

**Confirmed Minutes of the 127th Meeting of
the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee
held on 23 June 2014 at 2:00 pm**

Present:

Dr Dorothy CHAN, BBS (Chairperson)
Dr HUNG Wing-tat, MH (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Gary ADES
Prof CHAU Kwai-cheong, JP
Dr HAU Chi-hang, Billy
Prof FUNG Tung
Prof NG Cheuk-ye, John
Miss NG Yuen-ting, Yolanda
Dr TSANG Po-keung, Eric
Prof YEP Kin-man, Ray
Miss Evelyn LEUNG (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Prof TAM Fung-ye, Nora, BBS, JP
Mr WONG Lok-tak, Luther
Prof LI Xiang-dong
Dr YIP Chee-hang, Eric

In Attendance:

Mr K F TANG	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), EPD
Mr Y K CHAN	Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
Ms Joanne CHIN	Executive Officer (CBD), EPD
Ms Daicie TONG	Executive Manager (CBD), EPD

In Attendance for Agenda Item 3:

Mr Ken WONG	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment), EPD
Mr Steve LI	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Metro Assessment)3, EPD

Project Proponent Team

Mr Arthur WONG	Project Development Director, Ocean Park Corporation
Mr Stephen CHENG	Executive Director, Aedas Ltd.
Mr Eric CHING	Associate, Mott MacDonald Hong Kong Ltd. (Mott MacDonald)
Ms Funny WU	Principal Environmental Consultant, Mott MacDonald
Mr Gary CHOW	Senior Environmental Consultant, Mott MacDonald
Mr CHAN Pak-kin	Environmental Consultant, Mott MacDonald

Confidential

Ms Heidi YU

Environmental Consultant, Mott MacDonald

Action

Item 1 : Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 126th meeting held on 19 May 2014

The draft minutes were confirmed without amendment.

Item 2: Matters arising from the minutes of the last meeting

2. The Chairperson informed that in response to the suggestion of inviting relevant authorities to give Members an overview of the cumulative impacts imposed by the Hong Kong-Zhuhai-Macao Bridge (HZMB) projects in the Lantau area, the Secretariat had arranged the Highways Department to brief the full Council on the environmental performance of the HZMB projects at the ACE meeting to be held on 21 July.

3. The Chairperson informed Members that the EIA report on “Expansion of Hong Kong International Airport into a Three-Runway System” (the 3RS EIA report) was on public inspection between 20 June and 19 July. The EIA report had been selected for submission to ACE. EIASC meetings had been scheduled on 11 August (full day), 13 August (AM session) and 18 August (PM session) to discuss the objectives of and the key environmental aspects covered in the 3RS EIA report, and for consolidating its recommendation to the full Council. Non-EIASC Members would be invited to join the discussion. The Chairperson also encouraged Members to attend the public forum organized by the Airport Authority Hong Kong on 28 June. She had also asked the Secretariat to explore the practicability of setting up a data centre where Members could access the relevant materials on the 3RS EIA report and the public comments received for Members’ reference before EIASC would meet on 11 August.

Secretariat

Item 3 : EIA Report on “Tai Shue Wan Development at Ocean Park”
(ACE-EIA Paper 2/2014)

Internal Discussion Session

4. The Chairperson advised that today’s meeting would discuss the EIA report on “Tai Shue Wan Development at Ocean Park”. It was a designated project under “Schedule 2” of the EIA Ordinance (EIAO). The public inspection period of the report was from 20 May 2014 to 18 June 2014. The main concerns were related to protection / improvement of the roosting site for ardeids. As an administrative arrangement, public comments and the gist of major issues / concerns received by EPD had been circulated to Members for reference before the meeting. Written response from the project proponent (i.e. the Ocean Park Corporation, OPC) to the questions raised by Members had also been circulated for Members’ information

before the meeting.

5. The Chairperson informed Members that the discussion of the EIA report would be divided into the following four sessions –

- (a) Internal Discussion Session
- (b) Presentation Session
- (c) Question-and-Answer Session
- (d) Internal Discussion Session

The Presentation Session and Question-and-Answer Session would be opened to the public. The Internal Discussion Sessions and all other parts of the meeting would remain closed.

6. The Chairperson asked Members if they had any interest to declare. A Member declared that he was a member of the Ocean Park Conservation Foundation Scientific Advisory Committee which advised OPC on funding conservation projects. He advised that the Committee had no involvement in the present EIA report to be discussed. The meeting agreed that the Member could stay and continue participating in the discussion.

