Se-goun, Fergus  
Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH  
Mr LO Kin-hei  
Mr TSUI Yuen-wa  
Ms YAM Pauline  
Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN  
Mr LAW Kam-hung  
Mr NG Hoi-shing  
Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette  
Dr WONG Yat-lung, Philip

**Secretary:**

Miss CHAN Wai-ting, Queenie Executive Officer (District Council) 2,  
Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department

**In Attendance:**

Mr CHOW Chor-tim, JP	District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Miss YIP Ho-ka, Karen	Assistant District Officer (Southern), Home Affairs Department
Ms YIP Wai-see, Priscilla	Senior Executive Officer (District Council), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr CHAN Ip-to, Tony	Senior Executive Officer (District Management), Southern District Office, Home Affairs Department
Mr LING Chi-wai	Senior Engineer 10 (Hong Kong Island Division 2), Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr CHAN Tsz-kim, Joe	Housing Manager / Hong Kong Island & Islands 7, Housing Department
Ms LAU Sin-ying, Sin	Deputy District Leisure Manager (Southern) 1, Leisure and Cultural Services Department
Ms KO Wing-yee, Amii	Senior Estate Surveyor / South (District Lands Office, Hong Kong West and South), Lands Department
Miss LEE Kit-tak, Jessica	Senior Town Planner / HK 1, Planning Department

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 2):**

Mr KAU Kin-hong, Louis	District Planning Officer (Hong Kong), Planning Department
Mr TSE Pui-keung, Derek	Senior Town Planner / Hong Kong 5, Planning Department
Ms YIU Kuk-hung, Portia	Chief Planning Officer 2, Housing Department
Mr CHAN King-kong, Theron	Senior Planning Officer 7, Housing Department
Mr LEUNG Bing-man, Joe	Senior Civil Engineer 2 Housing Department
Mr CHUNG Kam-choi, Antony	Acting Senior Architect 5 Housing Department
Mr LO Shun-cheong	Senior Landscape Architect 2 Housing Department
Mr CHAN Veng-sang	Engineer / 3 (Special Duties (Works)) Civil Engineering and Development Department
Mr TONG Cheung	Engineer / 4 (Special Duties (Works)),

Ms LAU Wai-yee, Carrie	Civil Engineering and Development Department Acting Senior Engineer / Southern & Peak, Transport Department
Mr CHAN Siu-yuen	Senior Project Manager, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Dr Kin LO	Associate Director, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr Brad FONG	Senior Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Ms Kristin LAI	Engineer, Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited
Mr Goeff CAREY	Director, AEC Limited

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 3):**

Mr MOK Wai-chi	Assistant Divisional Officer (Building Improvement), Fire Services Department
Mr NG Ka-lok	Senior Station Officer (Building Improvement)1, Fire Services Department

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 4):**

Mr Arthur WONG	Project Development Director, Ocean Park Corporation
Ms Helen LAI	Assistant Project Manager, Ocean Park Corporation
Ms Una LAU	Public Affairs Director, Ocean Park Corporation
Ms Karen SUEN	Senior Project Manager, Parkland (Hong Kong) Limited
Mr Albert POON	Project Manager, Parkland (Hong Kong) Limited

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 5):**

Mr TAI Tak-chung	Senior E&M Engineer, Drainage Services Department
Mr CHAN King-lok	E&M Engineer, Drainage Services Department
Ms LAU Wai-yee, Carrie	Acting Senior Engineer / Southern & Peak,

Transport Department

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 6):**

Mr KU Chung-ye	Property Service Manager / S(HKI) 1, Housing Department
Ms LAU Wai-ye, Carrie	Acting Senior Engineer / Southern & Peak, Transport Department

**Attending by Invitation (Agenda Item 7):**

Mr KUNG Ho-yuen	Chief Health Inspector 1, Food and Environmental Hygiene Department
Mr LAU Wai-cheung	Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing / Pest Control), Food and Environmental Hygiene Department

**Opening Remarks:**

The Chairman welcomed Members and government representatives to the meeting.

2. The Chairman said that to facilitate smooth proceeding of meeting, all persons attending or sitting in the meeting should switch off all devices which might emit sound, and should not use any telecommunications devices for conversation during the course of the meeting according to Order 15(3) of the SDC Standing Orders. Each Member would be allotted a maximum of two 3-minute slots to speak in respect of each agenda item.

**Part I – Items Discussed**

**Agenda Item 1: Confirmation of the Draft Minutes of the 9<sup>th</sup> DDHC Meeting Held on 29 May 2017**

---

3. The Chairman said that prior to the meeting, the draft minutes of the aforesaid meeting had been circulated to all Members and relevant government department representatives. The Secretariat had not received any amendment proposals so far.

4. The minutes were confirmed by the Committee.

**Agenda Item 2: Proposed Public Housing Developments in Pokfulam South**

---

**(Item raised by the Housing Department)**

**(Include agenda item on “Proposed Amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/15” raised by the Planning Department and the motion debate moved by Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP)**

**(DDHC Paper No. 12/2017)**

---

(Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Mr CHU Lap-wai, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Mr LO Kin-hei and Ms YAM Pauline joined the meeting at 2:32 p.m., 2:33 p.m., 2:39 p.m., 2:55 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. respectively.)

(Ms YAM Pauline and Mr NG Hoi-shing left the meeting at 5 :36 p.m. and 5 :43 p.m. respectively.)

5. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives to the meeting:

Housing Department (HD)

- (a) Ms Portia YIU, Chief Planning Officer 2;
- (b) Mr Theron CHAN, Senior Planning Officer 7;
- (c) Mr Joe LEUNG, Senior Civil Engineer 2;
- (d) Mr Antony CHUNG, Acting Senior Architect 5;
- (e) Mr LO Shun Cheong, Senior Landscape Architect 2;

Planning Department (PlanD)

- (f) Mr Louis KAU, District Planning Officer / Hong Kong;
- (g) Mr Derek TSE, Senior Town Planner / Hong Kong 5;

Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD)

- (h) Mr CHAN Veng-sang, Engineer / 3 (Special Duties (Works));
- (i) Mr TONG Cheung, Engineer / 4 (Special Duties (Works));

Transport Department (TD)

- (j) Ms Carrie LAU, Acting Senior Engineer / Southern & Peak;

Ove Arup & Partners Hong Kong Limited

- (k) Mr CHAN Siu-yuen, Senior Project Manager;
- (l) Mr Kin LO, Associate Director;

- (m) Mr Brad FONG, Senior Engineer;

(n) Ms Kristin LAI, Engineer; and

ACE Limited

(o) Mr Goeff CAREY, Director.

Enquiries on Rules of Order

6. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP said that the Proposed Public Housing Developments in Pokfulam South (the proposed developments) was an important agenda. He was not satisfied that Ms FUNG Yin-suen, Ada, Deputy Director (Development & Construction) of the HD had been absent from the previous local consultation meetings and this meeting, and considered the department not showing respect to the SDC.

7. Mr CHAI Man-hon said that according to the Southern District Council Standing Orders, the SDC Chairman could arrange to have the related agenda put up at the Council meeting for discussion.

8. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP responded that HD did not ask to give a briefing of the proposed developments at the Council meeting.

9. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN believed that the departmental representatives present at the meeting were very familiar with the proposed developments. He trusted that they were capable of giving professional advice and response to the questions.

10. Ms Portia YIU responded that Ms Ada FUNG attached great importance to the proposed developments. Of the four rounds of local consultation held by HD in 2016 and 2017, Ms Ada FUNG was present at all meetings to exchange and listen to the views of the Legislative Council (LegCo) Members concerned, SDC Members and the local communities. Furthermore, the representatives from the Government at this meeting had a good understanding of the proposed developments, thus they could also brief Members on the proposal, exchange and listen to the views on behalf of the respective departments.

11. The Chairman said that this was a big issue. While he appreciated that HD and PlanD had assigned a lot of representatives to attend the meeting, Ms Ada FUNG who had been tasked to oversee the project still needed to attend this

meeting and listen to the SDC's views in order to show respect for the SDC. In his opinion, therefore, it was reasonable for Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP to consider that Ms FUNG should attend this meeting. He also regretted that Ms FUNG was absent from this meeting. He hoped that she would show respect for the SDC in future and listen to Members' views seriously. The Chairman asked the representatives of HD to convey the above opinions accordingly. Furthermore, the proposed developments were a housing issue, which fell within DDHC's terms of reference. Hence, it was a reasonable arrangement to discuss the agenda at DDHC meeting. The discussion would include the agenda raised by HD and PlanD, the motion moved by Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP as well as the amendment to motion proposed by Mr AU Lap-sing, MH. Since the above agenda, original motion and amendment to motion were under the same subject, the Chairman suggested that all these items be combined for discussion.

12. Members agreed with the suggested arrangement.

13. The Chairman first read out the motions:

(a) "Original Motion":

(Proposed by Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP and seconded by Ms TAM May-bo.)

"This Committee objects to the persistence of the Housing Department in ignoring the views of the affected residents, and further objects to a redevelopment plan of Wah Fu that is not supported by the commissioning of MTR service, including the route of the service, the location of the station and the commissioning timetable."

(b) "Amendment to Motion":

(Proposed by Mr AU Lap-sing, MH and seconded by Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH.)

"This Committee supports the Government's proposal for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate, but the Government should also properly address all different views of the affected residents and commence the detailed planning work for South Island Line (West) immediately."

14. The Chairman invited the departmental representatives to introduce the agenda item.

15. Ms Portia YIU, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference

Information 1), introduced the refined development proposal, the proposed development principles, development parameters, preliminary programme of the proposal, as well as the considerations relevant to Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment. Details were provided at Annex I to DDHC Paper No. 12/2017.

16. Mr CHAN Siu-yuen, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Information 2), introduced the findings of the technical assessments and the impact assessments of the proposed developments. Details were provided at Appendix 1 to the DDHC Paper No. 12/2017.

17. Mr Louis KAU said that PlanD had proposed amendments to the Approved Pok Fu Lam Outline Zoning Plan No. S/H10/15 (the OZP) with respect to the above proposed developments accordingly. Mr Derek TSE continued, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Information 3), to introduce the proposed amendments to the OZP. Details of the proposed amendments were at Annex II to the DDHC Paper No. 12/2017.

18. Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP briefed Members on the original motion. Details were summarised as follows:

- (a) HD introduced the latest development proposal to the public via Information Leaflet Issue No. 4 on 19 May 2017. Without delay, he joined Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yea of the LegCo and Pokfulam Chi Fu Fa Yuen Alliance together to raise their opinions and suggestions with HD on 24 May 2017; and a letter was also issued to the then CE-elect Mrs Carrie LAM CHENG Yuet-ngor on 29 May 2017 to put forward the views;
- (b) He did not object to the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and HD's consultation with the SDC was also welcomed. However, he was not satisfied that HD had presented the same development proposal to the SDC for consultation purpose without responding to public opinions and suggestions. This showed that HD had disregarded the public views;
- (c) He maintained that the department should respond to the public opinions and suggestions first and collect the views from this meeting for refining the proposal, which should then be put up for consultation with the Committee at its 11<sup>th</sup> meeting on 25 September 2017. As such, the



Committee needed not to rush to make a resolution on the proposed developments at this meeting; and

- (d) He gave examples of certain drawbacks of the proposed developments, including (1) from the town planning viewpoint, rezoning of Kai Lung Wan into South and North development was not desirable because Kai Lung Wan South was far away from the development centre. It would be difficult for the future residents to buy even their daily necessities; (2) it was of no material use to carry out road improvement works at the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road. Even if the junction was widened, it was not possible to make Pok Fu Lam Road wider, thus ended up causing traffic jam backwards to the bottleneck of Pok Fu Lam Road; and (3) MTR Corporation Limited told the meeting of the SDC on 17 November 2016 that the three railway projects to be taken forward did not include South Island Line (West) (SIL(W)), indicating that the construction of SIL(W) would turn out to be an empty promise. There had not been any specific measures to alleviate the traffic flow arising from the proposed developments.

19. Mr AU Lap-sing, MH briefed Members on the original motion. Details were summarised as follows:

- (a) The redevelopment project of Wah Fu Estate had been postponed many times. He was worried that if implementation of the proposal was delayed again, the construction of the first phase residential units would not be able to complete as scheduled by 2025. For the benefits of Wah Fu residents and to cater for the great demand for public rental housing from the grassroots, he urged HD to commence the redevelopment project immediately;
- (b) Although the consultation work and proposed developments were not yet adequate, he commented that HD should proceed to town planning procedure and continue to listen to the affected residents, in particular, those residents of Wah Fu and Chi Fu so as to optimise the project details;
- (c) He requested the Government to take forward the detailed planning work for the SIL(W) in order to address the demands of the SDC and residents as well as the concerns of the affected residents over the traffic issues; and

- (d) He hoped that fellow Members could lend their support to his amendment to motion.

20. Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, the seconder, gave additional remarks as summarised below:

- (a) Further delays in the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate would not only affect Wah Fu tenants and its nearby residents, but also those waiting for public housing units over the territory;
- (b) According to his knowledge, HD had already made some fine-tuning to the project in the light of public opinions. He hoped that the department could continue to collect views from the affected residents at the later stage;
- (c) As to whether or not widening of the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road could effectively improve traffic flow, HD and SDC would need to maintain close communication with a view to carrying out a further study; and
- (d) Detailed planning for the SIL(W) should be taken forward in conjunction with the redevelopment project of Wah Fu Estate at the same time. In devising the project details, the Government should put more effort in collecting views from the residents.

21. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr AU Lap-sing, MH, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr CHU Lap-wai, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Mr LO Kin-hei, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Ms TAM May-bo, and Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP raised the following comments and enquiries:

### **Support Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment**

- (a) A number of Members supported the amendment to motion. They said that despite the inadequacy of the proposed developments, it was necessary to support the project owing to the fact that Wah Fu Estate was

dilapidated and lacked ancillary facilities. In addition, the proposed developments had put forth an increase of over 10 000 public housing units which could benefit the residents of the Southern District and even the whole society; yet, they reiterated that the Government needed to continue optimising the project at the subsequent stages. A Member concerned that given the inadequacy of the proposed developments, there was no urgency for the Committee to express its stance at this meeting;

- (b) A number of Members reflected that there was huge demand for public rental housing from the residents in the district. Coupled with the tight supply of public housing units in the district, the queue for public housing in Southern District or application for local transfer was always longer than those of the other districts. Some Members supported the above views and said that quite a lot of Southern District residents had to endure poor living conditions. The residents had been longing for an accommodation in the new types of public housing for better living environment;
- (c) A Member said that Chi Fu residents supported the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate but did not support the proposed developments mainly on the grounds of the corresponding traffic facilities;
- (d) A Member commented that Pokfulam South was not the only suitable site, and queried why the Government did not consider using the ex-Wong Chuk Hang Estate site (i.e. the superstructure of Wong Chung Hang Station) instead for construction of public housing. A Member suggested that in order to expedite implementation, HD should proceed to the development of the five sites in Pokfulam South for the intended use first. Other proposed site could be covered by study for the second phase of the housing development;

### **Opinions and suggestions of the residents**

- (e) A Member said that when the Government announced the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate in 2014, the estate had just undergone a complete overhaul. Therefore, most of the residents had no strong desire for redevelopment at that time. However, after a lapse of few years, the building structure had worn down again. Some of the units were found

to have spalling concrete inside out. As such, residents now hoped that they could be relocated to somewhere else on the basis of redevelopment so as to improve their living environment. A Member shared the same view and opined that the existing condition of Wah Fu Estate was very poor and barrier-free access facilities were not available. It was no longer an ideal place to live in;

- (f) A Member urged the Government to expedite the pace of redevelopment. He said that he conducted a questionnaire survey on the residents of Wah Fu Estate in July 2017. Of the 932 questionnaires received (on a household basis), 86% respondents supported the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate with 78% considered that the redevelopment project was making slow progress;
- (g) A Member enquired about HD's response to a proposal from Chi Fu residents for moving the developments further south (i.e. shifting the proposed buildings in Kai Lung Wan North towards Kai Lung Wan South). A Member described this as a detestable proposal and commented that it would go against the spirit of community inclusion. Another Member cited the comment of a resident in Pokfulam Terrace that moving the public housing away from Chi Fu was tantamount to moving it closer to Pokfulam Terrace, and hence an unfair move; he considered that the Government and SDC Members should consider all factors from different perspective and strike a balance between residents in different areas;
- (h) Some Members regretted that HD had not responded to the opinions of Pokfulam residents before submitting the proposed developments to the SDC for consultation. Some Members, however, remarked that HD had carried out many public consultations. Moreover, the latest development proposal had already incorporated the demands of Chi Fu residents, such as withdrawing the development proposal at a site near Chi Fu Road;
- (i) Some Members pointed out that any district development in the vicinity would inevitably bring changes to the neighbourhood and so they hoped that the relevant stakeholders could understand. Meanwhile, the government departments were also expected to listen to the stakeholders as far as possible and enhance the transparency of the redevelopment

project in order to secure local support from the community;

### **Request the Government to realise the construction of SIL(W)**

- (j) A number of Members requested the Government to take forward the planning work for SIL(W) immediately in order to cater for the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. A Member added that the South Island Line (East) (SIL(E)) had altogether taken up nine years' time from beginning of its construction to commissioning of the railway. Comparing with the East section, the works for SIL(W) would be more complicated. It was believed that a longer lead time would be required for the project and hence early implementation was advisable;
- (k) A Member cited the then Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung Bing-leung, as saying that the Government would conduct a study work on SIL(W) upon commencement of the redevelopment project of Wah Fu Estate;
- (l) A Member said that since the traffic in Pok Fu Lam had reached its saturation, the Government had frozen the development of Pok Fu Lam as early as the 70s. Without the provision of new traffic infrastructure, no development was allowed in Pok Fu Lam. Accordingly, the proposed developments should be built on the premise that it would be approved by the railway transport system of SIL(W). Another Member asked HD if the SIL(W) was the only transport mode capable of satisfying the needs of the additional population. He believed that if there were any alternate means of transport as an interim measure, it might help address the concern of some people;
- (m) A Member pointed that there must be sufficient population to justify the requested construction of SIL(W), thus the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate was closely related to the development of railway system. A number of Members share the above views and commented that the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment served to provide the only chance for proceeding with the construction of SIL(W). Hence, both projects should be developed concurrently;

### **Other opinions and suggestions on traffic**

- (n) A Member requested for a detailed report on the Traffic Impact Assessment from the department concerned;
- (o) A Member requested the relevant departments to respond to the proposal of providing an elevated viaduct over the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road;
- (p) A Member observed that the residential blocks in the proposed developments were too far apart which would hinder networking with neighbours and not favourable for a friendly community planning. A Member shared this view and asked about the distance between the two sites to the north of Kai Lung Wan and Wah Fu Estate, and whether any feeder service would be provided to facilitate the travel of residents between these two sites;

#### **Opinions and suggestions on community facilities**

- (q) A Member said that quite a lot of Wah Fu residents were tour bus and truck drivers. As such, he suggested the provision of parking spaces for this type of vehicles in the new housing estates for the convenience of residents. But the design should prevent the vehicles from entering the estate area;
- (r) A Member requested HD to provide a route map showing how the housing estate was connected to the hiking trail within the Green Belt, and asked HD about its plan for beautification of the surrounding environment;
- (s) A Member requested HD to provide a simulation clip on the proposed building blocks after completion for reference. Another Member asked about the height of the blocks after completion;
- (t) Given that the number of public housing units would remain constant, a Member was concerned about the impact of the intended reduction in the total number of residential blocks from the original 13 blocks to 11 blocks in terms of the living area for the households;

- (u) A Member asked HD whether recreation and sports facilities for jogging track, cycling track and roller skating rink, etc., would be provided for the households;
- (v) A Member had reservation about the proposal of constructing a primary school in Wah Fu Estate as mentioned in the proposed developments. She believed that the proposed construction of a new school would lead to vicious competition with the existing two primary schools in the vicinity. She suggested relocating one of the existing primary schools for the new site and carrying out repair works to the one retained at the original site;

### **Other opinions and suggestions**

- (w) A Member said that HD might make a comprehensive evaluation of the project first before seeking funding approval from the LegCo in order to avoid stagnation of the developments at a later stage due to insufficient resources. A Member also supported the above suggestion;
- (x) A Member proposed either setting up a panel or following up the related matters of Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment at each DDHC meeting. A Member supported the setting up of a panel and suggested that representatives of HD be invited to attend the meetings so as to collect Members' views and respond to their enquiries;
- (y) A Member pointed out that the Council used to convene a special meeting to discuss the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate in February 2014, and according to Order 15 of the Southern District Council Standing Orders, the Chairman of SDC had the right to invite any person to attend a meeting of the Council; and
- (z) A Member hoped that Southern District Office could consider designatng more space in the Conference Room to accommodate the media and observers to the meeting.

