

**Confirmed Minutes of the 140th Meeting of
the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee
on 11 September 2017 at 2:00 p.m.**

Present:

Professor TAM Fung-ye, Nora, B.B.S., J.P. (Chairperson)
Ir Cary CHAN, J.P.
Dr Billy HAU
Ms Julia LAU
Professor Albert LEE
Professor Kenneth LEUNG
Ir Professor Irene LO, J.P.
Ir MA Lee-tak, S.B.S.
Professor John NG
Dr Eric TSANG
Mr Simon WONG, J.P.
Professor WONG Sze-chun, B.B.S., J.P.
Ms Becky LAM (Secretary)

Absent with Apologies:

Dr HUNG Wing-tat, M.H. (Deputy Chairman)
Dr Michael LAU
Mr Andrew LEE
Ir Michelle TANG
Mr Luther WONG, J.P.

In Attendance:

Mrs Alice CHEUNG	Deputy Director of Environmental Protection (3)
Mr C F WONG	Assistant Director (Environmental Assessment), Environmental Protection Department (EPD)
Mr Simon CHAN	Assistant Director (Conservation), Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department (AFCD)
Mr Louis CHAN	Principal Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment), EPD
Mr Lawrence NGO	Senior Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment)1, EPD
Ms HO Ching Yee	Senior Nature Conservation Officer (South), AFCD
Ms NG Ka Yan, Connie	Nature Conservation Officer (Lantau), AFCD
Mr Anthony HO	Environmental Protection Officer (Regional Assessment)12, EPD
Miss Dora CHU	Executive Officer (CBD) 1, EPD

Miss Apple LEUNG

Executive Officer (CBD) 2, EPD

In Attendance for Item 3:

Project Proponent Team

MTR Corporation Limited

Mr Wilfred YEUNG, Head of Property Project
Mr Simon CHAN, Chief Project Manager-Property
Mr Dave NG, Acting Chief Town Planning Manager
Mr Edward NGAI, Engineering Manager
Ms Felice WONG, Environment Manager
Mr Edan LI, Environmental Engineer I
Ms Louise LO, Environmental Engineer II

*Simon Kwan & Associates
Limited*

Mr CHUNG Cheuk Wai, Chief Architect

*Ove Arup & Partners Hong
Kong Limited
(Topside EIA Consultant)*

Mr Franki CHIU, Director
Mr Elvis LAU, Consultant
Mr Vincent LAI, Ecologist

*AECOM Asia Co. Limited
(Railway EIA Consultant)*

Mr Josh LAM, Executive Director
Mr Jimmy HUI, Technical Director
Ms Angela TONG, Associate Director
Mr Isaac CHU, Senior Environmental Consultant

Action

The Chairperson welcomed Members to the meeting and informed that apologies of absence had been received from Dr Hung Wing-tat, Dr Michael Lau, Mr Andrew Lee, Mr Luther Wong and Ir Michelle Tang.

Item 1: Confirmation of the draft minutes of the 139th EIASC meeting held on 14 August 2017

2. The Chairperson informed that the draft minutes of the last meeting were circulated to Members on 7 September 2017. The draft minutes were confirmed without amendments.

Item 2 : Matters arising

3. The Chairperson informed that the Environmental Impact Assessment Subcommittee (EIASC) last met on 14 August 2017 to discuss the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report on “Lamma Power Station Navigation Channel”. Since ACE meeting on 4 September 2017 was cancelled, the meeting recommended the full Council to endorse the EIA report with a list of conditions and recommendations as set out in ACE Paper 17/2017 by way of circulation. The

recommendations of ACE were submitted to the Director of Environmental Protection (DEP) on 11 September 2017.

