

CONFIDENTIAL

(Downgraded on 16.10.2009)

**Minutes of 403rd Meeting of the
Rural and New Town Planning Committee held at 2:30 p.m. on 18.9.09**

[Ms. Amy Y.M. Cheung, District Planning Officer/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (DPO/TMYL), Mr. C.C. Lau, Senior Town Planner/Tuen Mun and Yuen Long (STP/TMYL), Ms. Jessie Kwan, Town Planner/New Territories Headquarter (TP/NTHQ) and Professor Edmund Choi, Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) Consultant, were invited to the meeting at this point.]

[Mr. David W. M. Chan, Alfred Donald Yap and C. W. Tse arrived to join the meeting at this point.]

Agenda Item 3

[Closed Meeting]

Proposed Amendments to
the Draft Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan No. S/TM/25
(RNTPC Paper No. 15/09)

1. The Committee noted that Messrs. Tony C. N. Kan and Rock C.N. Chen had declared interests in this item as they owned some properties in Tuen Mun. However, as this item was related to the plan-making process only, the Committee agreed that Messrs. Kan and Chen could stay in the meeting and participate in the discussion.

2. Ms. Amy Y. M. Cheung, DPO/TMYL introduced to Members that the Tuen Mun Outline Zoning Plan (OZP) covered a large area of about 2,000 ha and the scope of the proposed amendments to the OZP included imposition of plot ratio (PR)/gross floor area (GFA) and building height (BH) restrictions, review of “Commercial/Residential” (“C/R”) zone and “Open Space” (“O”) zone involving private land, and incorporation of the recommendations of the “Planning and Engineering Review of Potential Housing Sites in Tuen Mun East Area” (Tuen Mun East Study) and rezoning proposals reflecting the as-built conditions or proposals previously agreed by the Committee.

3. With the aid of a Powerpoint presentation and a fly-through simulation, Mr C.C. Lau, STP/TMYL, briefed Members on the proposed amendments to the draft Tuen Mun OZP as detailed in the Paper and covered the following main points:

Current PR/GFA and BH Restrictions

- (a) The current PR/GFA and BH restrictions on the OZP including those regarding “Comprehensive Development Area” (“CDA”) zone in Areas 52, 55 and 56, “Residential (Group B)” (“R(B)”) sub-zones in the Tuen Mun East Area, “Village Type Development” (“V”) zone and “Other Specified Uses (“OU”) (Resource Recovery Park)” zone in Tuen Mun West Area were proposed to be retained. The two exceptions were “R(B)1” and “R(B)2” zones which were recommended to adopt a lower plot ratio and rezone to “Government, Institution or Community” (“G/IC”) respectively according to the findings of the Tuen Mun East Study;

Imposition of PR/GFA Restrictions

General Principles

- (b) PR/GFA restrictions were imposed to all development zones currently with no PR/GFA restrictions except the following:
 - (i) since a maximum BH restriction of 3 storeys (8.23m) had been imposed for the “V” zone and New Territories Exempted Houses were already restricted to a maximum roof-over area of 65.03m² under the Buildings Ordinance (Application to the New Territories) Ordinance (Cap 121), PR/GFA restriction for this zone was therefore considered not necessary;
 - (ii) for the “OU” zones covering small-scale developments pertaining to utility installation such as electric sub-station, gas off-take pigging stations, petrol filling station or where no development was envisaged, such as breakwater, the stipulation of development intensity was

considered not necessary; and

- (iii) incorporation of PR/GFA restrictions for “G/IC” zones was also considered impractical and unnecessary as these sites accommodated a wide range of uses and facilities in different scales with varying nature. The GFA requirements for various types of GIC uses could be very different, albeit falling under the same “G/IC” zoning. It was therefore not feasible to impose a blanket PR control over the entire “G/IC” zone.
- (c) the restrictions were generally based on the relevant Layout Plan, the Hong Kong Planning Standards and Guidelines and Tuen Mun East Study, where appropriate;
- (d) specific GFA restrictions for individual sites stipulated in the respective leases taking into account special site characteristics and circumstances would be respected and followed. The as-built conditions of existing development not governed by Layout Plan or lease restrictions would generally be followed;
- (e) existing development intensities would be respected if the lot was redeveloped for the same type of building as the existing building and hence there would be no loss of PR/GFA for existing developments as a result of the imposition of development intensity restrictions in the OZP;

PR/GFA Restrictions

- (f) proposed PR/GFA restrictions for various zones were highlighted below:

“Residential (Group A)” (“R(A)”) and Residential Related “OU” Zones

- (i) the administrative PR control of 5 for domestic and 9.5 for non-domestic (5/9.5) were proposed for the “R(A)” zone, unless the site was subject to special control under an approved planning scheme

or the lease restrictions. “R(A)” and “R(A)1” zones were restricted to a PR of 5/9.5;