22. Ms Portia YIU responded that it was learned from the remarks of Members that the Committee supported the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and looked forward to implementation of the project as soon as possible. She further said that there were currently over 100 000 general applicants on the Waiting List for

public rental housing; therefore, it was necessary for the Government to proactively identify suitable sites for public housing development in the territory with a view to addressing the housing demand of the public. The Government and Hong Kong Housing Authority (HA) had adhered to the development principle of “caring for people” and hoped that the proposed developments could maintain a balance in every aspect. Since 2016 the Government and HA had published four issues of Information Leaflets and conducted local consultation as well as meetings with the LegCo Members concerned, SDC Members and the residents in order to strengthen communication and collect opinions. The refined developments had taken into consideration the views of local residents. The Government had noted the residents’ concerns on the traffic and environmental issues and would continue to maintain communication with the SDC and refine the development in future, including minimising the impacts arising from construction activities.

23. Regarding a proposal of Chi Fu residents that all the proposed buildings in Kai Lung Wan (North) be moved to Kai Lung Wan South, Mr CHAN Siu-yuen responded that it was not a good option. He pointed out that the southeast of the area in Kai Lung Wan South was a very steep slope, partly under the pylon or too close to the pylon, and was close to Town Gas Aberdeen Depot which stored dangerous goods on Tin Wan Praya Road. If the proposed developments in Kai Lung Wan North was shifted to the southeast of the site in Kai Lung Wan (South), the adaptability of the site development would be restricted and might reach the area within 300 m of a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). This would require more detailed studies, and provision of road access to the proposed site might be very difficult. It would generate traffic towards Aberdeen, thus affecting the traffic condition in Aberdeen. It would make the proposed development more complex and difficult in the construction and technical aspects.

24. Ms Portia YIU added that HD also considered the suggested arrangement of shifting all building blocks from Kai Lung Wan North to Kai Lung Wan South not a good option. Kai Lung Wan North and Wah Fu North would serve as the two major activity hubs under the current development concept. If the development was to be shifted southward, the distance from Wah Fu Estate would increase while the linkage to the planned Wah Fu Station would also be weakened. In addition, she said that the five sites in Pokfulam South would mainly serve as reception resources for Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment and hence substantial increase in population was anticipated only after the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate.



25. Mr Brad FONG gave a consolidated response as follows:
- (a) To alleviate the traffic impact brought by the development projects, the Government proposed that road improvement works be carried out at the junction of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road, consisting of (1) widening of the carriageway at the junction on Pok Fu Lam Road southbound with two additional lanes to the existing two lanes at the upstream of the junction, adding up to four lanes, while the existing two lanes at the downstream of the junction would also be increased up to three lanes; and (2) provision of additional lane to the existing two lanes at Victoria Road leading to the junction, adding up to three lanes. Based on the Traffic Impact Assessment, the above improvement proposals could effectively deal with the traffic flow arising from the proposed developments upon completion; and
  - (b) In response to a Member's proposal of providing an elevated viaduct to connect Kai Lung Wan North, Pok Fu Lam Road and Shek Pai Wan Road, he estimated that the length of the viaduct would be about 200 to 300 metres. Not only would the viaduct take up a relatively large area, it was also not effective to deal with the traffic flow at the junction upon completion of the development projects. Comparatively, the proposed road improvement works would be more effective than construction of an elevated viaduct.
26. Ms Carrie LAU responded that TD agreed with the assessment report submitted by the consultant and opined that the road improvement works could satisfy the traffic needs arising from the proposed developments.
27. Ms Portia YIU added that since the commissioning of SIL(E), the traffic flow at the Aberdeen Tunnel had decreased by 7% in terms of the average daily number of vehicles, and the times of intermittent closure had also dropped significantly. Based on the statistical data, Aberdeen Tunnel administered over 200 intermittent closures in total in November 2016 (i.e. before commissioning of the SIL(E)), each closure lasting for about 4 minutes; whereas after commissioning, a total of 57 intermittent closures was recorded as at the month of April 2017, each closure lasting for about 4 minutes.
28. Mr Joe LEUNG responded that upon confirmation of the proposed

developments, HD would start the study on Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment afterwards, including an independent Traffic Impact Assessment to be carried out for an overall assessment of the traffic condition after the commissioning of SIL(E) and the anticipated commissioning of the Central-Wan Chai Bypass. If road improvement works were found necessary, HD would submit a proposal to TD for consideration.

29. Ms Portia YIU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Apart from providing parking facilities in accordance with the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines (HKPSG), HD would also take into account the parking demand in Wah Fu Estate and provide additional parking spaces as appropriate;
- (b) Concerning the loss of temporary parking spaces to make way for the relevant works, HD would reserve space, as requested by TD, in Kai Lung Wan North site for the provision of public parking spaces;
- (c) As regards Member's concern that the reduction in total development area from 18 hectares to 13 hectares might also lead to a decrease in the living space of the residents or community facilities, she explained that the total development area had included roads, area of cut slope in relation to site formation works, as well as the works area for mitigation measures to prevent natural terrain hazards. Under the refined proposal, the reduced total development area mainly involved roads and works area for the site formation. For instance, through not developing public housing development at the Near Chi Fu Road site, could already saved the construction of an access road leading to that site;
- (d) The refined proposal had put forth a more complicated method for site formation which required less slope works, coupling with construction of retaining wall to minimise the cutting of slopes so as to preserve more trees and natural stream courses;
- (e) The planning and design of HA's new housing estates were implemented in accordance with the current allocation standards for public rental housing, which was no less than 7 m<sup>2</sup> of the Internal Floor Area (IFA) per person;

- (f) HD would make reference to the HKPSG for provision of open space and various types of recreation facilities, and would also liaise with the Social Welfare Department to provide suitable community facilities for residents' use. Furthermore, HD would provide at least 20% green coverage while aiming at the target of 30%;
- (g) To strike a balance between conservation needs and development density, the refined proposal had adopted a domestic plot ratio of about 7, which was lower than the prevailing maximum domestic plot ratio of 8 to 10 in Hong Kong Island;
- (h) Wah Fu North and Kai Lung Wan North would serve as the two major activity hubs. Strengthening the linkage between the five sites in Pokfulam South and Wah Fu Estate would be one of the key features in the future planning;
- (i) HD would consider Members' suggestions on providing barrier-free access facilities, etc.;
- (j) For major repair to the school premises, redevelopment or relocation of individual schools, application was required to be made to the Education Bureau according to the established approval procedures;
- (k) The technical assessment had confirmed that the five sites in Pokfulam South were suitable for public housing developments. HD recommended that the development of these sites be activated as soon as possible. Regarding the alternative site proposals, it has always been HD's intent to consider any suitable sites across the territory for public housing development, with a view to addressing the increasing housing demand from the whole society;
- (l) The matters related to implementation of SIL(W) were mentioned in the Message from the then Secretary for Transport and Housing, Professor Anthony Cheung Bing-leung in the Information Leaflet No. 3 and the Railway Development Strategy 2014. An indicative implementation window from 2021 to 2026 was recommended as planning reference in Railway Development Strategy 2014. That said, taking forward of the SIL(W) was subject to the actual programme for the developments and

redevelopment of public housing in the Wah Fu area as well as the build-up of transport demand. According to the established procedures and prior to the finalisation of SIL(W) proposal, the Government would consult the public on the detailed alignment, locations of stations, mode of implementation, cost estimate, mode of financing and actual implementation timetable; and

- (m) For the time being, the Government had to activate the developments of the said five sites first, which would provide major reception resources for Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment. At the same time, this arrangement could free up space for railway construction at a later stage (including the planned Wah Fu Station in the preliminary conceptual scheme of SIL(W)). Hence, the implementation of SIL(W) was closely hinged on the developments of the five sites and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment.

30. Mr Louis KAU responded that Chi Fu Fa Yuen and Pokfulam Gardens were zoned as “Residential (Group B)” on the OZP, with a domestic plot ratio of about 5; whereas Wah Fu Estate and Wah Kwai Estate were zoned “Residential (Group A)” on the OZP, with a maximum domestic plot ratio of 10. With the proposed developments, the development intensity of the residential developments in that area would be gradually increased from medium-density in the north to high-density in the south. PlanD considered such a design acceptable. On the other hand, in view of the environmental and historic building consideration, the total development area would be reduced from the original 18 hectares to 13 hectares. Given that the number of public housing units would remain unchanged, it was inevitable to have an increase in the plot ratio. Yet, PlanD considered that the current average domestic plot ratio of 7 was still acceptable.

31. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Ms YAM Pauline, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Ms TAM May-bo, Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr CHU Lap-wai and Mr LO Kin-hei continued to raise the following comments and enquiries:

### **Content of Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment**

- (a) A Member enquired about which of the sites would have residential blocks completed first;

- (b) A Member asked HD to promise that upon demolition of Wah Fu Estate, the sites released should all be used for construction of public housing estates;
- (c) Referring to a previous criticism that the building blocks in the proposed developments were too far apart, a Member opined that it was the result of HD giving in to the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen by reducing the number of building blocks and calling off the development at the Near Chi Fu Road site, thus ended up the design as such. A Member objected to the above comment and pointed out that Chi Fu residents had made other site proposals to HD, for example, the private farmland near the Old Pok Fu Lam Kennels but were not accepted. Another Member hoped that HD could clarify the reduction in development area from 18 hectares to 13 hectares was purely out of consideration for conservation of heritage sites and technical issues of the works, and had nothing to do with the residents of Chi Fu Fa Yuen;
- (d) A Member said that the part of the proposed public housing blocks were apparently higher than Chi Fu Fa Yuen, rather than as what PlanD said, the public housing was designed to be built to gradually commensurate with the surrounding buildings;
- (e) Some Members requested HD to provide the following information for reference: (1) multi-facet visual effect diagram, including the locations of the access for residents' daily use and close-ups of the proposed building clusters; (2) a route map showing how the housing estate was connected to the hiking trail within the Green Belt; and (3) simulation images of the proposed building blocks after completion;
- (f) A Member stressed that as there were many different views on the proposed developments, it proved the inadequacy of the developments. There was no urgency to make a resolution at this meeting and further deliberation could be left to the next DDHC meeting;
- (g) A Member said it was understood that HD had made numerous refinements to the proposed developments taking into account the views collected from consultation exercises and thus the proposed

developments could not be put forward to the SDC for consultation at an earlier time;