Item 3: Discussion on EIA reports on “Proposed Comprehensive Residential and Commercial Development atop Siu Ho Wan Depot” and “Siu Ho Wan Station and Siu Ho Wan Depot Replanning Works”

(ACE-EIA Papers 4/2017 & 5/2017)

4. The Chairperson informed that the two EIA reports to be discussed were highly interrelated, the project proponent (i.e. MTR Corporation Limited) and its consultants would give their presentations in the order of (i) EIA report on “Proposed Comprehensive Residential and Commercial Development atop Siu Ho Wan Depot” (“Topside EIA”); and (ii) EIA report on “Siu Ho Wan Station and Siu Ho Wan Depot Replanning Works” (“Railway EIA”) followed by the Question-and-Answer Session of the two reports together.

5. The Chairperson invited declaration of interest from Members. A Member declared that he was engaged in a consultancy project with AECOM in relation to the slope greening works in Shatin which had no relevancy with the EIA reports to be discussed. Two Members declared that they were involved in the consultancy projects with Ove Arup and Partners Hong Kong Limited which did not involve the EIA reports to be discussed. The Chairperson and a Member declared interest as they hold a small number of shares of MTR Corporation Limited. Another Member declared interest as a Member of the Green Building Council.

6. The Chairperson reminded Members to keep confidentiality of the discussion on the EIA reports to be discussed.

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

Presentation Session (Open Session)

7. Ms Felice Wong gave an opening remark and with the aid of a powerpoint presentation, Mr Franki Chiu followed by Mr Josh Lam briefed Members on the background and objective of the projects, key findings of the EIAs and public concerns raised during the public inspection period.

Question-and-Answer Session (Open Session)

Building a liveable and sustainable community

8. Noting that the Topside project proposed to underscore a transit-oriented, compact development (TOD) in support of the Government’s strategic planning

objective as set out in the “Hong Kong 2030+: Towards a Planning Vision and Strategy Transcending 2030” (HK2030+), a Member asked the project proponent to explain the measures adopted for green building practices and incorporation of the concept of a sustainable community for the project site in the EIA.

9. In response, Mr Dave Ng explained that they had adopted design elements promulgated by the Buildings Department’s Sustainable Building Design Guidelines, and BEAM standards in future planning and operational stages of the Topside project. In addition, they had incorporated elements of a smart city into the scheme design for topside development planning such as incorporating cycle tracks and transit-oriented development. He supplemented that this project was at the initial planning stage and the concept and relevant measures to enhance sustainable development like the use of open space and urban design would be further explored at the detailed design stage.

10. In reply to a Member’s enquiry on the feasibility of recycling grey water within the project site, Mr Dave Ng advised that there were spatial constraints at the podium level for the installation of a grey water collection system. Nevertheless, he agreed to keep in view of the latest technology for more compact designs of the collection system and to consider such a system during the detailed design stage.

11. A Member enquired and Mr Edward Ngai replied in the affirmative that natural lighting and natural ventilation measures would be deployed at the Siu Ho Wan Depot (SHD) where applicable with a view to reducing energy consumption. Ms Felice Wong said that the erection of columns instead of concrete walls under the podium deck would facilitate natural ventilation and natural lighting. Mr Ngai added that each column would be about 11 metres apart.

12. A Member was of the view that the design of the project was apparently engineering-driven. She suggested the incorporation of green elements in the design of the noise canopy, with consideration of the materials used, angle of elevation and the direction of alignment etc., and echoed another Member’s view that the service road at the northern site boundary should be redeveloped to facilitate residents’ access to the waterfront. She also pointed out that the block siting of the development at the preliminary planning stage had direct implications on the sustainable development and BEAM Plus rating. As the development would be constructed in a new project site, a Member followed that the project proponent should seize the opportunity to optimize the massing and connectivity at the early planning stage of the project site.

13. To minimize disruption to the existing depot and railway operations, Mr Dave Ng explained that the first stage of replanning works was constrained to the existing long strip of open storage area at the southern part of the depot site. While noise impact from depot operation could be reduced by reprovisioning the stabling tracks under the concrete deck at an earlier stage, such a development scheme would impose constraints on the overall building disposition.

14. A Member pointed out that the provision of open space in the Topside project could just meet the prevailing provision standard of 2m² per person as stipulated in HK2030+. As the standard would be increased to 2.5m² per person, he reminded the project proponent to verify whether the relevant requirements could be satisfied when the project was completed in 2036.