- (ii) to ensure sufficient commercial floor space in the town centre, domestic and non-domestic GFA restrictions were proposed for sites thereat (i.e. “R(A)4” to “R(A)11”) taking into account lease entitlement, if available, or the as-built situation. Maximum GFA for public transport interchange (PTI) was also specified in the OZP at the major residential sites to ensure the provision of public transport facilities as well as to control over their bulk;
- (iii) the public housing sites under “R(A)” would be subject to a maximum PR restriction of 5/9.5. Whilst for most cases, the proposed restrictions were higher than their existing PR/GFAs, some Home Ownership Scheme (HOS)/Private Sector Participation Scheme (PSPS) sites might have lease restrictions higher than the recommended PR/GFA restrictions. For these sites, claim for existing building PR would be respected upon their redevelopment. There were also 9 HOS/PSPSs (i.e. “R(A)12” to “R(A)20”) with lease restrictions lower than the PR of 5/9.5. It was more appropriate to impose GFA restrictions on OZP according to their respective leases. Their sites were fairly large (2.55-8.73ha) and if they were allowed to be redeveloped to PR 5/9.5, very intense development incompatible with the surrounding areas would be resulted;
- (iv) domestic, non-domestic and PTI GFA restrictions for residential and Light Rail Terminal related “OU” zones were proposed mainly according to their lease restrictions and/or reflect existing conditions;
- (v) proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “R(A)” and residential related “OU” sites were detailed in paragraphs 4.5 to 4.11 of the Paper;

“CDA”, “R(B)”, “Residential (Group C)” (“R(C)”) and “Residential (Group E)” (“R(E)”) Zones

- (vi) in general, a PR of 1.3 was proposed for the “R(B)” zone mostly in the Tuen Mun East Area and the “CDA” zone in Area 59 currently without PR/GFA restrictions taking into account, where applicable, the lease restrictions, the existing building intensity, Layout Plan, and the recommendations of the Tuen Mun East Study;
- (vii) for “R(B)” zone closer to the town centre areas, higher PR of 3.3 and 3 were proposed for “R(B)10” and “R(B)11” respectively taking into account approved planning scheme, lease conditions and predominant existing development intensity;
- (viii) Hong Kong Gold Coast which included hotel and residential development was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)12” with a maximum GFA of 230,522m² to accord with the lease conditions;
- (ix) the residential developments at the easternmost part of Tuen Mun East Area in Area 59 was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)13” with PR restriction of 1.0 that generally reflected the predominant existing development intensity and respective Layout Plan;.
- (x) two sites located in the southeast of Lam Tei Interchange at Area 52 were proposed to be rezoned from “R(B)” to “R(C)” with a PR restriction of 0.4 to take reference of the restrictions in the lease and Layout Plan, the existing development intensity, and the low-rise village-type developments in Lam Tei;
- (xi) an existing “G/IC” site abutting Castle Peak Road – Lingnan and located to the south of Ching Leung Nunnery at Area 52, which was formerly occupied by ex-government quarters, was proposed to be rezoned to “R(E)”. Considering the predominantly private residential developments with PR of 3 to 4 in the surroundings and GFA of the ex-government quarters of about 9,875m² (equivalent to PR 2.9), a GFA restriction of 9,875m² was proposed;

(xii) strips of land zoned “GB” and “O” to the north of Tsz Tin Tsuen and Siu Hong Court in Area 51, contiguous to San Hing Tsuen which was zoned “R(E)” under the Lam Tei Yick Yuen (LTY Y) OZP were rezoned to “Residential (Group E)1” with the same PR restrictions of 1.0 and site coverage restriction of 40% as the “R(E)” zone under the LTY Y OZP;

(xiii) proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “CDA”, “R(B)”, “R(C)” and “R(E)” sites were detailed in paragraphs 4.14 to 4.17 of the Paper;

“Commercial” (“C”), “Industrial” (“I”) and Commercial/Industrial-related “OU” Zones

(xiv) the commercial development, Tuen Mun Parklane Square, at the junction of Tuen Mun Road and Tuen Hing Road at Area 11 currently zoned “C/R” would be rezoned to “C”. A maximum GFA of 40,000m² was proposed for the site in accordance with the lease conditions;

(xv) GFA restrictions were proposed for three “OU” sites at Tuen Mun East Area serving commercial functions to reflect lease restrictions/as-built conditions;

(xvi) in general, a maximum PR of 9.5 was proposed for the “I” zones in the town centre areas. For the “I” zones at the coastal areas, PR of 2.5, 3 and 5 were proposed to accord with the lease/as-built conditions;

(xvii) PR/GFA restrictions on special industrial “OU” zones in Tuen Mun West Area mainly aligned with those under the lease/as-built conditions; and

(xviii) proposed PR/GFA restrictions for “C”, “I” and Commercial/Industrial-related “OU” zones were detailed in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.21 of the Paper.