### **Opinions and suggestions of the residents**

- (h) A Member said that not only Chi Fu residents, the residents of Pokfulam Terrace and World Fair Court also commented that the proposed developments had impact on them, showing that there were problems in the developments. She called on fellow Members not to endorse an inadequate project imperatively, or else the next generation would bear the consequences. A number of Members reiterated that in spite of the fact that there was still room for improvement in the proposed developments, it was necessary to reach a compromise and support the project in order to have the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment implemented as early as possible. Upon HD's activation of the town planning procedure for the development of the five sites in Pokfulam South, the public at large could continue to discuss the project details with the department for further enhancement of the developments;
- (i) A Member opined that the public viewed the proposed development differently owing to a lack of trust in the professional advice of the Government and departments. However, he considered that it was not a matter of great anxiety for the moment because the public and the SDC could monitor the Government's work together. If the Government broke its promise in future, say contravening the administrative moratorium in Pokfulam area, the society at large could file a judicial review accordingly;
- (j) A Member cited the findings of his questionnaire survey conducted in Wah Fu Estate again and said that a majority of the respondents supported the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate and considered that the redevelopment project was making slow progress. A Member said that Wah Fu residents were expecting HD to announce the details on the redevelopment project, including information about the community facilities and open sapce;
- (k) A number of Members urged the Government to address the fervent demands of DDHC and the community for simultaneous implementation

of the two projects, Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment and SIL(W), and requested the provision of detailed design for the Committee's reference;

- (l) A Member hoped that the incumbent Secretary for Transport and Housing could keep the promise made by his predecessor and take forward the SIL(W) project. A Member opined that as both HD and TD were under the Transport and Housing Bureau, the parties should strengthen communication on the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment and SIL(W) project among themselves and accept opinions from the public in order to facilitate the developments;
- (m) A number of Members urged HD to give a clear and definite answer as to whether the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment would be complemented by the SIL(W);
- (n) A Member deeply regretted that HD said it needed to observe the traffic conditions after the commissioning of SIL(E) and study the situation when the Central-Wan Chai Bypass opened in order to assess the development need of the SIL(W). It was stipulated in the administrative moratorium governing Pokfulam development that without new traffic infrastructure, no development was allowed in Pok Fu Lam. Another Member said that HD should have evaluated the domestic population while the proposed developments were being planned, so the Government needed not to wait until the actual completion of the housing estates to make an assessment of the future traffic needs in the district. Therefore, she urged the Government to commence the planning work of SIL(W) as soon as possible without any unnecessary delay;
- (o) A Member said that she shared the view of another Member that there was no detailed information about the proposal of SIL(W) yet, thus she supported the original motion. On the other hand, if the Government promised to take forward the detailed planning work for the SIL(W) immediately upon the implementation of the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment, she would also support the amendment to motion;
- (p) A Member commented that the SIL(W) should not be used as a bargaining chip to determine the support for Wah Fu Estate

Redevelopment. He maintained that there were ample chances in the future to facilitate the implementation of SIL(W), for instance, SIL(E) was implemented upon a financing agreement reached between the Government and MTR Corporation. Besides, with the Government's lifting of the administrative moratorium in the area, there would be various housing development projects in Pok Fu Lam. The population growth would also serve as an opportunity to realise the construction of SIL(W). A Member did not agree that SIL(E) was implemented due to a financing agreement. He said that the extension of Ocean Park attracting a large flow of visitors was supposed to be the key to developing the railway line;

### **Other opinions and suggestions on traffic**

- (q) A Member requested HD again to provide a detailed report of the Traffic Impact Assessment for reference;
- (r) A Member said that although the commissioning of SIL(E) had led to a drop in the average daily number of vehicles in the traffic flow of the Aberdeen Tunnel, given the robust development in Ap Lei Chau coupling with the successive completion of hotels in the area, there was possibility that the developments would give rise to new challenges for traffic in Southern District. Therefore, she reminded the departments concerned not take it lightly. Some Members agreed with the above comment and opined that traffic assessment must involve macro study of traffic network and development in the Southern District as a whole, rather than just focusing on individual areas or development projects;
- (s) A Member said that the OZP had shown flyover intersection over Pok Fu Lam Road and Victoria Road, and asked PlanD for the reason why flyover intersection design was not adopted for the location involved;
- (t) A Member asked HD about the number of proposed parking spaces for light goods vehicles, and where would the department provide parking spaces in compensation for those parking spaces being reduced for work purpose;
- (u) A Member said that Aberdeen, as the centre area of Southern District,



had all along been plagued by serious traffic and hygiene problems. She was worried that the traffic network in Aberdeen was not sufficient to sustain the additional population brought by the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. Thus, she asked whether the traffic assessment conducted by the relevant departments had included the traffic condition of Aberdeen town centre;

### **Opinions and suggestions on community facilities**

- (v) A Member opined that the proposed developments would have impact on the ecological environment in the vicinity. HD ought to compensate the affected community accordingly. He suggested that HD convert the Waterfall Bay into a park for the public enjoyment;
- (w) A Member said that a request would be directed to the Education Bureau for an enhancement and upgrading of the school premises of the two existing primary schools in the area;

### **Other opinions and suggestions**

- (x) A Member said that Kellett School and St Paul's College Primary School were situated on the side of the proposed developments. As such he asked HD what measures they would take to avoid any impact on the schools during the construction period, for example, the installation of double-glazed noise insulation windows at the schools;
- (y) A Member put forth again the proposal of either setting up a panel or following up the related items of Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment in tabular form at the DDHC meetings. A Member supported following up of the matters in tabular form and suggested that the proposal of converting Waterfall Bay into a park be included in the table as a regular follow-up item; and
- (z) A Member said a farmland diagonally opposite to Wah Lok House had partly fallen within a private lot. She suggested that HD discuss with the landlord and consider developing the site for public housing purpose.

32. Ms Portia YIU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) She thanked Members for their opinions and suggestions;
- (b) HD had been working towards an open, fair and transparent consultation. HD would continue to make improvement and strengthen its communication with the residents;
- (c) She reiterated that the Message from the then Secretary for Transport and Housing in the Information Leaflet No. 3 already mentioned that Wah Fu Estate would be retained for public housing after redevelopment so as to address the keen demand for public housing from society. Government policy had continuity;
- (d) She would convey Members' request to the Bureau that the SIL(W) project should be taken forward simultaneously with the proposed developments and Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment;
- (e) She reiterated that the Government had announced in the Railway Development Strategy 2014 an indicative implementation window from 2021 to 2026 recommended as planning reference for SIL(W). But the taking forward would still be subject to the actual programme for the developments and redevelopment of public housing in the Wah Fu area as well as the build-up of transport demand. As the proposed developments had been discussed for nearly three years, the implementation timeframe for the proposed railway might need further adjustment. In this connection, HD wished to secure support from the Committee and activate the developments of the five sites as soon as possible in order to provide the major reception resources for Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment and free up space for railway construction at a later stage;
- (f) Assuming the rezoning and funding approval by the LegCo to be completely timely, the Government anticipated the site formation and supporting infrastructure works would commence in 2019. Then the sites would be handed over to HA for construction of building blocks, the earliest phase of which was expected to complete in 2025. Among the sites, Wah Lok Path, Wah King Street and Wah Fu North would be easier to process in terms of technical aspects, and hence the

developments on these three sites might be completed earlier. Furthermore, developments on the two sites at Kai Lung Wan were also expected to complete within the subsequent few years;

- (g) There were currently about some 100 temporary parking spaces on the sites concerned. Initially, the Government hoped that the reprovisioning proposals would cover all the parking spaces as far as possible;
- (h) She understood that the residents of Residence Bel-Air and other residential estates had concerns that the proposed developments might have visual impact on their flats. Since Hong Kong was a place of high density development, according to the planning guidelines of the Town Planning Board (TPB), it was more important to safeguard the public interest and protect the public view. Accordingly, the visual impact assessment would be conducted in some strategic locations and popular public viewing points;
- (i) Given the time constraint of this meeting, the project consultant only concentrated on the briefing of a summary of the findings of the technical assessments which consolidated the key points of various technical assessment items. If Members would like to examine the technical assessments further, HD was willing to liaise with the relevant Members to follow up after the meeting;
- (j) If Members were interested in the contents of the Traffic Impact Assessment, the report could be provided for their reference pending its completion and subject to the consent of CEDD; and
- (k) It had all along been the HA's intention to retain all public housing sites after demolition of the estates for public housing development. However, in order to keep in line with the overall housing strategy of the Government and cater for the development needs in the community, some sites were surrendered to the Government, such as the original site of Wong Chuk Hang Estate had been used for MTR Station and topside property development purpose.

33. Mr Louis KAU gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) Pending confirmation of the junction design of Victoria Road and Pok Fu Lam Road, PlanD would update the OZP in due course; and
- (b) He clarified that the administrative moratorium in Pokfulam area was partially uplifted in 2014 for the purpose of releasing six Government sites for public housing developments; whereas other housing developments in Pokfulam area were still subject to the relevant development restriction.

34. The Chairman said that under the Southern District Council Standing Orders, in case a motion amending the original motion constituted a direct negation of the original motion, no further voting on the original motion should be required upon passage of the amendment to motion; only if the amendment to motion was not passed would voting for the original motion be conducted in the Committee accordingly.

35. The Chairman held that the amendment to motion constituted a direct negation of the original motion. The Chairman invited Members to vote on the amendment to motion first. The amendment to motion proposed by Mr AU Lap-sing, MH and seconded by Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH was passed with 17 votes in favour, 3 against and zero abstention. Since the amendment to motion was passed, the Committee did not vote on the original motion.

36. In conclusion, the Chairman said that it was the function of DDHC to advise on district development affairs, such as town planning, land use and public housing projects. Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment was an important project. To address the demands of the Southern District residents for this project, the Committee supported the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment on the premise that the Government would implement the construction of the South Island Line (West) as requested. In view that DDHC Members had given different opinions on the proposed developments, he asked HD to note Members' opinions and requests. Meanwhile, HD was also required to strengthen consultation and refine the development purpose, with due regard and response to the various suggestions of the residents affected by the redevelopment. In addition, PlanD should truthfully convey the Committee's views to the Government and the TPB. He pointed out, in particular, that the traffic assessment of the proposed developments had not provided sufficient information. The decision now made by the Committee in favour of the proposed developments was just to reach a compromise. He reiterated that the construction of South Island

Line (West) must be linked to the redevelopment of Wah Fu Estate. Last but not the least, he remarked that any district development in the vicinity would inevitably affect the local community and residents. He hoped that HD would strive to turn the Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment into a popular project among the residents on the principle of “putting people first”. The Committee would continue to follow up the progress of Wah Fu Estate Redevelopment.

**Agenda Item 3: An Introduction to the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance  
Cap. 572  
(Item raised by the Fire Services Department)  
(DDHC Paper No. 13/2017)**

---

(Ms TAM May-bo, Jeanette left the meeting at 5:58 p.m.)

37. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the Fire Services Department (FSD) to the meeting:

- (a) Mr MOK Wai-chi, Assistant Divisional Officer (Building Improvement)1;  
and
- (b) Mr NG Ka-lok, Senior Station Officer (Building Improvement).