15. Mr Dave Ng advised that reference had been made to the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines when determining the site coverage of greenery, which was about 9 hectares. He agreed to keep in view of any changes in the open space provision standard and to explore the feasibility of increasing the provision of local and district open space during the detailed design stage.

16. A Member considered that photovoltaic (PV) panels could be used for the noise canopy. Ms Felice Wong explained that a composite design involving the use of opaque noise-absorbing materials at some lengths of the noise canopy might introduce some constraints.

Management of food waste

17. On management of food waste, Mr Dave Ng said that food waste decomposers would be installed at the central refuse collection chamber within the project site. In addition, the launch of food waste campaign such as the Food Wise Hong Kong campaign and Food Angel in shopping malls would be explored to recycle food waste generated by the commercial operators in future.

18. Noting that the Organic Waste Treatment Facilities, Phase 1 (OWTF) would be constructed in the vicinity of the area, a Member suggested and another Member concurred that the project proponent could maximize their geographical advantage and devise some strategies to increase the efficiency in the collection and transportation of food waste to nearby OWTF.

19. In response to a Member's concern that the transportation of food waste might become a source of odour, Mr Dave Ng said that odour emission from food waste was not anticipated as they would be stored in sealed containers during transportation to OWTF. Mr Franki Chiu added that the cumulative impact of different odour sources including the OWTF, Siu Ho Wan Sewerage Treatment Works (SHWSTW) and North Lantau Refuse Transfer Station (NLRTS) had been assessed and mitigating measures such as the adoption of deodorizer at the Sewage Pumping Station (SPS) would be implemented to address odour impact as appropriate.

Landscape and visual impacts

20. A Member asked the project proponent to justify the proposed locations for breezeways/air paths. Mr Dave Ng said that the breezeways/visual corridors would be planned at strategic locations based on air ventilation and visual

assessments to enhance air circulation and visual permeability. Four 30m-wide breezeways were introduced running diagonally across the project site with open space/ low-rise structure to ensure penetration of annual prevailing winds from the Eastern quadrant. In addition, six horizontal Northwest-Southeast running supplementary corridors of minimum 15m-wide would be introduced to facilitate penetration of summer prevailing winds above the podium. The locations of the breezeways/visual corridors were located across the project site with an aim to reduce the overall building mass and further enhance the visual permeability of the proposed development.

21. A Member asked whether any micro-climate study and/or technical assessments had been conducted to determine the locations of breezeways and/or visual corridors for the project. In response, Mr Dave Ng replied that while they had undertaken an Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Expert Evaluation, the findings would be further evaluated and assessed at the later stage to enhance the current building layout. The Member asked the project proponent to provide information on the current AVA to justify the locations of the breezeways for the project after the meeting.

MTRC

22. Noting that the summer prevailing wind was penetrating from the South, a Member expressed concern that the use of fixed windows for two-third of the flats along the southern façade in the proposed development scheme might be unfavourable for air ventilation and encourage electricity consumption. Mr Dave Ng explained that given the southern facades of residential towers along the southern boundary were more exposed to noise sources including the road traffic noise from North Lantau Highway (NLH), and railway noise from Tung Chung Line (TCL) and Airport Express Line (AEL) the proposed design of locating openable windows facing the North was to minimise the traffic noise and rail noise impacts.

23. A Member asked the project proponent to consider liaising with the Highways Department on the possibility of using noise enclosures at the NLH with a view to containing and minimizing the negative impact of traffic noise on the residential buildings. He considered that this provision could avoid noise mitigation measures such as the installation of fixed windows at the southernmost row of the proposed residential buildings. He also suggested the project proponent to make reference to Annex 18 of the Technical Memorandum on EIA Process (TM), i.e. Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, when reviewing the design of the project.