BH Concept

- (g) taking into account the topography, land use characteristics, existing BH profile and geographical location, in general, Tuen Mun could be divided into 7 sub-areas of different characters as shown in Plan 3 of the Paper. The proposed BH concept was illustrated in Plan 11 of the Paper;
- (h) a stepped height profile was adopted in the Central Coastal Area with BH gradually increasing from the waterfront at the south to the inland areas in the north to maximize the possible sea breeze effects and create diversity in height and massing at different localities;
- (i) the highest height band for Tuen Mun was proposed for the areas around West Rail Tuen Mun Railway Station site which served as the focal point of the town. Proposed height bands were gradually descending from this highest point towards the fringe areas;
- (j) a gradation of BH ascending from east to west and from sea towards the mountain areas was adopted for the Tuen Mun East Area with low to medium development intensity. Vistas towards the town centre upon entry from the east and vistas from MacLehose Trail towards the sea, would be preserved;
- (k) the view corridors and long vistas to points of visual interest, including the surrounding mountain viewsheds, the Town Park and the sea such as Castle Peak Bay and landmarks such as Tsing Shan Monastery should be preserved;
- (l) the “G/IC” sites were largely developed as relatively low-rise developments and served as visual and spatial relief as well as breathing space. Their low-rise profile should therefore be maintained. With completion of the proposed Tuen Mun-Chap Lap Kok Link and Tuen Mun Western Bypass, Tuen Mun West would become an important gateway area. Therefore

developments in Tuen Mun West Area should be kept low so as to preserve the view to the greenery Castle Peak backdrop;

- (m) to avoid monotonous townscape, the Explanatory Statement (ES) would clearly set out the intention to encourage variations in BH in large sites. Moreover, open space/GIC sites could serve as visual breaks and provide variation in the BH profile;

Major Findings of Air Ventilation Assessment Expert Evaluation Study

- (n) a consultancy study on the Air Ventilation Assessment (AVA) on Tuen Mun by Expert Evaluation (EE) was undertaken to assess the air ventilation impacts of the proposed development restrictions for various development zones for incorporation into the OZP. Findings of the AVA were detailed in paragraph 5.3 of the Paper and highlighted below:
 - (i) the prevailing annual wind direction was NNE which blew down along major flow paths along the Tuen Mun River Channel (TMRC), Tuen Mun Road and Ming Kum Road/Tsing Wun Road. Castle Peak Road and Tuen Mun Heung Sze Wui Road were also N-S flow paths. Several E-W paths along Tsing Tin Road, Shek Pai Tau Road, Pui To Road and Wong Chu Road formed the linkage between the N-S flow paths and allowed cross flow to bring wind to areas to the interior of the major flow paths;
 - (ii) the available wind for the Tuen Mun East and Tuen Mun West Areas should be adequate;
 - (iii) a strip of land at Area 29 between Leung King Estate and Po Tin Estate served as a breezeway bringing down the wind from the slope eastwards. Future developments should avoid forming long continuous lines of building blocking the katabatic winds blowing down the slopes;

- (iv) non-building area(s) within the proposed developments at Area 54 should be introduced to safeguard the penetration of the prevailing winds from NNE to the downstream areas;
- (v) existing low-rise GIC facilities and open spaces at Area 3 that currently served as air paths to bring wind into the inner area, should be preserved for better air penetration;
- (vi) air ventilation problems were encountered in the old town area and industrial area. To improve the air ventilation of the industrial area, setting back from the street frontage along Hung Cheung Road would allow a wider north-south flow path. Ho Tin Street could be a suitable east-west flow path if its western end could be unblocked. For the Tuen Mun old town, it would be desirable to have wider cross flow paths and increase the podia permeability for better air circulation;
- (vii) having heights progressively increased towards the Tuen Mun town centre area would be useful to bring the summer winds into the inland and town centre area. Several wind flow paths to bring winds to the further north including, the TMRC, Tuen Mun Road, Ming Kum Road, Castle Peak Road and Tuen Mun Heung Sze Wui Road should be maintained with as little obstructions as possible; and
- (viii) building blocks forming a long continuous line should be discouraged as it would block wind over a large part of area on its leeward side.

Proposed BH Restrictions

General Principles

- (o) existing BH restrictions on Tuen Mun OZP was proposed to be retained except for the sites zoned “R(B)1” and “R(B)2”. For “R(B)1”, BH restriction was revised from 24 storeys above car park to 70 and 85 metres above Principal Datum (mPD) to create a “stepped-height” profile for

visual and air ventilation consideration and preserve view from MacLehose Trail. For “R(B)2”, the site would be rezoned to “G/IC” with BH restriction of 8 storeys;

- (p) for other sites, the imposition of height bands is to tie in with the planning intention as well as to reflect the predominant conditions of the existing buildings/committed proposals. The existing out-of-context tall buildings should not be taken as the reference in formulating BH control;
- (q) generally speaking, for development zones other than “G/IC”, the proposed BH restrictions would not affect the development potential of the sites as permitted on the OZP. Height of existing buildings would be respected upon redevelopment;
- (r) in general, BH restrictions were specified in mPD, but in number of storeys for low-rise structures or those zones currently with storey-based restrictions;
- (s) for development zones with BH restriction to be introduced in this review, other than the sites for rural residential use zoned “R(E)1”, basement floor(s) might be disregarded in determining the number of storeys for BH;
- (t) “G/IC” zones with their relatively low-rise nature generally served as visual relief and breathing space in the midst of congested high-rise developments. Imposition of BH control on “G/IC” zones was therefore considered necessary. BH restrictions for the “G/IC” zones were formulated mainly to reflect the existing BH and/or BH restrictions on the land allocation/lease/approved planning scheme, accommodate the nature of the GIC facilities, maintain compatible building mass in the local setting, generalize BH restrictions for GIC facilities within the same cluster, meet the height requirement for the designated GIC facilities such as 8 storeys for school sites;
- (u) to allow for design flexibility, minor relaxation of the BH restrictions

through the planning permission system could be considered on individual merits;