7. The Chairperson reminded Members to keep confidentiality of the discussion on the EIA report as the full Council had yet to consider the Subcommittee's recommendations before tendering its comments on the report under the EIAO. Members were advised to refer any enquiries to the Secretariat for follow up in case they were approached on the discussion and/or decision of the Subcommittee.

8. For a more structured and focused discussion, the Chairperson suggested and Members agreed to raise questions on the key subject areas of the EIA report in the order of –

- (a) Ecology
- (b) Visual and landscape impacts
- (c) Air quality and noise impacts
- (d) Water conservation

[The project proponent team joined the meeting at this juncture.]

Presentation Session (Open Session)

9. Mr Stephen Cheng first gave an overview of the need and the layout of the Tai Shue Wan Development (the Project), followed by Mr Eric Ching who briefed Members on the different environmental aspects of the EIA report.

10. In reply to the question from a Member during the powerpoint presentation that the table comparing the total number of night-roosting ardeids in Ap Lei Chau

and Tai Shue Wan areas should give a full-year picture instead of from August to November 2013, Mr Eric Ching explained that the table served to give a direct comparison of the findings of the EIA report with the Environmental Monitoring and Audit (EM&A) findings collected for the South Island Line project, which had used data for these four months only for the study.

Question-and-Answer Session (Open Session)

Ecology

11. A Member enquired if the project proponent would first re-provision the Flamingo Pond in the south-western part of the project site as an alternative roosting site for ardeids and other wild birds before commencement of construction works of the Project. He further enquired if there were any developments associated with the Flamingo Pond that might cause disturbance in the vicinity of the re-provisioned Flamingo Pond. Mr Eric Ching said that there would not be any water rides or major human activities in the vicinity of the area which could serve as a buffer area between the new Water Park main campus and the Ecological Enhancement Area. Mr Arthur Wong supplemented that they were willing to consider the practicability of advancing the re-provisioning of the Flamingo Pond, taking into account the schedules of other construction works of the Project.

12. In response to a Member' concern on the possible impact on the northern and eastern streams in the project site, Mr Gary Chow informed that the current project design would avoid construction works on the eastern stream completely. Having regard that the northern stream was only a seasonal seepage with slow water flow, any impact imposed on it arising from the project would be insignificant.

13. Regarding the concern on the drop in the number of birds in Tai Shue Wan, Mr Arthur Wong said that egrets were noted to have moved out of the project site since mid 2013. The Hong Kong Bird Watching Society (HKBWS) had advanced a suggestion that the previous presence of flamingos might have provided certain assurance to egrets that the area was safe. Egrets probably sought alternative roosting site when the flamingos were removed.

Woodland loss and compensation planting

14. A Member asked for clarification on the different terminologies used in the EIA report for permanent woodland loss, temporary woodland loss, woodland compensation and woodland reinstatement. Mr Eric Ching explained that felling trees and planting them back later in situ was regarded as temporary woodland loss as the woodland would be reinstated in the same locality after the trees were planted back. The Member opined that tree felling already represented a permanent loss of the woodland as the trees newly planted could never be of the exact species and comparable maturity as those which had been felled. Two Members echoed that the newly planted trees might not re-create the same ecological functions that originally

existed in the area.

15. A Member asked for details of the compensatory tree planting plan including the objectives, species to be selected, as well as the management and monitoring of the planted trees. Another Member also asked about the criteria for selecting the species. Mr Chan Pak-kin replied that they would plant native species in the woodland compensation area. As the site had a direct marine frontage, they would select species with high tolerance to strong wind and salt sprays. The species should be those currently existed in the area that could adapt to the unique site conditions. They would also select those species that were the roosting substrates for ardeids. In answering a Member's further question that only four species were named in the EIA report for planting in the compensated woodland areas, Mr Eric Ching said that the tree planting list was not meant to be exhaustive, and the four species named were for general reference purpose. Mr Arthur Wong supplemented that the species to be planted basically would be the same as those currently being identified in the local environment. They would submit a Woodland Compensatory Plan with all the details to EPD and AFCD for consideration / approval before they developed the woodland compensation areas.

16. A Member remarked that the proposed three-year monitoring period for the compensated woodland areas was too short in view of the long years required for trees to grow to maturity. It would be difficult for the project proponent to see to the effectiveness of the compensatory measures within the timeframe. Mr Eric Ching replied that the EIA report had proposed three years was for initial monitoring. They would review and present their findings. AFCD's views would be sought on any extension which might be required when nearing the end of the three-year monitoring period. They would review the situation and extend the monitoring period as and when considered necessary. Mr Arthur Wong assured Members of their continued commitment to conserve the plantation in the project site. He said that almost half of the species matured from plantation care over the past 30 years since the opening of Ocean Park. They had every intention to maintain the new plantation in the same good condition as before.