24. In response to the concern of two Members on the building mass of the proposed development scheme, Mr Dave Ng said that typical 10-unit-per-floor layout (i.e. Type A tower) as compared with typical 8-unit-per-floor layout was adopted to allow more open space. In addition, a minimum 30% site coverage, i.e. approximately 9 hectares of greenery would be provided in accordance with the Sustainable Building Design Guidelines with landscaped open space and tree planting located primarily at podium deck level for residents.

25. Responding to a Member's enquiry of whether vertical greening could be applied to the residential development, Mr Dave Ng explained that although there might be practical difficulties, they would endeavor to allow more space for vertical greening particularly at the stepped podium towards seafront.

26. In response to a Member's comment on the extensive visual impact on sensitive receivers from across the project site as a result of the building mass and the lack of height variation of the residential towers, Mr Dave Ng explained that the project site had a span of about 1.6 km and the proposed residential towers comprised 20 m level difference from one end to the other. Given the inherent constraints of the site to adhere to the Airport Height Restriction (AHR), the current design deployed medium-rise buildings of 15 to 22 residential storeys (with maximum building heights ranging from about +86mPD to +106mPD) whereby the building height diminished gradually towards the Tai Ho Estuary.

27. Despite the development site area was about 30 hectares, Mr Wilfred Yeung reassured that sufficient green coverage would be provided though AHR requirements had to be complied with. As such, a current building height of +86mPD to +106mPD was proposed in order to meet adequate housing supply and to respond to a number of site constraints to the largest extent. Mr Dave Ng pointed out that the domestic plot ratio would likely to be within a range of three to four. Nonetheless, Mr Ng undertook to consider Members' suggestions on reviewing the building height variation in later stages of project implementation as far as practicable.

28. A Member opined and another Member concurred that with better planning, a steeper stepped profile would not necessarily lead to the loss of plot ratio.

29. Noting that the open space facing the waterfront consisted of a narrow 1.6 km long, 4m wide pathway with an extensive wall constructed along site boundary, a Member expressed concern on the visual impact and suggested widening the open space to maintain visual access. Mr Dave Ng explained that the pathway along waterfront was currently a substandard service road with no pedestrian access. The stepped height podium facing the sea would allow residents to enjoy the waterfront from above the ground.

30. Considering the waterfront landscape was a precious resource to the recreational use of future 37,800 population resided in the community, a Member suggested the project proponent to provide access to the northern site boundary and to maximize the use of the waterfront, e.g. by providing pedestrian links and/or cycle tracks. Mr Dave Ng explained that the proposed terraced podium was designed to step towards the waterfront.

Walkability and connectivity within the project site

31. In response to a Member's enquiry on enhancing connectivity and

walkability within the project site, Mr Dave Ng said that all-weather pedestrian links would be provided at both podium deck and podium levels of the project site to generate a pedestrian friendly environment. At podium deck level, covered walkway with landscaping and an internal cycle track network would be provided for access to Siu Ho Wan Station (SHO) Station. An integrated entrance was planned at podium deck level to provide seamless connection to the residents and visitors. At podium level, an air-conditioned passageway would be constructed to connect the shopping mall to the station concourse, with all the residential towers generally located within a walking distance of about 500m from the proposed passageway.

32. A Member considered that the walking distance from the eastern end of the project site to the proposed SHO Station would be over 1 km and it would require over 20-minute walk. This would not be conducive in encouraging the public to use the railway system rather than the road transport, and also in enhancing the proposed TOD as connecting point between the railway system and the city. As such, he suggested more facilities such as travellers and cycling network, parking locations could be considered in appropriate places to shorten travel time and allow an appropriate walking distance thereby strengthening walkability and improving connectivity within the project site.

33. In addition to the provision of internal cycle track network at podium deck level, a Member was of the view that the cycle track might be extended to improve the external connectivity to the nearby Tung Chung New Town Extension (TCNTE) which was about 1 to 1.5 km away. In addition, in the TCNTE there would be a comprehensive network of cycle track and walkways along the waterfront promenade for connecting the majority of leisure facilities in the Tung Chung area, the Member suggested the project proponent to consider enhancing the waterfront along the project site for connection to the TCNTE, in order to generate a synergy effect for further integration and enhancing the connectivity and walkability for both areas. In response, Mr Dave Ng said that at the detailed design stage, they would explore opportunities to foster connection with TCNTE through various means such as provision of new cycle tracks or elevated pedestrian walkways.