38. The Chairman invited the FSD representatives to introduce the agenda item.

39. Mr NG Ka-lok, with the aid of PowerPoint presentation (Reference Information 1), presented the Fire Safety (Buildings) Ordinance and the relevant amendments. The details were given at DDHC Paper No. 13/2017.

40. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH and Mr AU Nok-hin raised the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) Members said that fire safety was of utmost importance;
- (b) a Member said that there were quite a number of single blocks in some parts of the Southern District such as Ap Lei Chau Main Street and Aberdeen and many of them were “three nil” buildings, i.e. buildings without owners’ corporations, residents’ organisations nor property

management companies. Some owners and residents had to engage consultants to carry out the necessary fire safety improvement with the assistance of District Councillors. As it took time to approve the layout plans, she hoped that the departments concerned such as FSD, Buildings Department (BD) and Water Supplies Department could strengthen coordination and simplify the entire approval procedure and expedite the completion of works so that all existing fire safety requirements could be complied with;

- (c) a Member said that the owners and households encountered different difficulties when trying to comply with the requirements specified in the Fire Safety Direction or Fire Safety Improvement Direction and hoped that FSD could exercise discretion under special circumstances and withheld law enforcement actions against owners and households who failed to comply with the directions in time; and
- (d) a Member said that at FSD's request, two extra fire doors were installed at a barrier free access inside Lei Tung Commercial Centre earlier on. Residents had to go through three doors to get to the lift, which was quite inconvenient for them. As the place was not confined, he hoped that FSD could add clarify the meaning of "indoor" and "outdoor" in the legal provision to obviate the inconvenience suffered by the residents.

41. Mr MOK Wai-chi made a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) FSD would adopt a flexible and pragmatic approach to enforce the Ordinance and help the owners and households comply with the Fire Safety Direction. According to the FSD Circular Letters No. 2/2016 and No. 5/2016, improvised hose reel system (direct-feed type) which did not require supply tank could be adopted for non-domestic portion of the target composite buildings of three storeys or below. The required capacity of supply tanks in target buildings of six storeys or below or less than 20 metres in height with one of the major facades accessible by fire appliances via the emergency vehicular access was lowered from the original 2 000 litres to 500 litres at the minimum. A tank with a capacity of 500 litres was approximately the size of two washing machines. FSD was also considering further relaxing the required capacity of supply tanks in buildings of seven storeys or higher; and

(b) the requirements pertaining to fire doors fell under the purview of BD.

42. In closing, the Chairman welcomed FSD's taking the initiative to explain the Ordinance to the Committee. As the owners and residents in general might not have the relevant expertise on compliance with the Ordinance, he hoped that FSD could lend more support to the residents and provide assistance and information as appropriate.

43. The Chairman thanked the departmental representatives for attending the meeting.

**Agenda Item 4: Enhanced Design Scheme for a Hotel in Ocean Park  
(Item raised by Ocean Park Corporation)  
(DDHC Paper No. 14/2017)**

---

(Dr WONG Yat-lung, Philip left the meeting at 6:42 p.m.)

44. The Chairman welcomed the following representatives of the corporations concerned to the meeting:

Ocean Park Corporation (OPC)

- (a) Mr Arthur WONG, Project Development Director;
- (b) Ms Una LAU, Public Affairs Director;
- (c) Ms Helen LAI, Assistant Project Manager;

Parkland (Hong Kong) Limited

- (d) Ms Karen SUEN, Senior Project Manager; and
- (e) Mr Albert POON, Project Manager.

45. The Chairman asked the representatives of Parkland (Hong Kong) Limited to brief Members on the agenda item.

46. Ms Karen SUEN, with PowerPoint presentation (Reference Information), briefed Members on the proposed enhanced design, layout and facilities of the Hotel, with details given in DDHC Paper No. 14/2017.

47. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa,

Mr LAW Kam-hung and Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH raised the following comments and enquiries on the subject:

- (a) a number of Members expressed support for the enhanced design and welcomed the OPC's efforts in increasing public space in its planning;
- (b) a Member asked how to use water-borne transport to travel to the Hotel;
- (c) a Member recalled that the Committee had proposed at its meeting in March 2016 that (i) OPC should explore the feasibility of beautifying the vicinity of Shum Wan Road in collaboration with the relevant government departments and Po Chong Wan's Shum Wan Temporary Industrial Area Management Committee; (ii) the Hotel's design should adopt a blue-and-green colour scheme and avoid the use of reflective and metallic materials; and (iii) water-borne transport should be developed as an alternative route for visitors travelling to/from the Hotel and water park, with a view to alleviating traffic congestion at Shum Wan Road. In this connection, he asked whether OPC had followed up on the above proposals. Another Member agreed with the need for enhancing the vicinity of Shum Wan Road;
- (d) a Member said that owing to the presence of protected coral communities, the area concerned was not suitable for constructing pier facilities. Another Member enquired about the size of the coral conservation area;
- (e) a number of Members urged OPC to undertake that the use of G/F Waterfront Plaza should not be constrained by Ocean Park's events or operating hours, it should be open for public use 24 hours a day;
- (f) a Member hoped that OPC could engage SDC Members or residents in the future discussion of the design scheme of the Promenade and Waterfront Plaza, so that the facilities concerned could better meet public demand; and
- (g) a Member said that the traffic at Shum Wan Road was already very congested, in particular many vehicles parked along both sides of the carriageway during the school starting and finishing times on weekdays. The new hotel upon completion was expected to aggravate the problem of



congestion. OPC was asked to advise on the measures that would be adopted to alleviate traffic congestions.

48. Mr Arthur WONG gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) pursuant to relevant provisions of the Ocean Park Corporation Ordinance (Cap. 388 of the Laws of Hong Kong), the operation of OPC was confined within specified boundaries only. As both Shum Wan Road and the area from the shoreline were beyond the Ocean Park's lot boundaries, OPC was unable to carry out any works. However, OPC absolutely supported any beautification works or traffic improvement measures for Shum Wan Road;
- (b) consideration would be given to the adoption of green and timber colours as the theme in the design of the Hotel's external walls, and the use of non-reflective and non-metallic materials;
- (c) the results of the investigation on coral habitats had already been uploaded to the website of the Environmental Protection Department for perusal; and
- (d) OPC pledged that the Promenade, Waterfront Plaza and the pathway leading to the water park would remain open 24 hours a day, and no gates would be installed at the entrances.

49. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr CHAI Man-hon, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH and Ms CHAN Judy Kapui continued to raise the following comments and enquiries:

- (a) a number of Members welcomed the enhanced design scheme;
- (b) a Member said that even though the improvement works for Shum Wan Road and construction of a pier would be carried out beyond statutory boundaries, OPC might also proactively make application to relevant government departments, in order to tie in with the overall development of the area concerned;

- (c) a Member said that Shum Wan Road Temporary Industrial Area and the neighbourhood of shipyards were so dilapidated that they were incompatible with the appearance of the new hotel and water park. It was hoped that the departments concerned such as TD and the Food and Environmental Hygiene Department (FEHD), etc. could carry out simple repair works for the walkways and corners of the area concerned, as well as stepping up street cleansing efforts, with a view to enhancing the streetscape. This was echoed by another Member;
- (d) a Member said that during the OPC's briefing on the hotel development project in 2016, it was stated that there would be no overlapping between the travelling hours of local residents vis-a-vis visitors in the morning, and it was unlikely to cause a significant traffic impact; whereas Shum Wan Road might be overloaded during the evening peak after office hours and when visitors departed the Park. As such, the government departments concerned were asked to continue to monitor the situation. Another Member expressed grave concern over the traffic congestion in the area concerned, and urged OPC to continue to monitor and assess the related traffic conditions in the future;
- (e) a Member reiterated that as in-depth discussion had already been conducted on the issues of beautifying the vicinity of Shum Wan Road, development of water-borne transport and addressing the traffic congestion at Shum Wan Road, etc. at the DDHC meeting in March 2016. OPC should approach the relevant stakeholders proactively, in order to implement proposals recommended by the Committee as soon as practicable;
- (f) a Member objected to the exploitation of the environment resulting from the implementation of water sports activities or construction of a pier;
- (g) a Member said that based on the premise of conservation of the natural environment, the Government should leverage on the Southern District's unique assets to develop water-borne transport. Another Member suggested identifying an alternative site in the adjacent area for the construction of a pier, in order to avoid spoiling the coral conservation area;

- (h) a Member considered that exterior design of the Hotel could be more stylish and elegant;
- (i) a Member asked OPC to adopt suitable measures to avoid causing adverse impact on the natural ecological environment during the construction of the Hotel;
- (j) a Member was disappointed that OPC had failed to put forth concrete proposals on the beautification works for the vicinity of Shum Wan Road, and asked OPC to provide the related details to the Committee after the meeting; and
- (k) a Member wished that OPC could allow local organisations such as dance troupes or bands to conduct public performance at the public space in the area concerned.

50. Ms Una LAU thanked Members' views and gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) a few years ago, OPC had approached different government departments to discuss the beautifying works for Po Chong Wan. However, as a number of local stakeholders were involved and due to many different factors, OPC was unable to provide a pragmatic solution at the present stage. In the future, OPC would liaise with different parties in a continuous effort to identify a feasible solution, e.g. seeking assistance from the Tourism Commission;
- (b) in view of the relevant statutory provisions OPC was not empowered to construct a pier or undertake any operations outside its statutory boundaries. Therefore, even though technical issues with respect to the construction of a pier could be solved, it was still necessary to engage a suitable operator to undertake the provision of ferry services to/from the area concerned in the future. Therefore, it was suggested inviting an interested operator to undertake the pier project. This would be a relatively appropriate arrangement; and
- (c) OPC confirmed their pledge to open the public space in the area

concerned 24 hours a day, and welcomed organisations to make applications for conducting performance.

51. In closing, the Chairman concluded that the Committee expressed support for the enhanced design, layout and facilities of The Fullerton Hotel Ocean Park Hong Kong as proposed by OPC. The Chairman asked OPC to note Members' views, in particular their wish for the implementation of the beautification works for the carriageway leading to the Hotel, in order to enhance the landscape of the area concerned and the overall image of the Southern District. It was worthwhile for OPC to consider more thoroughly the proposal. He was aware of the restrictions faced by OPC under the relevant ordinance, but hoped that OPC could proactively approach the government departments involved and specify the obstacles encountered, as well as submitting a timetable and concrete proposals to the Committee accordingly. As for the development of water-borne transport, as this would benefit the Hotel, alleviate traffic congestions and be conducive to the overall economic development of the Southern District, the proposal for identifying an alternative location suitable for the construction of a pier put forth at the meeting merited further study. The Committee also noted the proposal for identifying a suitable operator to undertake the provision of ferry services, in order to cope with development needs.