17. Mr Eric Ching further confirmed with a Member's question that all the compensatory planting would be provided within the project site and the Ocean Park's boundary.

Ardeids

18. A Member agreed that the wintering period was the most important roosting period for ardeids. He asked why the ecological survey conducted in 2013 had not covered the two months of December 2013 and January 2014 which were the most important wintering period for roosting. Mr Eric Ching explained that the ecological field survey was carried out from February to November 2013 in compliance with the requirements of the Study Brief. He pointed out that the number of night-roosting ardeids had dropped to zero for two consecutive months in

October and November 2013. They considered that the data collected from the survey and other literature review had proved sufficient for forming the basis of the ecological impact assessment.

19. A Member noted the hypothesis that the roosting site of ardeids was originally in Wong Chuk Hang, which moved to Tai Shue Wan for one year due to the construction of the South Island Line (East) project, and further moved to Ap Lei Chau in the current survey. It was evident that there was a roosting population within the areas of Wong Chuk Hang, Tai Shue Wan and Ap Lei Chau, and these birds were sensitive to human disturbance. However, no assessment had been made in respect of the cumulative impacts imposed by possible developments in the three localities on the roosting population. The Member opined that developments in Ap Lei Chau in future might displace ardeids out of Aberdeen altogether after all the three localities were developed. Mr Eric Ching recognized the sporadic nature of ardeid roosting patterns along Aberdeen Channel, and in this light the EIA report has proposed to set up an Ecological Enhancement Area in Tai Shue Wan to provide an alternative roosting site for ardeids and other wild birds.

20. In reply to the question from a Member, Mr Arthur Wong gave the assurance that they would provide favourable conditions and settings in the Ecological Enhancement Area for ardeids to roost after completion of the construction works in the project site. They were keeping dialogues with HKBWS on the matter.

21. In response to a Member's suggestion on actively setting up an egretty in the project site, Mr Eric Ching said that the Ecological Enhancement Area served to create a habitat suitable for night roosting. There would be an opportunity for it developing into an egretty in future.

Landscape and visual impacts

22. A Member commended the project proponent on their efforts in the landscaping works, and suggested the use of native species over exotic flora species in the slope greening works to better integrate with the natural environment.

23. A Member was concerned about the design of the swimming pool in using an extensive skylight and the resultant glare impact. He also asked if spot lighting would be used to light up building structures after dusk. Mr Stephen Cheng informed that the size of the skylight had been substantially reduced from its original design, and non-reflective glazing materials would be used. He further advised that only general lighting would be maintained. Mr Arthur Wong supplemented that the street lighting level was designed with regard to the pedestrian and vehicular movements in the area, and no lighting impact was expected as there were no residential developments nearby. On this, the Member requested the project proponent to provide revised lighting simulations, an updated roof plan and configuration of the skylight for Members' reference.

24. A Member pointed out that there was minimal difference in the visual appearance of the major building bulk of the development as presented in the photomontages at Day 1 of the project and 10 years later. He opined that the project proponent had not fully explored the potential of enhancing edge treatment and vertical planting on the buildings to improve the overall visual quality and designing the building terraces to match with the natural landscape. He further remarked that no artificial greening features should be considered. Mr Stephen Cheng responded that they would plant hanging plants and climbers to soften the edges of the roofs and terraces, but there would not be vertical greening. While the detailed planting could not be presented clearly in the photomontages, he advised that they had obtained in-principle approval from the Planning Department and the Lands Department on the Master Landscape Plan under the Town Planning Ordinance (TPO).

25. A Member was concerned about the glare effect of the swimming pool skylight that would give rise to light pollution. Mr Stephen Cheng replied that their objective was to create a relaxing, resort-type atmosphere, and hence no strong lighting would be used. A lighting consultant had been engaged to devise measures to avoid reflective lighting. He also confirmed that non-reflective, low-e glazing materials would be used on the building bulk to minimize the chance of collision of birds with the reflective structures.

26. In reply to the question from A Member on the coverage of the woodland compensation areas, Mr Eric Ching said that the additional green roof and other planting in buildings would be provided on top of the 0.84 ha of woodland compensation areas as stated in the EIA report. Mr Stephen Cheng explained that the additional planting was made in response to the recent planning application submitted under the TPO in May 2014. The information could not be updated in the EIA report which was published in March 2014.