BH Restrictions for Various Sub-Areas

- (v) the proposed BH restrictions for various sub-areas were shown in Plans 12 and 13 of the Paper and highlighted below:

Central Coastal Area

- (i) to increase the air permeability from waterfront to inland, the BH profile designed for this sub-area was to provide a smooth gradation between the relatively lower waterfront development to higher inland development further north. To allow for an interesting height profile and taking into consideration AVA recommendations, BH bands in a range of 20mPD, 35mPD, 50mPD, 85mPD to 100mPD were proposed for the sites zoned “R(A)”, “I” and residential and commercial related “OU” in this sub-area;
- (ii) to reflect the existing BH and lease conditions of the two industrial waterfront sites and to achieve the stepped height profile for better urban design and breezeway effect, a 35mPD height restriction for the “I(1)” sites at Area 16 and 50mPD for the “I(2)” sites at Area 44 are proposed;
- (iii) a maximum BH of 85mPD was proposed for residential developments at the waterfront sites and two sites at the foothill of Castle Peak Ridge;
- (iv) a maximum BH of 100mPD for the “R(A)” sites at the east bank of the TMRC and to the landward side north of those waterfront sites at a lower height band, Sun Tuen Mun Centre at Area 18 and “R(A)” site for proposed Public Rental Housing in the northern edge of Area 18;

- (v) details of the proposed BH bands were given in paragraphs 5.6.1 and 5.6.2 of the Paper;

Central Core Area

- (vi) a stepped-down BH profile was proposed for this sub-area with taller developments at a central location of the town and gradually descended down to the fringe areas;
- (vii) a BH restriction of 156mPD representing the highest ceiling in Tuen Mun was proposed for the future development at West Rail Tuen Mun Railway Station (zoned “R(A)4”) located in the town centre. Descending height bands of 120mPD, 100mPD, 85mPD from this highest point towards the fringe areas were proposed;
- (viii) a maximum BH of 120mPD for the several existing “R(A)” developments located at Areas 5 and 9 to the northwest of the Railway Station is proposed;
- (ix) a “two-tier BH system” of 100mPD and 85mPD was proposed for the “R(A)1” sites at Area 10 to the east of the West Rail Tuen Mun Station and west of Tuen Mun Road. Amalgamation of sites was encouraged by allowing a higher height band of 100mPD for sites not less than 400m²;
- (x) a maximum BH band of 100mPD included the existing composite developments (zoned “R(A)5” to “R(A)11”) to the south of Pui To Road next to and in the north of the Town Park and Tuen Mun Cultural Square at Areas 11 and 37, other “R(A)” type residential developments to the further northeast and northwest at Areas 4 and 6 and “I” sites at Area 9 to the west of the Tuen Mun Station;
- (xi) a maximum BH band of 85mPD for sites near the fringe of the

Central Core Area in maintaining the stepped height profile was proposed for the portion of “R(A)” developments at Area 10 to the east of Tuen Mun Road, an existing commercial building, known as Tuen Mun Parklane Square at Area 11 (to be rezoned from “C/R” to “C” with a maximum BH restrictions for 85mPD and 30mPD for the southern and northern portion of the site respectively), the “T” sites to the south of Pui To Road at Areas 12 and 17 and the site zoned “OU” annotated “Comprehensive Industrial Development with Ancillary Commercial and Community Facility” at Area 17;

- (xii) details of the proposed BH bands were given in paragraphs 5.6.3 and 5.6.4 of the Paper;

Northern Fringe Area

- (xiii) in general, the topography in the Northern Fringe Area was higher than the rest of the town. A maximum BH of 120mPD was proposed for the existing relatively high-rise residential developments near Siu Hong West Rail Station at Area 51 and Area 52 and along Tsun Wen Road at Area 2 at the central position of the sub-area to reflect the existing height profile. The proposed private and public residential developments at the “R(A)” zone in Area 54 were also in this height band;
- (xiv) a maximum BH of 106mPD was proposed for the “CDA” at Area 52 that represented the highest building of the latest application No. A/TM/310 approved on 25.9.2003;
- (xv) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the residential developments at the hillside at the Northern Fringe Area;
- (xvi) a maximum BH of 85mPD for a small pocket of “R(A)3” site to the immediate south of Fu Tai Estate for a future student hostel of Lingnan University was proposed to respect the height stipulated in

the land grant;

- (xvii) a maximum BH of 70mPD was proposed for the “R(E)” site at the junction of Castle Peak Road – Lingnan Section and Tuen Mun Road to reflect the height of the planned government departmental quarters redevelopment at the site;
- (xviii) a maximum BH of 5 storeys including one-storey car park for “R(E)1” at the northern planning scheme boundary to be in line with that of the “R(E)” zone adjoining the site covered by the Lam Tei Yick Yuen OZP (S/TM-LTYY/6) in the north;
- (xix) a maximum BH of 3 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) for two small “R(C)” sites at Tuen Mun Area 52 at the Northern Fringe Area to generally reflect the restrictions in the lease;
- (xx) details of the proposed BH restrictions were given in paragraphs 5.6.5 to 5.6.7 of the Paper;