**Agenda Item 5: The Planning and Development of the Waterfront Area at Ap Lei Chau**

**(Include agenda items on “Improving Dragon Boating Center and Waterfront at Ap Lei Chau” by Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN; “Provision of a Temporary Open-air Car Park in Ap Lei Chau and Converting the Existing Car Park into a Multi-storey Car Park” by Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH and “Discuss the Land Use Planning for the Ap Lei Chau Waterfront Area” by Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Ms CHAN Judy Kapui)  
(DDHC Paper No. 15/2017)**

---

(Mr CHU Ching-hong, JP left the meeting at 7:40 p.m.)

52. The Chairman welcomed the following departmental representatives to the meeting:

Drainage Services Department (DSD)

- (a) Mr TAI Tak-chung, Senior E&M Engineer;
- (b) Mr CHAN King-lok, E&M Engineer; and

Transport Department (TD)

- (c) Ms LAU Wai-yee, Acting Senior Engineer/Southern & Peak.

53. The Chairman said that at the 4<sup>th</sup> meeting on 25 July 2016 and a workshop on 22 November 2016, the Committee discussed the planning and development of the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau. Members considered it very important to tackle the traffic problem arising from the development of Ap Lei Chau, in view of the closer link of Ap Lei Chau with other areas in the Southern District following the commissioning of SIL(E). Since it was almost half a year after the commissioning of SIL(E), at its 9<sup>th</sup> meeting on 29 May 2017, the Committee decided to hold a workshop again to review the latest situation. The workshop was held on 10 July 2017. The participating Members were of the view that the following two suggestions could be discussed further: (a) the construction of a temporary open-air car park in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau; and (b) the proposal put forth by the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee for expanding the scope of the short term tenancy (No. SHX-1244). Moreover, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, and Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Ms CHAN Judy Kapui separately requested in writing to discuss the planning and development of the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau. Since the agenda items raised by Members were similar in nature, he proposed to discuss them under one item.

54. Members agreed with the arrangement.

55. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, with the aid of PowerPoint Presentation (Reference Information), introduced the agenda item. The details were given at Annex 1 to the paper.

56. Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH introduced the agenda item. The details were given at Annex 2 to the paper.

57. Ms CHAN Judy Kapui introduced the agenda item. The details were given at Annex 3 to the paper.

58. The Chairman invited the departmental representatives to respond.
59. Mr TAI Tak-chung responded that the sewage pumping station at Ap Lei Chau Main Street started operation in 1996 to collect sewage from Ap Lei Chau area and then transport to Ap Lei Chau Preliminary Treatment Works for further treatment. It was an essential sewage treatment facility in the area. According to the record, the sewage pumping station was located at a government land allocated to DSD for the restricted purpose of pumping station facilities.
60. Ms KO Wing-yee responded that the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee submitted an application to the District Lands Office (DLO) earlier to expand the existing short term tenancy area for accommodating a dragon boat training centre. If the relevant bureau and departments supported the proposal, DLO would facilitate according to the applicable procedures. Regarding the proposed temporary open-air car park, if TD and other relevant departments supported the proposal, DLO would facilitate according to applicable procedures. In general, the Lands Department (LandsD) would let out temporary vacant site suitable for public parking use through short term tenancy by way of public tender. The site adjacent to Ap Lei Chau Municipal Services Building was Government land allocated to the Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD) for open space uses, whereas Ap Lei Chau Sewage Pumping Station was the Government land allocated to DSD.
61. Ms LAU Sin-ying responded that LCSD was currently managing an open-air out-sourced car park located next to the Ap Lei Chau Municipal Services Building. The provision of parking spaces was mainly for the users and visitors of nearby sports centre and parks. The new contract of the concerned car park would take effect in September 2017. In response to the demands of the district, the number of private car parking spaces would be increased from 23 to 26, including a disabled person parking space. As construction of car park was not under the jurisdiction of LCSD, LCSD would return the subject land for development of multi-storey car park in line with the policies and measures of the relevant departments.
62. Miss LEE Kit-tak responded that detailed reply of PlanD was given at Annex 9 to the paper and she had nothing to add for the time being.
63. Ms LAU Wai-yee responded that TD's detailed reply was given at Annex

10 to the paper. She supplemented that if a car park was constructed beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge, its ingress/egress point had to be near Ap Lei Chau Drive, which was quite far away. Moreover, sites for constructing car parks generally should have a minimum width of 15m (including a minimum width of 6.75m to be used as the main passage for the two-sided traffic, a walkway with a width of 3m and a parking space for private cars with a width of about 5m). Since most temporary sites in Ap Lei Chau had been reserved for other purposes while the width of the remaining sites was less than 15m, most sites in the area were not suitable for public car parks.

64. The Chairman enquired whether there were any other suitable places for the construction of a temporary public car park apart from the location beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge.

65. Ms LAU Wai-yee responded that as mentioned just now, most temporary sites in Ap Lei Chau had been reserved for other purposes. If there were sites released for use and SDC preferred to use it for the purpose of car parks, TD could provide advice relating to traffic and transport on the suggestion.

66. Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH declared that he was the Chairman of the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee and asked the Chairman whether he could speak in respect of this agenda item. The Chairman said that Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH could raise comments on this agenda item. Members had no objection.

67. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying declared that she was the Chairlady of Aberdeen Dragon Boat Race Committee. Members had no objection to her speaking in respect of this agenda item.

68. Mrs CHAN LEE Pui-ying, Ms CHEUNG Sik-yung, MH, Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH, Mr LO Kin-hei, Mr AU Nok-hin, Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH, Ms CHAN Judy Kapui, Mr LAW Kam-hung, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr TSUI Yuen-wa, Mr CHU Lap-wai, Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN and Mr CHAI Man-hon raised the following comments and enquiries:

### **Construction of a Temporary Open-air Car Park**

- (a) a number of Members said that the rapid development of Ap Lei Chau Main Street in recent years had led to drastic increase in vehicular and pedestrian flow and serious problems of illegal parking and traffic jam. They believed that the construction of a temporary open-air car park could improve the local traffic condition. A Member even thought that this could open up business opportunities;
- (b) some Members said that the construction of a car park was tantamount to encouraging the public to use private cars. Thus, the construction of a temporary car park should be based on the premise that there was a plan to construct a permanent car park to meet the long-term need. A Member suggested that if there was new property development project in the area, the property should provide car park for use by households to avoid adverse impact on the traffic;
- (c) some Members opined that the construction of a car park did not necessarily alleviate the problem of illegal parking. The car park might have an exactly opposite effect by attracting more people to drive to Ap Lei Chau;
- (d) a Member concerned that the general public attached great importance to sitting-out areas. He believed that if given a chance, most people would prefer developing the site into a sitting-out area rather than a car park. Concurring with the above view, some Members pointed out that some suggestions, such as opening up space on the ground by elevating the playground or constructing a car park in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau, would also cause harm to the environment and sitting-out facilities. Some Members believed that the above suggestions were intended to make optimal use of land resources and would not cause harm to the ecology or recreational facilities;
- (e) a Member said that he did not object to identifying a site in the vicinity of South Bay and the left shore of the Southern District for constructing a temporary car park. But he said that the car park should not be constructed beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge, Ap Lei Chau Park or the adjoining playground;



- (f) a Member was of the view that if the temporary open-air car park was situated beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge, it would not be convenient for the residents at Ap Lei Chau Main Street. Since there were dozens of parking meters at the adjoining Ap Lei Chau Praya Road and there were always some vacant parking spaces every morning, he anticipated that the utilisation rate of the proposed car park might not be high;
- (g) a Member said that as early as 2004, the Government had accepted the suggestion of the Harbourfront Commission of removing all parking spaces along the shoreline of Victoria Harbour and developing the sites into sitting-out areas. Thus, the provision of a car park in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau ran counter to the modern concept of planning. Concurring with this view, a Member opined that the location beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge was not suitable for vehicular access;
- (h) quoting the written replies from PlanD and DLO, a Member concluded that these departments were open to the idea of constructing a temporary car park. What was only lacking was the support of TD. She said that if TD rejected the suggestion because the site beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge was unsuitable, TD might provide an alternative site. She further said that currently only the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee had rented some places in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau for placing dragon boats through short term tenancy. There was in fact no lack of vacant land in the area;
- (i) some Members opined that it would be suitable to develop the sewage pumping station at Ap Lei Chau Main Street into a multi-storey car park in view of its location and area, and enquired whether DSD would consider removing the sewage pumping station and study the feasibility of opening up caverns and underground space for relocating the facility. Another Member suggested giving consideration to constructing a multi-storey car park on top of the sewage pumping station if it was infeasible to relocate the station;
- (j) a Member said that it was hard to decide whether to support the plan without knowing the demand for and supply of parking spaces at Ap Lei Chau Main Street;

## **Construction and Setting up of a Dragon Boat Training Centre**

- (k) a Member said that the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee had over the years spared no effort to promote dragon boat activity. Many people who had attended short-term dragon boat training indicated their wish to attend long-term training. He thus hoped that Members could support the suggestion of setting up a dragon boat training centre and requested LCSD to organise training courses;
- (l) a number of Members supported the development of a dragon boat training centre and requested the Government to grant a permanent site for the construction of the centre. A Member suggested setting aside an area inside the dragon boat training centre as a history exhibition corner to promote the traditional culture relating to dragon boat activity;
- (m) some Members suggested moving the existing location for placing dragon boats and the proposed dragon boat training centre to somewhere near the waterfront. A Member objected to this suggestion and contended that the waterfront area should be opened for public use as much as possible;
- (n) a Member suggested moving the dragon boat training centre to Chung Mei. A Member said that the current space at Chung Mei was insufficient for providing the facilities unless the shipyards at Chung Mei were relocated. A Member said that a suitable location should be identified first if the place for placing dragon boats was to be moved elsewhere;
- (o) a Member recalled that the place for placing dragon boats was moved to the existing location to tie in with the SIL(E) project. The existing location was zoned an “Open Space” in the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau Outline Zoning Plan (OZP). Providing a permanent location for placing dragon boats and a dragon boat training centre there conformed to the specified use. Although the location for placing dragon boats could be moved according to local development needs, at present the site had no long-term use under planning. He thus did not understand why some local organisations requested the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing

Committee to vacate the site and hoped that Members could discuss in a reasonable manner;

- (p) a Member said that during a local consultation conducted earlier on, DLO only made an account of the expansion application, but did not mention that the purpose of expansion was to construct a dragon boat training centre. She contended that DLO should provide the public with sufficient information when conducting consultation;
- (q) a Member reported that the lorry with a crane transporting the dragon boats often caused obstruction to the passers-by and hoped that the relevant party would take notice of this and make improvement;