27. A Member asked about the design and colour scheme of the building structures, and suggested using *Machilus sp* to create a unique scenic spot for visitors to appreciate similar to the popular sites for *Sakura* species that people flocked to visit in Japan and Korea. Mr Stephen Cheng replied that an earth-tone colour scheme would be adopted to allow the buildings and facilities to blend well into the surrounding natural environment. They also required further discussions with the water ride suppliers in this regard as the rides were mainly prepared in rainbow colour. Mr Arthur Wong followed that they were open on the choice of flora species to be planted so long as they were of ecological benefits to the surrounding environment.

28. As regards the choice of lawn grass for roof planting, a Member strongly advised against the use of *Carpet Grass* as the species would wither and stay dormant during the winter months. He suggested *Zoysia Japonica* which was fungus- and insect-free, required minimal fertilizer, and could grow all year round.

Mr Arthur Wong said that they had an open mind in this regard.

29. A Member was also concerned about the sustainability of plants on green roof and other green planting. He suggested flora species which could grow sustainably on their own without much irrigation and other attention as that would involve substantial management costs and extensive maintenance.

Transport of construction materials

30. A Member asked about the reason for using trucks instead of barges for transporting construction materials. He pointed out that there was an existing jetty near the project site, and sea transport should be preferred over land transport to better contain dust and noise impacts. Mr Eric Ching said that they had to avoid using sea transport because marine works would be required to modify the existing jetty into a proper barging point which in turn would affect the corals in the area. He remarked that at most 15 construction vehicle movements per hour were expected for transporting the construction materials. The potential air quality and noise impacts due to the truck movements had been addressed in the EIA report.

Air quality and noise impacts

31. In reply to A Member's enquiries about the site practice to be adopted to minimize air and noise impacts during the construction phase of the project, Mr Stephen Cheng said that generally pad footing would be used for the foundation works. Mr Arthur Wong supplemented that use of sheet piling would be limited to localized areas for works on sewages and manhole. He also advised that slope excavation would be kept to the minimal, with soil nailing 7-8 meters deep into the soil be done for slope stabilisation. Mr Eric Ching followed that necessary mitigation measures such as the use of quieter power mechanical equipment and moveable noise barriers would be adopted during the construction phase to meet the relevant environmental standards in Hong Kong.

32. A Member sought clarification on the decrease in the projected background traffic flows at concerned road links in 2015 as shown in the EIA report. Mr Arthur Wong said that some 15 000 visitors had been recorded using Tai Shue Wan as the second entrance to Ocean Park before it was closed in 2011 pending redevelopment, and this figure was adopted as the basis for comparing the traffic impact from construction vehicles. The traffic forecast aimed at showing the differences in traffic flows between the two scenarios when the Tai Shue Wan entrance was in operation before 2011 and when the entrance was temporarily closed during construction of the Project. After the new Water Park came into operation, it was estimated that there would be less visitors, i.e. only around 7 000 visitors using the Tai Shue Wan entrance. They said that without the new Water Park, they would likely re-open this former second entrance to regulate visitor movement and improve visitor circulation.

33. A Member opined that it was common practice that traffic forecast should be made by comparing with current situations rather than with a historical scenario. It was unrealistic as visitors to Ocean Park would not use Tai Shue Wan if there were no amusement facilities thereat without the Project. The Chairperson said that she assumed the projection was based on the scenario which had the highest traffic volume during operation of the new Water Park and that the impact on the traffic flow to nearby roads would drop when the South Island Line Ocean Park Station had commenced operation.

34. In response to a Member's enquiry on the possibility for the project proponent to restrict polluting vehicles coming to Ocean Park to minimize pollution from vehicular emissions, Mr Eric Ching said that they could only impose control on their own vehicle fleet. Mr Arthur Wong supplemented that, with the opening of the South Island Line Ocean Park Station, it was anticipated that more visitors would take the mass transit, with the resultant drop in traffic volume and air pollution impact in the area. He also advised that they planned to encourage more use of public transport by providing shuttle service for visitors to commute between the Ocean Park main entrance at Wong Chuk Hang and Tai Shue Wan.

35. In reply to a Member's further question on the use of cleaner vehicles, Mr Arthur Wong said that use of electric vehicles was their target subject to availability in the market as well as the costs consideration. The Member referred to the case of Kowloon Bay International Trade & Exhibition Centre (KITEC) where they operated half of the shuttle fleet with electric coaches at a lower overall running cost.