Eastern Fringe Area

- (xxi) being the interface between densely developed areas in the Central Areas and mountain slopes, the general urban design principle for development at the fringe areas was to respect the natural environment, create an appropriate edge and where appropriate, visual corridors to the surrounding natural landscape assets;
- (xxii) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” site at Area 4 that generally reflected the existing height;
- (xxiii) the residential developments at the Eastern Fringe Area to the east of Castle Peak Road – Castle Peak Bay and south of Pui To Road were mainly zoned “R(B)” with BH of around 60-65mPD. A maximum BH of 70mPD was proposed to reflect the existing BH and to

strengthen the transition between the high-rise Central Areas and the medium to low-rise Tuen Mun East Area to its northwest and east respectively;

- (xxiv) details of the proposed BH bands were given in paragraphs 5.6.8 and 5.6.9 of the Paper;

Western Fringe Area

- (xxv) a maximum BH of 100mPD was proposed for the “R(A)” site, i.e. Shan King Estate at Area 7 with existing heights varying from 66 - 116mPD. The Western Fringe Area was dominated by G/IC uses, the BH restrictions of which mainly reflected their as-built conditions. Details of the proposed BH restriction were given in paragraphs 5.6.10 of the Paper;

Tuen Mun East Area

- (xxvi) the four guiding principles for determination of BH restrictions were:
- to maintain the distinct low-rise and tranquil characters;
 - to enhance the existing “gateway” feature of the Tuen Mun East Area with stepped-up BH profile which generally increased from So Kwun Wat in the east to the higher density Central Area in the west, and from the waterfront to the hilly areas;
 - to respect the existing restrictions on the administrative Layout Plan, the lease restrictions and/or the existing BH;
and
 - to take into account the latest recommendations of the Tuen Mun East Study.
- (xxvii) BH proposals were detailed in paragraphs 5.6.12 and 5.6.13 of the Paper and summarised below:
- two height bands of 85mPD and 70mPD for the “R(B)1”

zone covering an ex-military site were proposed to safeguard the vista from MacLehose Trail, create a “stepped height” profile and to improve local air ventilation;

- maximum BH of 70mPD was imposed on the residential and hotel components (except those existing low-rise developments facing the marina) of Hong Kong Gold Coast at Area 57 to generally accord with the lease restriction of 76mPD;
- for the coastal “CDA” site at Lok On Pai in Area 59, a variation of BH from 26mPD to 41mPD was proposed from urban design and air ventilation perspectives;
- BH of 10 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) was proposed for the “R(B)” sites of the existing residential developments at Area 48, Spring Seaview Terrace and Monte Carlo Villas at Area 57, Peridot Court, the Aegean, Villa Sapphire and upper portion of Aqua Blue at Area 58 and the proposed developments in Areas 55 and 56;
- maximum BH of 6 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) was proposed for the “R(B)” sites at the Hillgrove and TMTL449 at Area 58, residential developments of Hong Kong Gold Coast facing the marina, pockets of residential developments in the “R(B)” zone along the waterfront and the former police quarters near the Siu Lam Interchange at Area 59 (to be rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(B)”); and
- maximum BH of 3 storeys (excluding basement floor(s)) was proposed for the “R(B)13” sites at Area 59 at the eastern most part of Tuen Mun and at the waterfront.

Tuen Mun West Area

(xxviii) the area was predominantly for low rise special industries indicated below for “G/IC”, “I” and “OU” sites;

“G/IC” and “OU” Zones (non-residential related)

- (xxix) the “G/IC” and “OU” zones, apart from providing facilities to serve the community or for specific purposes, also served as breathing space and visual relief to the Area. Taking into consideration the recommendations of the AVA Study, redevelopment of the “G/IC” and “OU” zones for more intensive development was generally not encouraged. Therefore, BH restrictions were imposed on all the “G/IC” and “OU” zones to limit their vertical profile and/or to reflect their existing BH;
- (xxx) for GIC developments with height of 13 storeys or below, BH in terms of number of storeys was imposed to allow some flexibility for special requirements while a more definitive BH control in mPD was proposed for GIC facilities with BH exceeding 13 storeys;
- (xxxii) for undesignated “G/IC” sites on formed land, a BH restriction of 3 storeys was proposed to allow minor ancillary facilities. For service reservoirs and unformed “G/IC” sites at the hilly areas, 1 storey BH restriction was imposed;
- (xxxiii) to preserve the breathing space in the Northern Fringe Area for better air penetration, the existing low-rise character for the large “G/IC” zone at Area 3 would be maintained with proposed BH restrictions predominantly of 3, 4 and 5 storeys;
- (xxxiii) the proposed BH restrictions for “G/IC” zone were shown on Plan 13 and detailed in paragraphs 5.7.4 and 5.7.5 and Attachment VI of the Paper;
- (xxxiv) non-residential “OU” zones mainly covered the special industries and

[Mr. Edmund K.H. Leung arrived to join the meeting while Mr. Tony C.N. Kan left the meeting temporarily at this point.]

commercial uses in the Tuen Mun East and West Areas. To cater for the wide variety of their operation needs and land uses, BH restrictions in terms of mPD or number of storeys were designated for respective “OU” zones, where appropriate. Some of the major proposals were highlighted below:

- two height bands of 60mPD and 95mPD corresponding to the existing platforms levels were proposed for the “OU (Crematorium, Columbarium, Funeral Services Centre and Open Space)” zone;
- BH restriction of 85mPD was proposed for the “OU(Power Station)” site;
- the “OU(Special Industries Area)” site designated for the Shiu Wing Steel Mill would be subject to a BH restriction of 60mPD or the height of the existing building;
- BH restriction of 30mPD was proposed for “OU(River Trade Terminal)”, “OU(Sewerage Treatment Plant)”, “OU(Container Storage and Repair Depot)”, “OU(Special Industrial Area)” for the proposed Permanent Aviation Fuel Facility for fuel storage tanks and “OU(Special Industrial Area)” site to the west of River Trade Terminal;
- the “OU(Cement Plant)” site would be subject to a BH restriction of 26mPD, or the height of the existing building; and
- BH restriction of 26mPD was also proposed for the “I(3)” sites at the waterfront at Area 40 to follow the height restrictions in the leases and the BH of existing developments.

(xxxv) details of the BH restrictions on “OU” zones were shown in Plan 13 and detailed in paragraph 5.7.7 and Attachment VII of the Paper.

- (w) currently, the major wind flow paths were Tuen Mun River and Ming Kum Road. To facilitate the north-south and east-west air ventilation of the densely built-up industrial areas, four NBAs along Kin On Street and Hung Cheung Road and at the junctions of Ho Tin Street and Kin Fat Street respectively were proposed;
- (x) to enhance visual permeability within the dense built-up environment, a 10m wide strip of land from the southern boundary of the lots of three industrial buildings at Area 12 were designated as NBAs so as to set back the industrial buildings to introduce a suitable setting for the low-rise Tin Hau Temple and the proposed Tin Hau Plaza;
- (y) to protect vistas to the existing vital points of visual interest i.e. Tuen Mun Town Park and the waterfront; and to improve the amount of air feeding into and penetrating through the Central Core Area, two strips of lands of approximately 15m-wide along Tuen Mun Heung Sze Wui Road between Hoi Wing Road and Tuen Hing Road were proposed. The NBAs together with Tuen Mun Heung Sze Wui Road and the existing open spaces formed an 800m breezeway from the waterfront area to the Town Park, creating a landscape avenue along this central spine of the town;
- (z) to enhance the linkage between the Tuen Mun Town Park and the two future points of interest, i.e. the west bank of TMRC at Area 33 and a sports ground at Area 16, identified under the Tuen Mun River Area Revitalization Project, a 10m wide NBA was proposed along the promenade at the western edge of Yau Oi Estate;
- (aa) for the “R(A)” sites in Area 54, sufficient building gaps should be provided to facilitate north-south wind paths. Requirement of NBAs as suggested in the AVA would be specified in the ES of the OZP and its detailed configuration should be considered under the detailed AVA prepared for the future developments on these sites;
- (bb) the AVA EE also suggested that adequate spacing between buildings

should be provided and large clusters of continuous buildings should be avoided in Tuen Mun East Area. Long continuous lines of buildings blocking the katabatic winds in Area 29 should also be avoided. These recommendations together with suggested design measures that could improve air ventilation conditions such as lower podium height, greater permeability of podium, wider gap between building, mixed BH within large site capped with the proposed height restriction were included in the ES;

- (cc) the proposed NBAs and other AVA recommendations included in the ES were detailed in paragraphs 6.1 to 6.5 and shown in Plans 11a, 11b and 11d of the Paper;

Land Use Review of the “C/R” Zone

- (dd) the “C/R” sites at Areas 11 and 37 in the town centre and at Area 28 in the waterfront area had already been developed;
- (ee) seven sites currently zoned “C/R” in the town centre were rezoned to various sub-zones of “R(A)” to reflect the existing “R(A)” type buildings with 3-5 levels commercial/car park podium. They included Tuen Mun Town Plaza, Kam Wah Garden, the Trend Plaza, New Town Mansion and Waldorf Garden. Non-domestic GFA restrictions for these sites were proposed to ensure sufficient commercial floorspace in the town centre area;
- (ff) a site at the junction of Tuen Mun Road and Tuen Hing Road at Area 11 covering a 24-storey commercial building, known as Tuen Mun Parklane Square and adjoining section of Tuen Hi Road to its east was rezoned from “C/R” to “C” to reflect the existing use and maintain its function as district commercial/ shopping centre;
- (gg) a waterfront site (south of Wu Chiu Road) covering Richland Garden at Area 28 was rezoned from “C/R” to “R(A)” to reflect the existing use;

- (hh) a number of government facilities including Tuen Mun Town Hall, Tuen Mun Public Library, Tuen Mun Government Offices, Tuen Mun Law Courts, Tuen Mun Cultural Square, Yan Oi Polyclinic and Pok Oi Hospital Mrs Cheng Yam On School falling within the “C/R” zone were proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC”;
- (ii) an existing petrol filling station abutting the eastern side of Tuen Mun Road at Area 37 was rezoned to “OU(Petrol Filling Station)” to reflect the existing use and an approved planning application;
- (jj) the “C/R” zone at Tuen Mun Area 27 at Sam Shing Wan comprising an water area and part of an existing breakwater was rezoned to “Undetermined” which would be subject to further detailed study on the need and scale of the reclamation, the long-term land use and technical feasibility;
- (kk) rezoning proposals of “C/R” zones were detailed in paragraphs 7.2.2 to 7.2.5 of the Paper;

[Mr. Tony C.N. Kan returned to join the meeting at this point.]