### **General Land Use**

- (r) a Member said that the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau had a large area. There should be sufficient space for developing a temporary open-air car park as well as a dragon boat training centre. To make full use of the temporarily vacant land in the area, all options should be taken into consideration. A Member suggested engaging a consultant to carry out overall planning for the land along Ap Lei Chau waterfront and conduct a detailed study on the various development proposals, including the dragon boat training centre, temporary car park, water sports centre and footbridge. A Member opined that during the planning process, more residents' views should be collected;
- (s) a number of Members opined that recreational and sitting-out facilities should be provided in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau for public use. A Member said that according to the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines, there were already sufficient sitting-out space and facilities in that area and believed that there would not be any development in the near future;
- (t) a Member enquired whether PlanD could reformulate the development directions of the sites at Ap Lei Chau waterfront according to Members' development proposals;
- (u) a Member suggested the construction of a walkway connecting the two

communities of Deep Bay Pier and Ocean Court;

### **Other Comments**

- (v) a Member urged the relevant department to pay attention to the serious problem of illegal parking in the vicinity of Ap Lei Chau Main Street;
- (w) a Member said that the 160 vehicle permits issued to the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee would expire on 30 June 2017. Therefore, no private cars of that Committee would enter the area beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge;
- (x) a Member opined that some proposals were too idealistic. He said that only pragmatic options could really benefit the residents and the community;
- (y) a Member said that the responsible person concerned had been requested to clean up the place for placing dragon boats. A Member hoped that the cleaning work could continue to ensure environmental hygiene; and
- (z) a Member said that SDC had discussed the planning and short, medium and long term development of the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau at different Committee meetings. He also said that it took ten years for the shipyard at the northern tip of Tsing Yi to be transformed into the popular waterfront promenade. Since planning took time, he advised LCSD to seize the time and actively plan the long term development of the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau so that the public could be benefitted as early as possible.

69. Mr TAI Tak-chung responded that DSD was open to the suggestion of using the site of sewage pumping station at Ap Lei Chau Main Street as a temporary car park as well. If the sewage pumping station needed to be removed from the existing location, a site had to be identified for relocation in the same area. Relevant financial arrangement and assessment of the project's impacts on the traffic and environment in the vicinity also had to be considered.

70. The Chairman asked about the technical feasibility of constructing a car park on top of the sewage pumping station. Mr TAI Tak-chung opined that the

proposal might be feasible.

71. Ms KO Wing-yee responded that DLO had requested the Southern District Dragon Boat Racing Committee to submit detailed information relating to its application for setting up a dragon boat training centre. Once the information was all available, DLO would consult the relevant government departments and conduct local consultation through the relevant departments. Besides, if DSD and the relevant departments agree to the share use of DSD's government land allocation at Ap Lei Chau Main Street sewage pumping station as a temporary public car park as well, DLO would facilitate the delivery of proposal according to applicable procedures.

72. Ms LAU Sin-ying responded that LCSD would study and facilitate the delivery for the proposal of developing various recreation and sports facilities in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau according to SDC's views and the local needs for the facilities. Regarding the promotion of dragon boat activity, local sports associations could apply for funding from LCSD under LCSD's Community Sports Club Project, the details of which could be found on the relevant webpage (<http://www.lcsd.gov.hk/tc/cscp/index.html>).

73. Miss LEE Kit-tak gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) the planning intention of the sites along the north shore of Ap Lei Chau had all along been reserved for waterfront promenade. PlanD currently did not have any plan for replanning the sites;
- (b) since the relevant department currently did not have a time table for the construction of the waterfront promenade, to make optimal use of the Government's land resources, PlanD generally welcomed temporary use not exceeding five years, provided that SDC's support was secured and no objections from the departments involved were received; and
- (c) the sewage pumping station at Ap Lei Chau Main Street was zoned "Government, Institution or Community" on the Aberdeen and Ap Lei Chau OZP and subject to a building height restriction of one storey. Whilst temporary open-air carpark was always permitted, multi-storey carpark would require OZP amendment.

74. Ms LAU Wai-yee gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) currently the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau was not opened for use by public vehicles. As there were not many vehicles, there was no clear demarcation between the pavement and carriageway;
- (b) TD needed to assess the technical feasibility of constructing a public car park at the site according to the existing design standards; and
- (c) at present the Government mainly provided parking spaces inside private development projects by way of its Land Sales Programme in order to reduce/minimise the public's demand for public car parks constructed by the Government. Moreover, given the limited land resources in Hong Kong, sites suitable for multi-storey car parks were in general also suitable for other purposes. If the provision of public parking spaces could be combined with a development project, it would be the most optimal use of land resources and more beneficial to the society as a whole.

75. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN, Mr FUNG Se-goun, Mr LO Kin-hei and Mr CHAI Man-hon further raised comments and enquiries as follows:

- (a) a Member believed that one should understand the demand for and supply of parking spaces at Ap Lei Chau Main Street before deciding whether to support the project of constructing a temporary car park;
- (b) quoting TD's view on increasing the number of parking spaces, a Member said that providing more and more parking spaces would only attract passengers to opt for private cars, thereby aggravating the road traffic congestion. A Member agreed and pointed out that the provision of a temporary car park would attract more vehicle flow. Unless the temporary car park was to be replaced by a permanent car park, it could never be closed. The temporary car park at the waterfront of Quarry Bay was a case in point. But a Member said that there was also a temporary car park at Java Road, North Point which was finally closed due to the Government's sale of land. This showed that the above claim was not necessarily true;

- (c) a Member reiterated that the waterfront area should be developed into a water sports centre and considered it even more desirable if catering services and parking facilities could be provided nearby;
- (d) a Member was of the view that the area of Ap Lei Chau waterfront should be sufficient to accommodate both a public sitting-out area and a temporary car park. Concurring with this view, a Member opined that the dragon boats could be placed at the existing location until a permanent site was identified for relocation;
- (e) a Member suggested again that the government departments should engage a professional consultant to carry out planning for the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau;
- (f) a Member said that apart from paying attention to the views of local organisations, Members should also listen to the residents' voice; and
- (g) apart from medium and long term development plans, some Members hoped that the relevant departments could face up to and try to resolve the existing problems, which should include changing the railings inside the area, improving the environmental hygiene of the place for placing dragon boats and the adjoining areas as well as enhancing the night time lighting system in the waterfront area of Ap Lei Chau, including repairing the lights beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge.

76. The Chairman concluded that Members had put forth different proposals on the long term planning and development of the waterfront area at Ap Lei Chau. After several rounds of discussion, the Committee came up with two main development options: the development of a dragon boat training centre and the construction of a temporary open-air car park. Most Members agreed that the dragon boat activity was a traditional heritage of the Southern District and worth developing. They thus supported the development of a dragon boat training centre. The details of the project, such as the operation mode, the necessary facilities and space of the dragon boat training centre as well as the financial arrangements required the collaborative study of the various stakeholders. Regarding the suggestion of constructing a temporary open-air car park, he understood that some Members objected to the provision of parking facilities in the northern shore of Ap Lei Chau on

the ground that this would sacrifice the sitting-out area and green space. But in fact the existing traffic problem at Ap Lei Chau Main Street was caused by the lack of long term planning and the failure to provide ancillary transport facilities to catch up with the development. The provision of additional parking spaces by constructing a temporary open-air car park in the area could help alleviate the problem. He stressed that this was a temporary measure and it would not be the case that the temporary car park, once opened, could not then be closed in future as pointed out by some Members. Further deliberation on the long term development could be carried out by the Committee. Finally, the Chairman urged the departments concerned to enhance the lighting system beneath Ap Lei Chau Bridge, the railings at Ap Lei Chau Praya Road and the environmental hygiene of the adjoining areas.

77. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN said that the Chairman seemed to hold a different view from his comment that the provision of a temporary car park would lead to increased demand and then the need for a permanent car park. The Chairman said that he had taken note of Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN's view.

**Agenda Item 6: Follow up the Impacts of the Resale of Divested Car Parking Spaces in Wah Kwai**  
**(Item raised by Mr AU Nok-hin and to be discussed in conjunction with the agenda item on “Concern on the Car Parking Facilities in Noble Square” raised by Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH)**  
**(DDHC Paper No. 16/2017)**

---

(Mr AU Lap-sing, MH and Mr LO Kin-hei left the meeting at 8:57 p.m. and 9:06 p.m. respectively.)

78. The Chairman welcomed Mr KU Chung-yee, Property Service Manager/S(HKI)1 of HD; and Ms LAU Wai-yee, Acting Senior Engineer/Southern & Peak of TD, to the meeting. He said that Mr AU Nok-hin and Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH had put forward written requests to discuss “Follow up the Impact of the Resale of Divested Car Parking Spaces in Wah Kwai” and “Concern on the Car Parking Facilities in Noble Square” respectively. As both agenda items bore relevance to Noble Square, they would be discussed concurrently. He invited the two Members to introduce their agenda items.



79. Mr AU Nok-hin briefed Members on his agenda item, with details given at Annex 1 to the discussion paper. He stressed that the divestment of parking spaces of Noble Square Car Park had adversely affected the daily life of residents, and queried why LandsD had failed to decline the application concerned in the first place. To address the issues arising from the divestment of parking spaces, he suggested identifying a site near Wah Kwai Estate for the construction of a temporary car park for the use of affected residents on a rental basis.

80. Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH briefed Members on her agenda item, with details given at Annex 2 to the discussion paper. She said that recommendation had been made to TD on the addition of public parking spaces at Tin Wan Praya Road for the use of those residents affected by the divestment of parking spaces on a rental basis. However, TD had not yet given a definite response.

81. Ms KO Wing-yee briefed Members on the LandsD's written reply, with details given at Annex 3 to the discussion paper. She invited Members to note the Development Bureau's written reply on the proposed car park use at the existing Tin Wan Concrete Batching Plant site.

82. Mr KU Chung-yee briefed Members on the HD's written reply, with details given at Annex 4 to the discussion paper.

83. Ms LAU Wai-yee briefed Members on the TD's written reply, with details given at Annex 5 to the discussion paper. She added that currently, there was neither suitable space at Tin Wan Praya Road available for the provision of on-street parking spaces nor vacant government land for the construction of a car park under short-term tenancy. She also said that it was the Government's transport policy to encourage members of the public to use public transport wherever possible. The continuous provision of additional parking spaces would promote private car ownership and usage, thereby stimulating further growth in the private car fleet and aggravating traffic congestion on existing roads. Lastly, she pointed out that TD did not have any authority to intervene in the routine operations and commercial decisions of car park owners.

84. Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH, Mr AU Nok-hin and Mr CHAI Man-hon raised the following comments and enquiries on the subject:

- (a) a Member said that according to the land lease conditions, Hong Kong

Housing Authority (HA) would provide car park facilities for the use of residents in Wah Kwai Estate and Ka Lung Court on a rental basis. However, previously a parking space owner had attempted to lease his own parking space at an unreasonably high monthly rent, which was unaffordable to tenants. She considered that even though the existing car park had already been divested, HA still had the responsibility of intervening in the leasing arrangements of the parking spaces concerned, with a view to protecting the interests of residents;

- (b) a Member said that there was a shortage of motorcycle parking spaces in Wah Kwai Estate. She had proposed to TD the allocation of a site in the district for the provision of motorcycle parking spaces. However, so far TD had failed to clearly explain the reason why her proposal was declined;
- (c) a Member reiterated his proposal on identifying a site near Wah Kwai Estate for the construction of a temporary car park, and called on fellow Members' support;
- (d) a Member pointed out that quite a number of existing car parks in public housing estates were owned by the Link Real Estate Investment Trust (the Link). He hoped that LandsD could process future applications for sub-deeds of mutual covenant in a prudent manner, and exercise its power granted under the land leases in order to prevent the recurrence of divestment of car parks in public housing estates; and
- (e) a Member said that currently, there was increasing demand for parking spaces in Wah Fu Estate because many tenants parked their vehicles in the estate. This had aroused public concern. In this connection, he asked HD about the measures to be taken to accord priority to residents in Wah Fu Estate in using parking spaces.

85. Mr KU Chung-yee responded that under Clause 3(25) of the land lease, the owner of Wah Kwai Estate Car Park had to provide a specified number of parking spaces, including motorcycle parking spaces, at the land lot concerned.

86. Ms KO Wing-yee reiterated that regardless of whether the parking spaces were divested or not, the owner of Wah Kwai Estate Car Park was required to comply

with the conditions of the land lease governing Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 443 (the lot), including Clause 3(25), i.e. parking spaces should be provided on the lot as stipulated in the land lease for its tenants, occupiers and visitors as well as tenants of Aberdeen Inland Lot No. 416 (Ka Lung Court) to park their vehicles, in order to meet the demand for car parks in the community. Upon receipt of a complaint about or a referral of any land lease breach, LandsD would conduct site inspections and take follow-up actions in accordance with the applicable practice. If necessary, views of relevant bureaux/departments and legal advice would also be sought. If a breach of land lease conditions was substantiated, LandsD would take appropriate lease enforcement actions. For breaches of lease conditions involving parking spaces, LandsD would normally require the owners to rectify the irregularities or process their regularisation applications having regard to the actual circumstances, failing which LandsD would consider taking further actions, including registering warning letters at the Land Registry (commonly known as “imposing an encumbrance”) and vesting the relevant interests in the Financial Secretary Incorporated pursuant to relevant provisions of the Government Rights (Re-entry and Vesting Remedies) Ordinance (Cap. 126 of the Laws of Hong Kong).

87. Ms LAU Wai-yee responded that TD considered the site at Tin Wan Praya Road not suitable for the provision of a car park under short-term tenancy because it occupied a small area and no site formation works had been carried out.

88. Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH requested TD to follow up with her on the identification of a suitable site for the provision of a motorcycle parking area after the meeting. Ms LAU Wai-yee said that she would contact the Member concerned after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: TD has already liaised with the Member concerned on the matter, and would continue to explore the feasibility of providing a motorcycle parking area.]

89. In closing, the Chairman concluded that the Committee had repeatedly discussed local issues arising from the resale of the Link’s properties at its previous meetings. He asked the representatives of HA and the departments concerned to note Members’ views, and continue to monitor and follow up on the management matters of divested facilities, in particular those cases in contravention of land lease conditions, with a view to reducing the impact on residents. Besides, Members might consider making recommendations on site selection with respect to the

provision of a temporary car park.

**Agenda Item 7: Progress Report on Planning Works in the Southern District  
(DDHC Paper No. 17/2017)**

---

(Mr AU Nok-hin left the meeting at 9:25 p.m.)

90. The Chairman welcomed Mr KUNG Ho-yuen, Chief Health Inspector 1, and Mr LAU Wai-cheung, Senior Health Inspector (Cleansing/Pest Control), of FEHD, to the meeting.

**Request to Improve the Drainage System of the Villages in Southern District  
(II) On Shek O Village, Wong Chuk Hang San Wai Village, Kau Wai Village  
and Tai Hau Wan Village (Annex 1 - page 3 of the discussion paper)**

91. Mr FUNG Se-goun enquired about the latest progress and construction schedule of the Wong Chuk Hang San Wai Village Public Toilet project.

92. Mr LAU Wai-cheung responded that the Minor Building Works Committee had already approved the funding application of the project on 12 May 2017, and FEHD had also conducted site inspection in collaboration with the Architectural Services Department (ArchSD) in June 2017. Upon receipt of further updates from ArchSD, FEHD would update the Committee accordingly.

**Progress Report on Planning Works in Southern District (Annex 2 - page 7 of the  
discussion paper).**

93. Mr LAW Kam-hung enquired about the latest situation of the planning application on the Proposed Electricity Supply Installation and Hotel at No. 2 Yi Nga Drive, Ap Lei Chau (Application No. A/H15/272), and its future arrangements.

94. Miss LEE Kit-tak responded that on 12 June 2017, the applicant requested TPB to defer the consideration of the subject application for two months, in order to allow time to prepare further information in response to the comments from government departments and members of the public. On 23 June 2017, the Metro Planning Committee of TPB agreed to the applicant's request for deferment. The applicant had already submitted further information in late July 2017 (i.e. about one week before this meeting), which included the applicant's response to departmental

and public comments, six revised impact assessment reports, two newly submitted impact assessment reports and several revised layout plans. The TPB Secretariat would publish the further information on 1 August 2017 for public inspection. Members of the public could provide their comments on the further information to TPB on or before 22 August 2017.

95. Mr LAW Kam-hung asked PlanD whether TPB would reply to persons who had submitted comments and inform them of the latest arrangements.

96. Ms CHAN Judy Kapui asked how TPB would deal with public comments received in the first and second rounds of consultation.

97. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH asked whether PlanD could furnish other information in addition to the further information to be published shortly for the Committee's reference.

98. Miss LEE Kit-tak gave a consolidated response as follows:

- (a) for the time being, the TPB Secretariat would not issue acknowledgement letters to commenters; and
- (b) public comments received in the first and second rounds of consultation would be conveyed to TPB together with local views collected by the Southern District Office.

[Post-meeting note: Supplementary information from PlanD: to save resources and to be more environmental friendly, commenters could visit the TPB's website for the latest status of their applications.]

99. Ms CHAN Judy Kapui asked how the TPB Secretariat would deal with the situation that the same person had submitted comments in the first and second rounds of consultation separately.

100. Miss LEE Kit-tak responded that the first round of consultation conducted in May 2017 aimed to collect public comments on the application concerned; while the second round of consultation conducted in August 2017 aimed to collect public comments on the further information. Therefore, even though the comments had been raised by the same person, the TPB Secretariat would deal with them separately.

101. Mr LAW Kam-hung said that this Committee would not convene any meeting during the public consultation period between 1 and 22 August 2017. In this connection, he asked the Chairman how the Committee could follow up on matters relating to the further information submitted by the applicant and express its stance accordingly.

102. The Chairman said that as he understood, the further information submitted by The Hongkong Electric Company Limited did not entail amendment to the key development parameter, i.e. the proposed 1 200 guest rooms remained unchanged. However, he was concerned that if the second round of consultation was met with a more lukewarm response among residents than the first one, it might send a wrong message that opposing voices had quieted down.

103. Ms CHAN Judy Kapui shared the Chairman's view, and suggested that the Committee should either convene a special meeting or issue a letter to TPB to reiterate its opposing stance. Ms LAM Yuk-chun, MH and Dr MAK TSE How-ling, MH supported that Committee should issue a letter to the parties concerned to express its opposing stance.

104. Miss LEE Kit-tak acknowledged that the further information submitted by the applicant did not entail amendment to the key development parameter. Regarding the passage of a motion against the application concerned at the 9<sup>th</sup> DDHC meeting, PlanD had put it on record and would convey to TPB accordingly.

105. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN opined that Members should first scrutinise the content of the further information before drawing a conclusion.

106. Mr CHAI Man-hon suggested that if the further information did not have a significant impact on the existing proposal, the Committee might write to the parties concerned again to reiterate its stance against the project, and consideration might be given to addressing public attitude therein.

107. In closing, the Chairman concluded that a letter would be issued to PlanD to reiterate the stance of the Committee after the meeting.

[Post-meeting note: Previously, the Committee has approved to issue a letter to PlanD by way of circulation of papers (vide DDHC Paper No.

18/2017) to reiterate its objection to the project and request PlanD to convey this Committee's stance to TPB accordingly. The Secretariat issued a letter to PlanD on 16 August 2017 already.]

**Planning Application No. A/H15/271 (Annex 2 - page 6 of the discussion paper)**

108. Mr CHAN Fu-ming, MH enquired about the reasons for the applicant's withdrawal of the application on the Proposed Public Utility Installation (Aboveground Gas Governor Kiosk) and Crash Barrier on government land at Tin Wan Hill Road.

109. Miss LEE Kit-tak responded that as the department concerned had raised technical issues on the proposed works, the applicant had withdrawn the application, so as to allow sufficient time would be allowed for thorough consideration and study on the issues concerned.

**Progress Report on Lands Department Temporary Government Lands Allocation in Southern District (Annex 7 - page 23 of the discussion paper)**

110. Mr Paul ZIMMERMAN objected to the renewal application of the temporary site at Sandy Bay (TGLA No. GLA-THK 1875). He said that over the years, local residents had repeatedly requested the Government to resume the site for the development of a promenade. Consideration had also been given by the Working Group on District Minor Works Projects on conversion of the site as a workshop for the development of waterfront facilities. Besides, he pointed out that the site concerned suffered from the flooding problem. Nevertheless, DLO had failed to provide the high water mark for reference. He said that unless DLO addressed the above problem, he found it difficult to support this renewal application.

111. Ms KO Wing-yee responded that the Member's view would be referred to the department concerned for following up and reply.

**Agenda Item 8: Any Other Business**

---

112. The Chairman said that the Secretariat had not received any proposal under “Any Other Business”.

**Part 2 - Date of Next Meeting**

113. The Chairman advised the meeting that the 11<sup>th</sup> DDHC meeting would be held at 2:30 p.m. on 25 September 2017 (Monday).

114. There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:48 p.m.

Secretariat, Southern District Council  
September 2017