36. A Member asked whether the project would increase the traffic flow at the Wong Chuk Hang main entrance. Mr Arthur Wong replied that, after the opening of the South Island Line Ocean Park Station in 2015 / 2016, visitors would be encouraged to use public transport. The number of visitors driving to the Park was expected to drop, while some of the bus routes would also be cancelled as a result. They also planned to work with the media to give early announcement if their public car park was nearing full occupancy.

Water conservation

37. A Member enquired about the water conservation and wastewater treatment measures to be in place when the new Water Park came into operation. Another Member proposed the adoption of permeable pavement design for harvesting rainwater for irrigation or cleaning purposes. Mr Stephen Cheng said that their consultant team had been liaising with the Water Supplies Department (WSD) and aimed to devise a more sustainable design on water conservation. In this light, a rainwater harvesting system would be set up to collect rainwater for irrigation and flushing. They were also working with WSD and an international firm to come up with a plan on more economic use of water as water charges would account for a major operational cost of the new Water Park.

38. A Member asked whether there would be any educational facilities in the new Water Park on topics such as nature or environmental conservation. Mr Arthur Wong said that while details of the educational facilities were beyond the scope of the EIA report, they were developing the education programmes with themes on conserving water resources.

39. In reply to a Member's question on the progress of the hotel building near the Wong Chuk Hang entrance, Mr Eric Ching advised that the hotel was not a designated project and no EIA study would be required.

40. A Member asked whether the re-provisioned Flamingo Pond would be housing flamingos. Mr Arthur Wong replied that it was subject to further deliberation as AFCDC had imposed new licensing requirements for keeping the birds in an enclosed area rather than an open space as in the past.

41. The Chairperson thanked the project proponent team for the presentation and invited them to take note of Members' suggestion as well as providing the supplementary information for Members' reference.

[The project proponent team left the meeting at this juncture.]

Internal Discussion Session

42. The Chairperson reminded Members that the EIASC could make recommendations to ACE on the EIA report with the following approach:

- (i) endorse the EIA report without condition; or
- (ii) endorse the EIA report with conditions and details of the proposed conditions; or
- (iii) defer the decision to the full Council for further consideration – highlight issues or reasons for not reaching a consensus or issues to be further considered by the full Council; or
- (iv) reject the EIA report and inform the proponent the right to go to the full Council.

43. The Chairperson proposed and Members supported to impose a condition to request the project proponent to develop the Ecological Enhancement Area at the south-western end of the project site in the first phase of the construction of the Project for the purpose of establishing an alternative roosting site for ardeids and other wild birds so as to improve the overall ecological benefits of the Tai Shue Wan Development.

44. The Chairperson remarked that there was an observation that the delineation of temporary and permanent loss of woodland was unclear. Project proponents should be advised to give special attention on this matter when

submitting their EIA reports in future. For the present EIA report, a Member considered it necessary for the project proponent to differentiate the ecological purpose of woodland reinstatement and compensatory planting as well as setting out the justifications on the flora species to be selected.

45. A Member sought clarification on the appropriate juncture for EIASC to require a detailed woodland compensatory plan from the project proponents. Mr Y K Chan said that for the present EIA report, comments from ACE would be taken into account by EPD when the project proponent submitted the detailed Woodland Compensation Plan for approval before commencement of construction. He further explained that in general, the major requirement of woodland compensation was a quantitative approach for compensating the loss of woodland in terms of area. The species to be used might not be comprehensively specified except that native flora species should be opted as far as practicable. Mr Chan supplemented that while the list for compensatory planting as set out in the EIA report was not exhaustive, the four species named should serve well for Members' reference at this stage.

46. A Member reiterated his earlier disagreement on the notion of "temporary woodland loss" used by the project proponent as he was concerned that the distorted concept would be picked up by other project proponents for their EIA reporting in future. Mr Y K Chan shared that the description used in the present context was confusing. There appeared to be the misguided notion that it only represented a temporary loss of the ecological function which could be restored at the same site some years later. He echoed the Member's views that the loss of woodland followed by on-site reinstatement should not be strictly considered as "temporary woodland loss". The Chairperson invited AFCD to advise project proponents on the proper definition and use of terminology in their future EIA submissions. The Member recapped that while the project proponent should submit the Woodland Compensation Plan for approval by EPD, they should aim to establish a better quality and more diversified secondary woodland areas in the project site rather than replicating the young secondary woodland habitat in situ.