34. In response to a Member's enquiry on the transportation alternatives other than railway, Mr Dave Ng advised that a Public Transport Interchange (PTI) was proposed next to the concourse of the SHO Station to facilitate passengers in interchanging between different modes of public transport.

Vibration issue of topside development

35. In response to a Member's enquiry on whether vibration would be induced by the railway to the future development, Ms Felice Wong explained that a train speed limit would be imposed within SHD. In addition, the stabling tracks and the test track of the reprovisioned SHD, as well as TCL / AEL operation were all at-grade tracks without structural integration with the building structure of SHD topside development, and hence vibration transmission through structural elements

to the planned sensitive receivers was considered not significant.

Adopting the BEAM Plus principles

36. When using the BEAM Plus design principles for the new buildings, a Member suggested the project proponent to take note of the BEAM Plus neighbourhood criteria, and to apply the relevant standards through enhancing the interior design of the common areas which would be under the management of the project proponent, and to include such principles in the Deed of Mutual Covenant for continual improvement. Another Member concurred that this arrangement would be conducive to achieving a low carbon design and a sustainability community.

37. Mr Wilfred Yeung said that it was MTRC's existing practice to achieve the BEAM Plus "Gold" rating criteria for all new residential developments through tender requirement for partnering developers. They would only allow developers to achieve a lower rating if the developer could demonstrate genuine insurmountable difficulties in obtaining the "Gold" rating. While they had adopted BEAM Plus standards for residential and commercial buildings, the application of BEAM Plus Existing Buildings and BEAM Plus Neighbourhood required further consideration as they might entail significant implication whereby the responsibility would be passed onto the future residential flat owners.

Construction waste management

38. On waste management, a Member suggested the project proponent provide more options for consumers in relation to the design of residential properties, such as providing "unadorned" flats to reduce waste disposal. In response, Mr Wilfred Yeung made reference to the current market trend and opined that most buyers preferred fully furnished flats as compared to "unadorned" flats given that the finishing quality by developers was very high nowadays.

39. Noting that an estimated 1,000,000m³ of Construction and Demolition (C&D) materials would be generated from the construction of the project, a Member asked the project proponent to consider measures to reduce construction waste. Another Member concurred and opined that in addition to the basic requirement of separating inert and non-inert C&D waste, a more detailed and comprehensive separation of C&D materials should be implemented which was also favourable to the re-use of C&D materials on-site as far as practicable. In response, Mr Dave Ng explained that with reference to the "Reduction of Construction Waste Final Report" for which a C&D materials generation rate of 0.1m³ per 1m² of gross floor area was adopted, the figure was an estimate of waste generation from the topside development. He envisaged that the amount of waste generation would be significantly reduced through the various waste reduction measures to be implemented at the construction, design and implementation stages.

Designated Projects under EIAO

40. In reply to a Member's question regarding the statutory requirements, Mr C F Wong advised that the sewage pumping station assessed under the Topside EIA constituted a Schedule 2 designated project which required an Environmental Permit (EP) for its construction and operation. The engineering feasibility of the topside development was however a Schedule 3 designated project under the EIA Ordinance (EIAO) and thus an EP would not be required.

41. A Member remarked that while both the Railway and the Topside projects had the same project proponent, it was important to delineate the scope and roles of each project to avoid undesirable read-across implications. For instance, mitigation of the rail noise generated by the Railway project should not be the primary responsibility under the Topside project, which was the receiver of the noise impact. Mr C F Wong concurred that the provision of mitigation measures at source as far as practicable was a principle of the EIA mechanism.

42. Mr Dave Ng explained that as the noise canopies would be installed along the podium edge which was above the depot level, it would be more desirable for the future developer of the Topside project to undertake the installation work of the canopy. A Member was concerned that such an arrangement would set a bad precedence in which the responsibility of mitigating an environmental impact generated by a project might be shifted from the source to the receiver or other parties.