Land Use Review of “O” Zones

- (ll) there were six “O” zones involved private land but with no development programme as confirmed by LCSD. Three of the “O” sites with main encroachments onto private lots were proposed to be rezoned to “R(E)1”, “R(A)20”, “GB”, “V” and ‘Road’ to mainly reflect existing uses. They included:
 - (i) a piece of land zoned “O” surrounding Siu Hong Court near the Lam Tei Interchange was rezoned to “R(E)1”, “R(A)20” and ‘Road’ mainly to reflect the site characteristics and existing function;

- (ii) an “O” site at the Western Fringe Area on the slope of the Castle Peak Ridge at Tuen Mun Area 43 was rezoned to “GB” given its urban fringe location and well-vegetated conditions; and
 - (iii) a formed site zoned “O” (about 0.89ha) at Area 56 near So Kwun Wat Tsuen was rezoned to “V” taking into account that an area of 9,764m² within the nearby “V” zone in So Kwun Wat OZP area had been taken up for drainage works.
- (mm) the remaining three “O” zones covering both government and private lands were proposed to be retained in view of their potentials to be developed into recreational uses. These included an “O” site at Tuen Mun Area 59 abutting Castle Peak Road – So Kwun Wat near Siu Lam Interchange, the “O” site at Area 55 to the east of Aegean Coast and the waterfront “O” zone at Sam Shing Wan;
- (nn) zoning amendments had been proposed to reflect the as-built situations of existing open spaces and were summarised below:
- (i) open spaces subsumed in large “R(A)” sites including Yan Oi Town Square, Tsing Hoi Playground, Tsing Wah Soccer Pitch, Tsing Sin Street Basketball Court, Wu Shan Lawn Bowling Green and Wu King Road Garden were rezoned to “O”;
 - (ii) existing open spaces including Wu Shan Tennis Court and a riverside open space site to the east of Chelsea Heights at Area 5 falling within “G/IC” zones were proposed to be rezoned to “O”; and
 - (iii) various sites within the industrial areas, currently occupied by Shek Pai Tau Playground at Area 9, Hung Cheung Road Playground, Hung Cheung Road Sitting Out Area and San On Street Sitting Out Area at Area 12, and a site at the junction of Hoi Tin Street/Kin On Street forming part of the air path as recommended in the AVA EE were rezoned from “I” to “O”.

(oo) recommendations of “O” zones were detailed in paragraphs 8.2 to 8.4 of the Paper;

Rezoning Proposals Recommended under Tuen Mun East Study

(pp) based on the findings of the Tuen Mun East Study, rezoning proposals were detailed in paragraph 9.1.1 of the Paper and summarised below:

- (i) an ex-military site to the northwest of Aegean Coast was rezoned from “R(B)2” to “G/IC” to reserve it for future GIC uses;
- (ii) a site zoned “R(A)” in Area 56 in the Tuen Mun East Area once considered for the public housing development was rezoned to “R(B)”, in view of visual impact, compatibility with surrounding land use and infrastructural constraints, with PR restriction of 1.3 and BH restriction of 10 storeys;
- (iii) a site previously occupied by a police quarters was rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(B)” to facilitate private residential use with PR restriction of 1.3 and BH restriction of 6 storeys;
- (iv) boundary of the “CDA” zone at Lok On Pai in Area 59 was rationalized. Moreover, a strip of land of about 15m in width along the sea frontage of the “CDA” site was rezoned from “CDA” to “O” for a public waterfront promenade; and
- (v) some slopes not suitable for development were rezoned to “GB”.

Other Rezoning Proposals

(qq) other rezoning proposals mainly to reflect development proposals, existing/committed uses, provide clearer planning intention and rationalize zoning boundaries were proposed. They were detailed in paragraphs 9.1.2

to 9.1.10 and 9.2.1 to 9.2.4 of the Paper and summarised below:

- (i) To reflect the latest land use proposals recommended in the Tuen Mun Area 54 Review Study, a site to the southwest of Po Tong Ha was rezoned from “G/IC” to “R(A)” for the proposed public housing development and a site located to the north of Tsz Tin Tsuen was rezoned from “G/IC” to “V” as the site was no longer required for the proposed sewage pumping station use;
- (ii) the completed medium-density residential development at TMTL 443 in the “CDA” site to the north of Lingnan University at Area 52 was proposed to be rezoned to “R(B)11” with a PR restriction of 3.0 and a BH restriction of 120mPD;
- (iii) a number of existing GIC facilities which were mostly free-standing schools and community facilities in “R(A)” zones were proposed to be rezoned to “G/IC”, in order to reflect more clearly their existing and intended uses and to facilitate their functions as visual and spatial relief through designation of BH restrictions;
- (iv) six government sites in the industrial area at Areas 9 and 12 were currently occupied by GIC uses including police station, fire station, ambulance depot, cooked food market, refuse collection point, public toilet and open-air carpark. In order to reflect the current uses and/or to maintain their existing low-rise character for air penetration within the industrial area, these sites were rezoned from “I” to “G/IC”;
- (v) the “OU (LRT Terminus)” zone in Tuen Mun East Area no longer required for Light Rail development was rezoned to “G/IC” for future GIC facilities;
- (vi) to reflect the existing natural setting, two “R(B)” sites at Area 48, with mature vegetations were rezoned from “R(B)” to “GB” while a natural slope at the northern portion of a “G/IC” site at Area 29

between Po Tin Estate and Leung King Estate was also rezoned to “GB”;