AFCD

47. The Chairperson suggested and a Member supported to include a recommendation to ask the project proponent to provide favourable conditions and settings in the Ecological Enhancement Area for ardeids to roost after completion of construction works in the project site.

48. A Member requested the project proponent to submit an indicative roof skylight plan and its configuration to allow Members to better understand the extent of glare impact and possible light pollution to the locality. A Member echoed that the project proponent should give due consideration to the glare impact on local ecology. In this regard, a Member suggested if certain performance requirements could be stipulated to govern the design such as adopting non-reflective skylight and use of an earth-tone colour scheme for buildings and facilities in the project site. Mr K F Tang clarified that the project proponent had to submit relevant plans and design to the Buildings Department, which however might not refer to the EIA

report in vetting the submission. That being the situation, Members would have to decide carefully on any requirements on design which were to be proposed for inclusion as a condition in the Environmental Permit (EP) or as a recommendation for advice to the project proponent. He advised that a condition in the EP should be specific, enforceable and practicable for compliance.

49. The Chairperson opined that the requirements on design should not be imposed as conditions as the design plans as well as choice of materials could vary and improve over time. The Chairperson proposed that while the project proponent could be requested to submit the design drawings for Members' information, a set of recommendations incorporating Members' requirements could be proposed for consideration by the project proponent. Members agreed to this approach.

50. A Member supported the observations made by two Members on the design of the new Water Park for public education purpose as well as for devising water conservation measures in cooperation with WSD. A Member added that a permeable paving design for harvesting rainwater should also be included in the recommendations.

51. The Chairperson referred to a Member's earlier suggestion and proposed to recommend the project proponent to introduce green transport mode including the use of electric vehicles for shuttle service subject to available technology at the time of operation.

52. The Chairperson proposed and Members agreed to put forward the following general comments and observations on the EIA report to the project proponent for appropriate improvement –

- (a) the photomontages of the building bulk for illustrating the visual impact of the project before and after operation should be presented with care to match with the information in the EIA report;
- (b) due consideration should be given to the selection of the year and data for comparison and analysis when presenting the survey findings on ecological impact assessment and the traffic flow forecast; and
- (c) the objective and approach on woodland reinstatement should be presented with greater clarity.

53. Having regard to the findings and recommendations of the EIA report and the information provided by the project proponent, Members agreed to recommend to the ACE that the EIA report could be endorsed with the following proposed condition and recommendation –

Condition of endorsement

The project proponent shall develop the Ecological Enhancement Area (i.e. the re-provisioned Flamingo Pond) at the south-western end of the project site in the first phase of the construction for the purpose of establishing an alternative roosting site for ardeids and other wild birds so as to improve the overall ecological benefits of the Tai Shue Wan Development.

Recommendations

- (a) Despite there will be a condition requiring submission of the Woodland Compensation Plan for approval by the Director of Environmental Protection, it is recommended that the project proponent should consult the Director of Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation and set out the justifications on the flora species to be selected for planting in the Woodland Compensation Plan with the view to providing a better quality and more diversified secondary woodland areas in the project site, and manage the tree planting with respect to the general health condition and survival rate of the plants.
- (b) The project proponent should provide favourable conditions and settings in the Ecological Enhancement Area for ardeids to roost after completion of the construction works in the project site.
- (c) The project proponent should consider sustainable flora species for green roof and vertical planting to blend in with the surrounding natural environment.
- (d) The project proponent should consider enhancing the greening design of the project including the use of non-reflective materials to reduce glare as well as adoption of an earth-tone colour scheme to allow the buildings and facilities in the site to blend well into the surrounding natural environment.
- (e) The project proponent should liaise closely with the Water Supplies Department on water saving measures to be adopted in the project site, including a permeable paving design for harvesting rainwater for irrigation or cleaning purposes.
- (f) The project proponent is strongly recommended to pursue the opportunity to incorporate programmes on nature conservation in the overall design of the project for public education purpose.
- (g) The project proponent should introduce green transport including the use of electric vehicles for guest shuttle service subject to available technology at the time of operation.

[Post-meeting note: The meeting agreed that the project proponent team would not be required to attend the full Council meeting on the report.]

Item 4 : Any other business

54. There was no other business for discussion at the meeting.

Item 5 : Date of next meeting

55. The Chairperson reminded that EIASC will next meet on 11 August 2014 to start discussion on the 3RS EIA report. Members would be advised on the agenda in due course.

**EIA Subcommittee Secretariat
July 2014**