Location and design of SHO Station

43. A Member requested for further elaborations on the selected location of the SHO Station. Mr Edward Ngai explained that while three alternative locations had been considered at the initial planning stage, locating the station at the east of the project site was deemed infeasible due to the spatial constraints. The preliminary design stage therefore focused on the remaining two station options, namely the Central Station and Western Station. The Central Station option would require the realignment of the NLH which would involve extensive natural terrain improvement works and such works would encroach upon the Tai Ho Priority Site. Furthermore, as the Central Station location was on a mount that had a level difference of up to six metres with the ground level, extensive site formation works had to be undertaken in order to construct stations platforms on a flat surface. Such extensive site formation works would need to be carried out around a high speed operating railway and it would pose very high risks to both the safety and operation of the railway services. Besides, a public road was proposed at the west of the project site to connect the topside development to the Tai Ho Interchange. From the environmental perspective, it would be less desirable to locate the station and the PTI at the central which would require the extension of the public road and increase the distance for other public transport to reach the PTI. Mr Ngai explained that the Western Station would have less negative environmental impact and thus was preferred over the Central Station.

44. In reply to a Member's question regarding the planned structure of the SHO Station, Mr Edward Ngai advised that the platform would be at the ground

level and the concourse would be located at the first upper floor.

45. A Member questioned the need of a concourse. With reference to overseas station designs, he opined that direct access to platforms could facilitate better spatial connections. Mr Edward Ngai explained that the concourse and the platform would serve different functions. Mr Jimmy Hui supplemented that due to the spatial constraints imposed by the NLH, Tuen Mun – Chek Lap Kok Link and depot facilities, the floor area was barely sufficient for building the platform. Other facilities which served the functions of a concourse would have to be placed on the upper level.

46. A Member requested the project proponent to provide supplementary information to elucidate the constraints of locating the proposed station at the centre of the project site. MTRC

Conclusion

47. Mr Wilfred Yeung thanked Members for their comments and assured Members that their comments would be carefully considered, in particular on the use of the waterfront and the feasibility of connecting the podium to ground level. There being no further questions from Members, the Chairperson thanked the project proponent team for their presentation and clarification on the projects.

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

Internal Discussion Session

48. Mr C F Wong informed the meeting that given the project proponent undertook separate EIA studies to cover the topside development and depot replanning works, the EIASC should come up with separate recommendations for each EIA report. Since the topside development was a Schedule 3 designated project, no EP was required for the construction and operation of this project. In response to a Member's earlier view that the Railway project, being the source of railway noise impact, should be responsible for the corresponding mitigation measures, Mr Wong added that for those mitigation measures (e.g. the installation of noise canopies at the podium edge and provision of temporary cantilever noise barriers) included in the EIA report of the Railway project, which was a Schedule 2 designated project, EPD could include relevant conditions in the EP. With reference to other similar cases, noise mitigation measures provision could also be implemented through the town planning mechanism or the land lease.

49. In response to a Member's suggestion of noise enclosures at the NLH, Mr C F Wong advised that the primary noise source was generated from the railway operations, which had already been addressed by various mitigation measures. Mr Louis Chan remarked that the noise enclosure along NLH would be an extensive structure which could lead to significant visual impacts, and there might not be space for providing the noise enclosure at some critical sections.

50. The Chairperson advised that the EIA Subcommittee might make recommendations to ACE on the two EIA reports with the following consideration:

- (i) endorse the EIA report(s) without condition; or
- (ii) endorse the EIA report(s) with conditions and/or recommendations;
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(s) and inform the project proponent of the right to go to the full Council.

Topside EIA

51. A Member expressed concerns towards endorsing the EIA report of the Topside project. He was of the view that the project proponent did not demonstrate adequate consideration on aspects like sustainability, design of the waterfront and measures to mitigate landscape and visual impacts at the meeting. He was concerned that a lack of consideration on these aspects at an early planning stage could lead to unfavourable environmental consequences.