- (vii) sites no longer required for development were rezoned to zonings/areas which reflected their actual uses such as ‘Road’, ‘Nullah’ or “OU (Breakwater)”;
- (viii) technical adjustments to the zoning boundaries for various sites at Tuen Mun West Area to accord with the updated land allocation plans and the existing site conditions along the seawall were proposed. These rezoning proposals were detailed in paragraph 9.2.1 of the Paper;
- (ix) to adjust the boundary of “OU(Breakwater)” zone to the south of the River Trade Terminal to exclude the unreclaimed part of the breakwater;
- (x) boundary adjustments for the “CDA” site in Area 55 in Tuen Mun East Area were proposed to tally with the boundary of the approved “CDA” scheme (latest approved application no. A/TM/288-1, approved on 13.7.2006), involving rezoning from “CDA” to “R(B)” and from “R(B)” to “CDA”; and
- (xi) other minor boundary adjustments to reflect as-built situations were proposed and they were detailed in paragraph 9.2.4 of the Paper.

Proposed Amendments to the OZP

- (rr) the proposed amendments to the OZP and its Notes were mainly related to stipulation of BH restrictions, incorporation of PR/GFA restrictions, designation of NBAs, rezoning “C/R” and “O” zones, zoning amendments to reflect findings of Studies, proposed development, existing conditions and approved planning scheme. Details of these amendments were given in Attachment I, II, VIII and IX of the Paper;

- (ss) the ES of the OZP had been revised to take into account the proposed amendments to the OZP and to update the general information for the various land use zones to reflect the latest status and planning circumstances of the OZP. Details of the amendments were given in Attachment III of the Paper; and

Public Consultation

- (tt) to avoid pre-mature release of the development control information which might lead to a surge of building plan submissions before the control under OZP would be gazetted and defeat the purpose of the development control, the Tuen Mun District Council would be consulted on the amendments during the exhibition period of the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/25A (to be renumbered to S/TM/26 upon exhibition) for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance.

4. In response to the Chairperson's enquiry, Mr. C. C. Lau confirmed that the land under the Tuen Mun East Study was mainly Government Land.

5. Mr. C. W. Tse said that many development sites in Tuen Mun East Area were on two sides of the major roads and might be subject to noise problems. He asked if any mechanisms were proposed to ensure that the developers would tackle the noise problems in the future developments. Ms. Amy Cheung responded that the Tuen Mun East Study had confirmed that the development proposals recommended were environmentally acceptable subject to the incorporation of appropriate mitigation measures such as the adoption of noise barriers, variation of BH or adjustment of block disposition. While the Study Consultant would further discuss with departments concerned to finalize the proposed mitigation measures, the overall development parameters recommended under the Study would not be affected. The Consultant of the Study had recommended including special conditions in the lease to ensure that the future development would not be susceptible to unacceptable noise impact.

6. In response to a Member's concern on the air ventilation problem particularly in

summer in the town centre areas and the Chairperson's enquiry on the proposed mitigation measures, Professor Edmund Choi explained that the town centre areas and the industrial areas had experienced weak air ventilation as a result of the densely built environment. With the aid of Figure 6.13a of the AVA EE Report, Professor Choi suggested that mitigation measures were to have flow paths cutting through the area and indicated that this could be done by having NBAs to facilitate the north-south flow path along Kin On Street and Hung Cheung Road and east-west flow path along Ho Tin Street within the industrial area. For the old town areas near the Tuen Mun West Rail Station, he explained with the aid of Figure 6.13b of the AVA EE Report that east-west flow paths linking Tuen Mun Heung Sze Wui Road and Tuen Mun Road which were the major flow paths were proposed. Moreover, BH variations would help enhance the downwash effect and hence air ventilation in the area.

7. After further deliberation, the Committee decided to :

- (a) agree to the proposed amendments to the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/25 and that the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/25A at Attachment I (to be renumbered to S/TM/26 upon exhibition) and its Notes at Attachment II of the Paper were suitable for exhibition for public inspection under section 7 of the Ordinance;
- (b) adopt the revised ES at Attachment III of the Paper for the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/25A as an expression of the planning intentions and objectives of the Board for various land use zones on the Plan; and
- (c) agree that the revised ES was suitable for exhibition together with the draft Tuen Mun OZP No. S/TM/25A (to be renumbered as S/TM/26 upon exhibition) and issued under the name of the Board.

[The Chairperson thanked Ms. Amy Y. M. Cheung, DPO/TMYL, Mr. C. C. Lau, STP/TMYL, Ms. Jessie Kwan, TP/NTHQ and Professor Edmond Choi, AVA Consultant, for their attendance to answer Members' enquires. Ms. Cheung, Mr. Lau, Ms. Kwan and Professor Choi left the meeting at this point.]