52. A Member concurred and pointed out that the incorporation of the concepts of sustainability and smart city was not evident in the design of the Topside project. As the location of the PTI would have negative air quality implications, the Member enquired and Mr C F Wong replied that the vehicular emission impact from the proposed PTI had been assessed and the requirements of the TM and the study brief could be complied with according to the EIA Report.

53. The Chairman enquired and Mr C F Wong replied that all relevant government departments had confirmed that the project could meet the requirements stipulated in the TM and the study brief. In accordance with the EIAO, only EIA reports meeting the requirements of the TM and the study brief would be made available for public inspection and be submitted to EIASC. Having said that, Mr Wong advised that the project proponent could be required to provide further information under Section 8 of the EIAO upon receiving comments from the public and the ACE.

54. Mr Louis Chan clarified that under the EIAO, ACE might provide comments to DEP within 60 days of its receiving a copy of the report. Mr C F Wong supplemented that under the provision of the EIAO, DEP would make a decision on the approval / rejection of the EIA report after receiving the further information.

55. A Member drew Members' attention to the EIA report on "Development of a bathing beach at Lung Mei, Tai Po" for which the project proponent was required to furnish additional information on the status of the habitat of Lung Mei Beach as a prerequisite for the EIA report approval.

[Post meeting note: ACE endorsed the EIA report for the Lung Mei project at its full Council meeting subject to the project proponent's provision of supplementary information.]

56. Two Members expressed concern whether the project proponent could provide adequate information timely prior to the forthcoming full Council meeting.

57. A Member pointed out with the agreement of the Chairman and another Member that the ACE could form an independent view on the EIA report even if the relevant government departments confirmed that the project had met the requirements of the TM and the study brief. The Chairman reminded that the EIASC should provide clear and sound justifications to support its decision.

58. Considering that the Planning Department confirmed that the project had met the requirements of the TM and the study brief in respect of the visual and landscape impacts, a Member opined and another Member concurred that it might not be fair to reject the EIA report solely because Members had a high expectation on the project proponent. As an EP was not required for the construction and operation of the topside development, a Member was concerned that the public credibility of the Council would be undermined if the project proponent decided not to take into account of its recommendations. Nevertheless, he was inclined to recommend the full Council endorse the report with recommendations. Three Members also considered that there were insufficient grounds to reject the EIA report.

59. With reference to the EIA report on “Tung Chung New Town Extension”, a Member recalled that the project proponent had been recommended to alleviate the landscape and visual impact of the high-rise residential buildings by deploying a stepped profile. He was of the view that similar requirements should be imposed on the topside development in the present case. Although there was a large demand for housing supply, he opined that the living standard should not be compromised. Mr C F Wong said that apart from using a stepped profile, there were alternative ways to mitigate the landscape and visual impact in the TM, such as by using vertical greening and/or using colours schemes to harmonize the buildings with surrounding landscape features. He added that it was quite common for individual project proponents to provide information of enhancement measures beyond specific requirements under the study brief and the TM, but it would be important to differentiate those enhancement measures with mitigation measures required under the EIAO.

60. Members felt that they could not endorse the EIA report on the Topside project at this meeting because of the unresolved concerns, and they would like to seek for supplementary information from the project proponent and further discuss the concerns. As it was not feasible to arrange another EIASC meeting before the full Council on 9 October 2017, a Member suggested discussing the concerns at and deferring the decision to the full Council.

61. A Member opined and another Member agreed that an opportunity should

be given to the project proponent to provide supplementary information and incorporate Members' comments in their plans before EIASC/ACE formed a final decision.

62. The Chairperson proposed and Members agreed that the decision of endorsing or not the EIA report would be deferred to the full Council for further consideration. The project proponent would be requested to submit the following supplementary information on issues to be further considered by the full Council:-

- (i) design concepts and considerations to further alleviate the landscape and visual impact of the residential buildings and podium, such as review of the building layout/design, massing/heights of the buildings, façade/podium treatment, colour schemes, etc. with a view to harmonizing with the landscape character of the surrounding area;
- (ii) feasibility of the project contributing to the waterfront/coastline which is a specific landscape element of the site; providing connectivity of residents to-access the northern site boundary and maximizing their use of the waterfront;
- (iii) feasibility of alternative designs to avoid installing fixed windows for sensitive facades at the southernmost row of residential buildings;
- (iv) detailed explanations on the considerations given to choose the Western Station option instead of the Central Station option;
- (v) the master layout plan and relevant sections for the project;
- (vi) information on measures that would be implemented for the project site to become a sustainable community and low carbon development;
- (vii) information on air ventilation assessment, microclimate study and view study done to justify the locations of the breezeways/airpath and view corridor;
- (viii) confirmation on the targeted standard to be achieved under the BEAM Plus rating system for the topside development; and
- (ix) drawings showing the provision of natural daylight and ventilation to the depot.

The secretariat would prepare the list of supplementary information required and seek comments of EPD and Members before passing to the project proponent for preparation of a written response.

Secretariat

[Post meeting note: The list of supplementary information required was passed to the project proponent on 15 September 2017.]

63. The meeting also agreed that the project proponent team should be invited to provide the written response to ACE before the full Council meeting scheduled on 9 October 2017, and to attend the full Council meeting.

64. In the event that the full Council eventually decided to endorse the EIA report upon receiving supplementary information from the project proponent, the Chairperson requested the secretariat to prepare a draft list of recommendations covering the following areas to facilitate the discussion:-

- (i) connectivity and walkability between the residential buildings and the SHO Station;
- (ii) recycling of food waste;
- (iii) sustainability of the development in terms of the rating under the BEAM Plus rating system;
- (iv) generation and reuse of surplus inert C&D materials;
- (v) carbon footprint and energy consumption;
- (vi) landscape and visual impact of the residential buildings; and
- (vii) reuse of greywater.

Railway EIA

65. The Chairperson proposed and Members agreed that the Railway EIA report could be endorsed with conditions and recommendations.

66. The Chairperson suggested and Members supported to include a condition to minimize the rail noise impact. Mr C F Wong advised that the project proponent might be required to submit a Noise Mitigation Measures Plan to DEP for approval before commencement of construction of the project.

67. The Chairperson also suggested and Members agreed that the project proponent should submit a comprehensive waste management plan for the separation and reuse of C&D materials generated under the project.

68. The Chairperson further suggested with the support of Members to recommend the project proponent to:-

- (i) incorporate the concept of sustainability into the design of SHO Station and SHD, including but not limited to the use of natural ventilation and lighting to reduce energy consumption; and
- (ii) provide facilities including pedestrian walkway, linkage, public spaces and cycle tracks to enhance connectivity and walkability within the project site and also to the adjacent waterfront and nearby Tung Chung New Town Extension.

69. The meeting agreed that the project proponent team would not be required to attend the full Council meeting for this report.

[Post meeting note: The list of proposed conditions and recommendations was circulated to Members for comments on 25 September 2017.]

Item 3 : Any other business

Site visit to Yuen Long South Potential Development Area

70. The Chairperson informed that the EIA Report on "Housing Sites in Yuen Long South" would be discussed at the EIASC meeting scheduled on 16 October 2017. To facilitate the discussion at the meeting, the project proponent, i.e. the Civil Engineering and Development Department (CEDD) invited ACE Members to attend a half-day pre-meeting briefing and site visit to the Yuen Long South Potential Development Area on 21 September 2017. She advised that so far eight Members had signed up for the visit and invited the other Members reconsider joining the visit should their schedule permit. The visit itinerary would be provided to Members in due course.

[Post meeting note: The visit itinerary was sent to Members of the ACE for reference on 13 September 2017.]

Item 4 : Date of next meeting

71. The Chairperson advised Members that the next Subcommittee meeting was scheduled on 16 October 2017 at 9:30 a.m. to discuss the EIA report on "Housing Sites in Yuen Long South". Members would be advised on the agenda in due course.

**EIA Subcommittee Secretariat
October 2017**